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This dissertation challenges the over-familiar Christian dualism of the corrupt body and the redeemed soul, and completely rethinks the significance of the term “soul” in Renaissance culture. I argue that sixteenth and seventeenth century poets and philosophers uneasily defined the human as possessing two contradictory souls, and that the anxiety provoked by the contradiction of the Aristotelian and Christian souls led to a basic redefinition of the early modern subject. The dissertation begins with an intellectual history describing how 16th century theologians came to realize that the presence of two souls in man, Aristotelian and Christian, represented a major crisis for Christian doctrine. Reading the work of Pietro Pomponazzi, Philipp Melanchthon, and John Woolton, I argue that the paradox of two souls became a problem of political obedience and a rationalization of the Christian subject's passive relation to law. The dissertation then tracks the critical response of prominent English poets, such as William Shakespeare, John Donne, and John Davies, who argued that the paradox of two souls could not be understood as a fictional justification of law and political obedience, and that 16th century theologians were telling the wrong fiction to explain the two souls. All of these English poets turned to the resources of poetic language and dramatic plot as the most potent means to understand and resolve the two souls paradox as a basis for a novel Christian poetics of freedom, and not an abject servility to law. In all of these English poets, I identify a sustained work of contesting and redefining the parameters of the word “soul” as the basis of the Christian subject, and a reconfiguration of the two souls paradox into a problem rendered comprehensible by literary narrative and the craft of poetry.
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Introduction: “Crowded Subjectivity: Two Souls in Historical Phenomenology”

And indeed I know not, whether it will be pleasing to all, that instituting the something Paradoxical Doctrine of the Animal Soul, that I should assign to that Soul, by which the Brutes as well as Men live, feel, move, not only Extension, but Members, and as it were Organical Parts...and that moreover, I should form this...Man, a Two-soul'd Animal, and as it were a manifold Geryon.¹

-Thomas Willis, Two Discourses Concerning the Soul of Brutes.

I am inspired. This inspiration is the psyche. The psyche can signify this alterity in the same without alienation in the form of incarnation, as being-in-one’s-skin, having-the-other-in-one’s-skin...This self is out of phase with itself.

[...]
The Mind is a multiplicity of individuals.²

-Emmanuel Levinas, Otherwise than Being, or Beyond Essence.

Shall we...draw three souls out of one weaver?³

-William Shakespeare, Twelfth Night, II.iii.54-57

My dissertation rethinks the Renaissance concept of “man” in terms of a crowded subjectivity, of two souls crowding the body of the individual subject, making that subject ill at ease in its own skin. I argue that the central problem of defining the concept of the human in the Renaissance was not the conventional dualism of body and soul that we all know very well. Rather, I demonstrate that the most vexing problem of early modern culture was the previously unrecognized dualism of two souls, the Aristotelian and Christian souls.⁴ Throughout the sixteenth century, Christian thinkers came to realize that these two souls fundamentally contradicted one another. One hand, the Aristotelian soul was mortal, rooted in the function of the body’s organs, and internally divided into the three faculties of reason, sensation, and nutrition. On the other hand, the Christian soul is believed to be immortal, transcendent, and should have absolutely no debt to the body’s organs. The realization in the sixteenth century that the two souls directly contradicted one another provoked a great deal of anxiety in the early modern world, leading Christian thinkers to ask: how can we, as God’s perfect design, have two redundant and contradictory souls? And how could the core of the Christian subject possibly be

---

¹ Willis, Thomas. Two Discourses Concerning the Soul of Brutes. London: Thomas Dring, 1683.
⁴ The problem of “two souls in one body” has traditionally been associated with Augustine’s critique of the Manichean position that the human is composed of a good soul created by God, and an evil soul created by the “people of darkness” (gente tenebrarum). In the early modern period, the problem of two souls does not concern good and evil as much as the different and irreconcilable substances composing the Aristotelian and Christian souls. For the Manichean debate among the early Christian fathers, see: Ferwerda, R. “Two Souls: Origen’s and Augustine’s Attitude to the Two Souls Doctrine.” Vigiliae Christianae 37 (1983): 360-378.
defined by a psychological contradiction or paradox? I argue that the concept of the soul was an intrinsically unstable term that was being renegotiated in Renaissance culture.

Once we recognize that the crisis of two souls is the defining problem of the early modern period, we can go back and reread seemingly familiar texts with completely new eyes, seeing how prominent literary figures such as John Donne, William Shakespeare, and Sir John Davies were all actively participating in a vibrant debate of the time in ways that we haven’t previously acknowledged. My work offers radical new readings of their major texts as specifically responding to the two-souls problem. Their decisive solution to the two-souls crisis involved rethinking the paradox as a specifically literary problem, by focusing attention on the figures and tropes traditionally used to describe how the soul functions. These English poets attempted to identify a new mode of Christian agency by rewriting how the two souls define the subject in the malleable language of poetry, and by modifying the tropes and figures used to understand the soul. They forcefully asserted that the contents of the soul were not fixed by natural or divine law, but could be rewritten by the poet.

The major innovation introduced by these poets was transforming the theological into the emphatically literary and figural. For them, rhetorical figures and literary language are not simply representations or approximations of abstract theological ideas. Rather, literature and rhetoric are the only ways to untangle and resolve the seemingly intractable paradox of two souls. All of the English poets in my project transformed the soul from the metaphysical basis of salvation, traditionally analyzed in the domains of theology or philosophy, into a matter most powerfully understood in terms of its textuality and its composition in literary language.

In defining the Renaissance conception of the individual as a crowded subject bursting at the seams with two souls, I take my cue from my epigraph cited from Emmanuel Levinas’ *Otherwise Than Being*. Levinas reconceives subjectivity in terms of the psyche or soul that defines an alterity in the same, an other inhabiting my body, making me crowded and stretched in my own skin. Although recent critics have argued for the need for a “historical phenomenology” of the early modern period, I argue that such a phenomenology of historical modes of subjectivity, drawing from Levinas’ startling account of a phenomenological ethics, needs to account for the psyche or soul as the locus of an auto-alterity, an other crowded within the same.5 Taking my cue from Levinas, my project understood in the framework of a historical phenomenology is most interested in recasting the early modern subject as a “self out of phase with itself,” with two souls that define human nature in contradictory ways, and locked into irreconcilably different wavelengths or periodicities. The crowded early modern subject composed of two souls is something like the self defined as a “multiplicity of individuals” in one overstretched body, “too tight in its own skin.”6 As a messianic thinker, Levinas comes closer

---


6 Levinas, p. 108.
than we might initially assume in identifying a historically salient problem in thinking about the early modern soul as the locus of Renaissance spirituality. It is precisely this crowded, claustrophobic model of the subject defined by two contradictory souls that led early modern thinkers to be ill at ease with the concept of man. Jacob Burckhardt famously articulated the idea of “man” in the Renaissance as an individual subject defined by his autonomy, and his recognition of this autonomy: “man became a spiritual individual, and recognized himself as such.”

I argue that we have misrecognized the manner in which the early modern human recognized himself. The early modern human did not exult in his identity and autonomy, but rather, recognized that the two souls composed him as a crowded subject riven by paradox and contradiction. It is this anxious recognition, and the responses fashioned to address it, that form the argument of the present analysis.

The Conflict of Two Souls: The Aristotelian Faculties vs. Christian Spirit

Why would this contradiction of two souls cause a cultural crisis in early modern Europe? At the most basic level, the two souls fundamentally contradicted one another because they attempt to define completely different aspects of human nature. Both Aristotle and the early Christian fathers agreed that the “soul” was the first principle of the human, but they differed in elaborating what this “principle” entailed. In his foundational account in *De Anima*, Aristotle defines the soul as the “principle” of embodied life: “The soul is in a sense the principle of animal life.” Therefore all animals possess life if they possess a soul, and the soul is the “principle” that defines the organization of their bodies and their living faculties. In essence, Aristotle’s soul is a biological principle. In Christian doctrine, the soul has nothing to do with the living functions of the body. From the teachings of the early Christian fathers to the present day, the soul is the principle defining man’s spirituality, the promise of immortality, and the possibility of salvation: “‘soul’ signifies the spiritual principle in man.” The soul is distinct from the body, because it represents the spiritual, transcendent principle in human beings, differing completely from the material state of the living body. Sir Walter Ralegh defines the Christian soul as a “spiritual principle” well in his *Treatise of the Soul* as a sharp distinction between animals and humans: “Our souls are immortal, and have an heavenly beginning; whereas theirs are mortal, and do perish with the body, as of the body they have their beginning.” For Ralegh, the distinction between the Christian soul and the bestial animal soul is one of origins and destinations. As a “spiritual principle,” the Christian soul marks the “heavenly” beginnings of human life, and its “immortal” nature demonstrates its final promise of salvation. Mere animals, however, do not enjoy the “spiritual” nature of the Christian soul, since they are bound in the state of their body: their beginning is rooted in the body, and they “perish” when the body ceases to function. If the “spiritual principle” of the Christian soul marks humanity’s exalted status

---

transcending the bodily condition of mere animals, Aristotle's definition of the soul as the “principle of life” fundamentally contradicts this taxonomic hierarchy of the human’s immortal spirituality rising above the animal’s mortal corporeality. Precisely the opposite occurs in Aristotle’s logic: the soul as the “principle of animal life” does not lift man above the state of the animal body, but rather brings him down, linking his soul to the shared characteristics of all animals and all living things. As a “principle of animal life,” there is nothing transcendent or “spiritual” about Aristotle’s soul. From this initial sketch we can begin to see the fault lines emerge between the two different models of soul, as the two fundamentally different “principles” defining human nature: the principle of “life” versus the principle of “spirituality.” If the Aristotelian soul is the general principle of embodied *life*, human or otherwise, the Christian soul is the spiritual principle differentiating different modes of *death*, or modes of being before and after life, sharpening the contrast between the spiritual promise of heavenly origins and ultimate immortality versus the mere corporeality of animals that begins and ends with the condition of the body. As a “spiritual principle,” the Christian account of the soul is more interested in human being before and after life, than in the nature of that being during the span of one’s life.

The contradiction between the Aristotelian and Christian souls goes much deeper than this. As a principle of “life,” Aristotle’s soul describes how life emanates from the function of the body’s organs, rooting the soul in the body in contradiction to the Christian soul’s effort to transcend the body’s mortal animal state.

The soul may therefore be defined as the first actuality or form of a natural body potentially possessing life; and such will be any body which possesses organs...the soul is the origin of the characteristics we have mentioned, and is defined by them, that is by the faculties of nutrition, sensation, thought, and movement.\(^{11}\)

In Aristotle’s comprehensive definition, the soul marks the actualization of the natural body’s potential for life; it is the form of the body’s matter.\(^{12}\) Therefore any natural body that is living must necessarily possess a soul. In defining the soul as the constitutive relation of actuality and potentiality, form and matter, Aristotle places an important condition for the possibility of the living soul; the soul must be the form of a body possessing *organs*. The soul is therefore embedded in the body’s organs, which for Aristotle, comprise the most basic unit of life. The functions or “characteristics” of the soul in question are defined by Aristotle as the faculties of nutrition, sensation, thought, and movement. The specific roles of each faculty in defining human life is clearly delineated in Katharine Park’s important account of the Aristotelian “organic soul.”

The “organic soul” - the principle responsible for those life functions inextricably tied to the bodies of living beings and immediately dependent on their organs. These functions ranged from the vital operations of digestion and reproduction through sensation and emotion to the higher cognitive functions of imagination and memory.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Aristotle, *De Anima*, 412a27-413b14.

\(^{12}\) Aristotle, *De Anima*, 412a5-412a20.

\(^{13}\) Park, p. 464.
Separate but related, the faculties occupied a static hierarchy of dependence and nobility, ranging from the lowest faculty of nutrition to the highest faculty of intellect...the lowest, called the vegetative soul, included the functions basic to all living things: nutrition, growth, and reproduction. The second, the sensitive soul, included all of the powers of the vegetative soul as well as the powers of movement and emotion and the ten internal and external senses. The intellective soul, finally, included not only the vegetative and sensitive powers - the organic faculties - but also the three rational powers of intellect, intellective memory...and will.\textsuperscript{14}

The three primary Aristotelian faculties of nutrition, sensation, and intellection encompassed all living functions from digestion and reproduction, to the higher cognitive processing of imagination, memory, and reason.\textsuperscript{15} Throughout the medieval and Renaissance periods, Aristotle’s organization of the soul’s living functions in terms of faculties was the primary way of explaining human cognition and biology. All of these faculties were defined by the organs that were responsible for their function, and so they were called “organic faculties.” Since Aristotle was the Philosopher, Christian thinkers drew upon his extremely influential model of the soul when they needed to explain how cognition, the senses, or the body worked. Aristotle’s definition of the soul was organic - bound by the function of the body’s organs, divided into three faculties, and accounted for all living functions from the most visceral autonomic processes of respiration and digestion, to the immaterial cognitive processes of the brain.

Aristotle’s soul rooted in the body’s organs, split into three faculties, and defining the principle of animal life fundamentally contradicts the basic tenets governing the doctrinal account of the Christian soul. The Christian soul in contrast, should be immortal, indivisible, and should have zero debt to the body’s organs. Most theologians and natural philosophers in the Renaissance accounted for this intrinsic incompatibility in terms of a difference of the substances composing the Aristotelian and Christian souls. As Francis Bacon paradigmatically explains, the two souls have different origins, and therefore, different compositions.

I mentioned, in speaking of Forms, the two different emanations of souls, which appear in the first creation thereof; the one springing from the breath of God, the other from the wombs of the elements.\textsuperscript{16}

For Bacon, each of the two souls have different “emanations” or origins, which confer different “Forms” on each soul. One form of the soul is defined by the matter of the “elements,” corresponding to the Aristotelian definition of form and matter. The other “form” of the soul is

\textsuperscript{14} Park, p. 467.
\textsuperscript{15} The place of reason was debated, as we shall see, since in the Thomist solution, reason was synonymous with Christian soul, whereas in alternative accounts, reason was embedded in the brain and therefore part of the organic, and not Christian, soul
literally *inspired* from the breath of God, a soul created instantaneously from nothing. The Christian soul is *created* spontaneously from the breath of God, while the other gestates in the “womb of the elements,” assembled and constructed from natural substances. In contrasting the different “Forms” of the two souls, outlining the difference between spontaneous inspiration versus gestation in the womb, divine creation versus biological composition by elements, Bacon outlines the prevalent early modern view that the two souls were composed of intrinsically different substances, one created and inspired, and the other forged in biological processes such as gestation in a womb, and constructed of physical elements. If the Christian soul is spontaneously inspired, then the Aristotelian soul differs because it is not created in a single moment, but is continually constituted in a more complex self-reflexive feedback loop: “the soul is the origin of the faculties we have mentioned, and is defined by them.” In Aristotle’s circular definition, the soul is the “origin” of the faculties, and in turn the faculties it originates feed back to define the soul-as-origin. In this recursive logic, the soul is both cause and effect, the creator of the faculties and the thing that is defined by the very faculties it creates.

The Christian soul, in contrast, is created once by God, and it is not continually redefined in relation to its creation. According to Calvin, the Christian soul not defined by a reflexive logic, but by a sense of return: it is a gift inspired from God, and it will be returned as a spirit in a state of salvation.

Moreover, there can be no question that man consists of a...soul, an immortal though created essence, which is his nobler part. Sometimes he is called a spirit. But though the two terms, while they are used together differ in their meaning, still, when spirit is used by itself it is equivalent to soul, as when Solomon speaking of death says, that the spirit returns to God who gave it. The vocabulary of creation and “breath” (*spiritus*) from Genesis leads Calvin, as in most doctrinal accounts, to define the soul as a spirit, “created” by God’s inspired breath, and characterized by its “immortal” nature. The soul is homologous to the “spirit” since God inspired and created the soul, and upon death, the spirit understood as a gift is returned to its creator. The Christian understanding of the soul-as-spirit or inspired creation fundamentally defines the soul in terms of its eventual return to God, who originally “gave” and “created” the soul’s “essence.” Defining the soul as a gift of spirit, and creative breath, therefore places the soul in a trajectory toward salvation and immortality: the gifted soul as an inspired creation will return to its creator in an immortal state. Origen puts it more succinctly than Calvin, in asserting that the soul is the primary condition of salvation: “this which is saved is called a soul.”

---

17 Genesis 2:7.  
soul were vitally important for explaining different aspects of human nature. The Aristotelian soul and its faculty psychology was the primary system of explaining human life, cognition, and affect, while the Christian soul was the basis of spirituality, salvation, and immortality. As Bacon contends in the *Advancement of Learning*, many had “variously reported” on the nature of the different “substances and faculties” of the soul, but few had actually “laboriously enquired” into the paradoxical relationship of the two souls, which when carefully examined, leads one into a “maze” of confusion rather than a straight “way” to a unified definition of the human.\(^\text{20}\) It is precisely Bacon’s suggested “laborious enquiry” of the fault lines dividing the two souls, beyond a mere “report” of their existence, which I propose to undertake in this project.

**Refiguring the Soul**

My analysis of the two souls could have included any number of Renaissance English writers and poets, from Edmund Spenser, to Sir Philip Sidney, to Ben Jonson, to Elizabethan sonneteers such as Michael Drayton, Fulke Greville, Samuel Daniel, and Barnabe Barnes, and could have considered many more of Shakespeare’s plays. All of these poets directly addressed, and exhaustively thought about, the two-souls paradox in their works.\(^\text{21}\) The sheer number of works reacting to or attempting to resolve the two-souls problem evinces the central position of the matter in early modern culture, and the urgent sense of anxiety that two contradictory souls provoked among poets, theologians, and natural philosophers. For the purposes of this project, I have chosen to engage Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, and the poetry and prose of Sir John Davies and John Donne as three exemplary protagonists in the unfolding of the two-souls crisis in Tudor and Stuart England. Reading Shakespeare, Davies, and Donne is an ideal way to understand the conflict of two souls, since they articulated the most innovative solutions that transformed the two-souls paradox into the basis of a new articulation of Christian agency.

All three of these poets exploited the crisis of two souls as an unprecedented opportunity to explode the field of preconceptions governing the nature of the soul. In the gap between the two souls, these English writers found a space for redefining the specific manner in which the two souls constitute the Christian subject, by reimagining the rhetorical figures traditionally used to explain the mechanics and substance of the soul, in effect, turning the paradox of two souls into a matter of accurate figuration. Throughout the dissertation, I study the literary tactics used by these three English poets to articulate a new range of rhetorical figures to imagine the workings of the two souls, which have most frequently been described as exceeding the grasp of the human mind. In much of the medieval and Renaissance tradition of psychology, rhetorical figures were the only way to approximate the workings of the soul and its faculties since its operations were too rarefied for the imprecise instruments of fallen reason. However,

\(^{21}\) To this list, we could add the theological, philosophical, and scientific works of Richard Hooker, Francis Bacon, Sir Walter Ralegh, Helkiah Crooke, William Harvey, Thomas Hobbes, and the Cambridge Platonists such as Henry More and Ralph Cudworth, who all afforded the paradox of two souls a central place in the development of their thinking.
Shakespeare, Donne, and Davies controversially asserted that the wrong figures have been used for centuries in the Christian tradition to describe the relation of soul and body, and soul and soul. All three of these poets suggested that the presence of two contradictory souls in composing the individual Christian subject caused a crisis because the wrong figures had been used to describe their relation, and proposed to replace the imprecise range of metaphors with a different vocabulary capable of more sensitively describing the complex interrelation of the two souls.

It is perhaps useful at this point to specifically account for how these English poets proposed to replace one set of poor metaphors, with another, more accurate set of metaphors in resolving the paradoxical relationship of the two souls. In the case of John Donne, his *Anniversary* poems and sermons reject the traditional “Russian doll” structure widely-employed in the standard Christian dualism of a hidden interior soul encapsulated by the exterior shell of the body. Donne argues that the relation of the Aristotelian and Christian souls does not conform to this traditional interior/exterior model of body and soul, instead arguing that the two souls compose the dual faces of a sheet of text that can be rotated in space in relation to the reading and writing subject. The two souls defined the written object of the writing psychological subject. Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* identifies the power of theatrical rhetoric to “strike” and reshape the nature of the Aristotelian soul’s faculties as a way to resist the demands of Protestant law binding the Christian soul. For Davies, the two souls should not be figured as a body politic or a “little world” that medieval and Renaissance political allegories had almost universally used to describe the moral government of the body and of the state in terms of the brain or reason ruling as a monarch over the rebellious parts of the body. For Davies, the two souls needed to be rethought in terms of a political commonwealth based on the consent of the soul’s faculties and organs, bound by the meter of lyric as a unifying psychological force.

All of these English poets identify the power of rhetoric and figural language to transform the nature of the soul, and seize upon the anxiety provoked by the crisis of two souls as a unique occasion to recompose the Christian subject in far more malleable terms than had previously been imagined by theologians and natural philosophers. All of the poets studied in this project are also unprecedented in their efforts to harness the power of the literary text as a technology capable of molding the structure of the soul. In emphasizing the power of rhetorical language and the literary text in reimagining the nature of the two-souled Christian subject, I chart the manner in which Donne, Shakespeare, and Davies gave unprecedented power to poets as the central agents in resolving this theological and scientific debate. If our understanding of the soul relies on figural approximation rather than an impossible direct rational comprehension, who better to untangle the paradox of two contradictory souls than the poet whose specific work centers on the craft of rhetorical language?

Thus the poets studied in this dissertation attempt to exploit the crisis of two souls as a way to completely rewrite how the soul composes the Christian subject in specifically literary, and not exclusively theological, terms. For all of the poets considered in this project, the soul was not something fixed by divine or natural law, but was something capable of being rewritten and recomposed like a poetic text. By transmuting the basic substance of the theological, the
soul, into the emphatically literary and figural, these English poets imagined the soul as an intrinsically malleable substance at the core of the Christian subject, a textual tissue to be edited in language and rhetoric.

By forcefully asserting the malleability of the two souls in the language of poetry, these English poets more generally attempted to articulate a new mode of Christian freedom in the wake of the Protestant Reformation. The poets studied in this dissertation more specifically contest the dominant Protestant narrative of the Christian soul as subject to binding and imprisonment by law, popularized by major theologians such as Luther, Calvin and Melanchthon, who are all studied in the first chapter. Stephen Greenblatt has argued that the influence of Calvin had a profound impact on English theology during the time of Shakespeare, turning Elizabethan England into a “absolutist world” modeled on the Protestant God’s absolute reign.

In the vision of English theologians inspired by Calvin, God was no longer a monarch with whom lowly mortals could negotiate by means of supplication, ascetic self-discipline, and other propitiatory offerings. Divine decisions were incomprehensible and irrevocable, unconstrained by any form of mediation.22

The result of Protestant doctrine’s revised understanding of God as a punitive dictator, and not a negotiating monarch, was an always-persecuted, imprisoned, and shackled soul. Programmatic accounts of this Protestant-soul-as-prisoner can be found in the poetry of the period, perhaps emblematized most dramatically in Andrew Marvell’s “Dialogue Between the Soul and Body”: “O, Who shall from this dungeon raise / A soul enslaved so many ways ?” Marvell describes the soul in an idiom familiar to early modern Protestants. The soul is sunken into a “dungeon” and “enslaved so many ways.” In particular, it is the depraved state of the flesh-bound body that “enslaves” the soul, with “bolts of bones,” a “soul hung up...in chains of nerves, and arteries, and veins.”23 The result of the soul’s imprisonment in the sinful body is a necessary servitude to God’s absolute law as the only path away from fleshly desire and toward salvation. The imprisonment of the Christian soul in the body requires a state of voluntary servitude to the Protestant God’s rigid law. As the recognition of the two contradictory souls as a problem for Christian theology increased in the sixteenth century, Protestant thinkers such as Martin Luther, John Calvin, Philipp Melanchthon, and English theologians such as John Woolton and Richard Hooker, applied the “inslaved soul” narrative to the paradox of two souls, arguing that the faculties of the Aristotelian soul were corrupted in the fall, and represent the indelible scar of original sin, while the Christian soul represents a glimmer of prelapsarian psychology in the fallen human. The influential Puritan William Perkins offers perhaps the most concise account of this postlapsarian psychological difference.

Originall sinne, which is corruption ingendred in our first conception, whereby every facultie of soule and bodie is prone and disposed to euil... By this we see, that sinne is not a corruption of mans substance, but onely of faculties: otherwise neither could mens soules be immortal, nor Christ take vpon him mans nature.\(^\text{24}\)

For Perkins, original sin is the catalyst that causes the internal division of the soul’s Christian substance which is “immortal,” from the faculties and organs of the Aristotelian soul which are corrupted and “disposed to evil.” It is the possibility of redemption by Christ’s incarnation, and the eventual hope of salvation, which divides the human into two different souls. The human scarred by original sin is not uniformly fallen, but this partially fallen status has the unfortunate consequence of constituting his soul as two divided substances. If man were completely fallen, possessing only a fallen soul, then he would have no hope of immortality or salvation. It is the glimmer of immortality, the trace of prelapsarian purity, which fractures the human into a partially fallen soul, and a partially immortal soul. Perkins’ explication of original sin demonstrates the division of the soul in the Protestant account between the immortal substance of the Christian soul that holds out the possibility of salvation, and the faculties that are marked by original sin. Perkin’s popular account of the two souls as a story of the fall reflects the standard Protestant narrative studied in the first chapter, where theologians such as Melanchthon and Woolton claimed that it’s quite natural for humans to be divided into two souls, since the fracture registers our fragmented, sinful state after the fall. To remedy the inherent division of the soul in two after the fall, humans require an externally binding force to guide us back to salvation, and in these Protestant accounts of the two souls, that binding force is God’s natural law.

The English poets studied in this project chafed at this rationalization of the two souls as a justification of voluntary servitude to law, which leads fallen souls to exchange the chains of sin for the more tightly binding chains of God’s authoritarian law. In this choice without choice, the paradox of two souls was exploited by Protestant thinkers as a way to tightly bind Christian subjects in a state of servile obedience, stripping them of all psychological agency in a manner corresponding to Luther and Calvin’s mocking rejection of human free will. Shakespeare, Donne, and Davies all rejected this idiom of voluntary servitude to God’s law and they attempted to imagine an alternative to the prison metaphors describing the captive, enslaved state of the Protestant soul. For them, the possibility of such an alternative lay in offering a completely different narrative of the two-souls paradox than in the Protestant account of obedience to law. All of these English poets attempted to redirect the problem of two souls away from the pole of fallen slavery and psychological abjection to law, to the opposite pole of enunciating a radically new form of Christian agency. Such a redirection of the two-souls paradox involved a movement from the language of law to the language of verse. The English poets in this project argued that the two souls composing the Christian subject required redefinition in the language of verse, and not in the prose dictates of law. For them, poetic verse is the correct medium to understand how the two souls compose the human without paradox or internal contradiction, since as Donne

points out in his *Anatomy of the World*, God’s law itself was written in song, and therefore the Christian theological tradition has lamentably misidentified the proper linguistic format to understand the principles governing the soul:

If you...think it due...
As matter fit for chronicle, not verse,
Vouchsafe call to mind, that God did make
A last, and lasting’st piece a song. He spake
To Moses, to deliver unto all,
That song: because he knew they would let fall
The Law, the prophets, and the history,
But keep song still in their memory.25

Refocusing the question of two souls in the versified language of poetry does not lead to the standard Protestant account of voluntary servitude and binding to law, but rather surprisingly opens the concept of the “soul” up to renegotiation in the malleable language of literature. By shifting from prose law to poetic verse as the proper framework for understanding the seemingly paradoxical conflict of the Aristotelian and Christian souls, the English poets at the heart of this study harnessed literary language as a technology to rewrite and redefine the relation of the two souls as the basis of an unprecedented form of Christian freedom. By mapping out the fissures and gaps between the two souls in the language of poetry, these English poets attempted to give to the individual Christian subject the power to literally rewrite how the soul constituted them as a political and ethical agent. More generally, my project prompts readers of early modern literature to recognize that whenever we encounter the term “soul,” we should acknowledge that it is a concept in flux during the period. The crisis attending the paradox of two souls allows us to reread the literature and philosophy of the Renaissance in a completely new way, and illuminates the prominent role of poets and their versified literary creations in resolving the conflict by using the constitutive difference between two souls as the impetus for a new, but previously unrecognized, mode of writerly Christian freedom.

**The Power of the Literary in the History of Ideas**

Telling the story of the early modern crisis of two souls through the poetry and drama of *literary figures* such as Shakespeare, Donne, and Davies, and not through the natural philosophy of Francis Bacon, William Harvey, Thomas Hobbes, and the Cambridge Platonists, or through the theology of William Tyndale, William Perkins and Richard Hooker, is an important part of the story itself. My project is not interested in crafting an intellectual history of early modern psychology and cognition, and does not attempt to identify the place of the two-souls crisis in this intellectual history. Other scholars have attempted to sketch precisely such an intellectual

history of the soul, namely, Susan James, Noga Arikha, and most recently, Fernando Vidal. All of these historical studies have emphasized the primacy of philosophy, science, and to a lesser extent, Christian theology, in accounting for early modern debates about mind, soul, and body. For these historians of philosophy and science, the domain of the literary in the Renaissance period is a charming, but ancillary, byproduct of these weighty debates negotiated among natural philosophers. In these histories of the soul and mind, literary texts are downstream cultural effects simply corroborating that certain structures of feeling, to borrow Raymond Williams’ term, pioneered and worked out in philosophical or scientific texts, took hold in mass culture and became dominant modes of thought for even aesthetically-minded poets and dramatists.

My argument in this dissertation reverses this conventional relationship between the philosophical and the literary in the early modern history of ideas. Literary writers did not simply serve as cultural signposts of a philosophical idea’s ubiquity. Rather, in the narrative I develop, literary figures such as Shakespeare, Donne, and Davies, fashioned the most innovative and decisive solutions to the paradox of two souls in their poetry and plays. When read in comparison, scientific and philosophical figures such as Bacon or Harvey seem to be struggling in their wake by simply rehashing old ideas incapable of rethinking the problem in more productive or illuminating terms. The two souls paradox is rethought and resolved most decisively in the domain of the literary, and specifically, using the resources of rhetorical language. The methodological claim I am making insists that literary history should not simply corroborate the arguments of the history of philosophy or science, but should push back against standard intellectual histories of the early modern world so as to give a powerful counternarrative of how poetic language, rhetorical figures, and the idea of the literary constituted powerful and influential means of working out alternative models of the soul, cognition, and the mind in the cultural debates of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that have led to the modern life sciences and the philosophy of mind. The lack of such counternarratives has been a major weakness in recent literary studies of scientific and philosophical concepts in Renaissance England. Struggling with the legacy of the new historicism, many critics in the past two decades have created synchronic cultural networks of resonances, echoes, analogies, and parallels, in which literary texts are simply mirror images registering contemporaneous scientific or philosophical innovations. Therefore many critics have argued that John Donne talks very frequently and with great intensity about anatomy, while others have said Shakespeare writes very frequently and demonstrates great knowledge about Galenic humoralism, and others have


claimed that Sir John Davies factually reports a popular understanding of the soul in his poetry. In examples such as these, Donne, Shakespeare, and Davies don’t directly affect the outcome of anatomical, humoral, or psychological controversies, and they don’t change the outcome of the scientific debate; they simply obliquely refer to science and this is an interesting historical fact. These synchronic readings of literature’s debt to the intellectual culture of a period has weakened the power of literary texts by turning them into simply mimetic cultural objects capable of merely reporting what was occurring in English culture at a given time, without offering an account of how these texts intervened in, and altered the course of, the intellectual culture they participated in. In the wake of new historicism’s synchronic “thick description” of a culture, the act of literary creation turns into a mirror of the ideas circulating at a given time, and poets and playwrights become reporters, and not influential agents. An influential example of such a tactic can be found in John Rogers’ *The Matter of Revolution*, which rationalizes its juxtaposition of science, politics, and poetry, by appealing to linguistic mechanisms exceeding authorial intention:

We will see the unacknowledged assumption of the logical interdependence of natural and political philosophy push all the writers studied here into logical traps and literary binds, often well beyond the parameters of authorial design.

In this classic case of a hermeneutics of suspicion, what links the various registers of poetry, natural and political philosophy is the blindness, and not the insight, of the writers in crafting their texts. The unifying force is a set of “unacknowledged assumptions,” and the manner in which poets and philosophers alike fall into “logical traps and literary binds” beyond the “parameters of authorial design.” Rogers, like many critics, does not yoke together the literary with the scientific and philosophical by asserting the ultimate power of literary language, but rather accomplishes such a synthesis by demonstrating the shared blindness of all, an oversight or mistake that is recognized and neatly cleaned up by the critic.

In response to these recent critical problems of literary history in relation to the history of ideas and of science, I have explicitly chosen to tell the story of the early modern crisis of two

---


souls through three poets whose literary texts have particularly suffered in recent criticism. The motivation for these lines of reading is certainly laudable; critics have attempted to revise popularly held, but trite, understandings of all of their texts. Therefore, in the past twenty years, it has become popular to claim that Shakespeare is not the universal poet transcending time and place, but he was engaged in the messy humoral physiology of his time; John Donne wasn’t the paradigmatic metaphysical poet, but he was actually most concerned with the visceral materiality of anatomy; Sir John Davies wasn’t only a common law constitutionalist, but he was a man of letters demonstrating great knowledge of the dominant scientific culture of his time. In revising the legacies of these poets by embedding their texts in the intellectual context of their production, recent historicist and scientifically-minded criticism has reduced these writers into symptoms of culture rather than agents in shaping how that culture looks and signifies. To counteract these unfortunate effects of recasting literary history as an adjunct to the history of ideas, my project argues that poets such as Shakespeare, Donne, and Davies were directly participating in theological and scientific debates surrounding the crisis of two souls in sixteenth and seventeenth century Europe, and they acted to transform the debate into an explicitly literary one. In their literary texts, these writers translated the previously theological and scientific paradox of two souls into a matter to be untangled and resolved in the malleable language of verse. My readings identify how their verse constituted a rhetorical technology capable of reshaping the nature of the two souls composing the human. By repositioning the paradox of two souls in the space of literary language, they attempted to reclaim a sense of writerly Christian agency in the wake of the Protestant Reformation’s account of the soul’s bound and enslaved condition.

Reclaiming the Soul from the Body

My argument contests some of the dominant paradigms guiding early modern literary criticism. My dissertation’s return to the soul as a theoretically important topic of study specifically responds to the obsession with the body and its materiality dominating literary criticism for the past half-century. This heavy emphasis on the body has turned the historically significant concept of the soul into something of a forgotten relic, and a conservative field of study. However, my argument’s emphasis on the soul does not simply revert to the traditional dualism of body and soul, as many studies of the soul have done. Rather, I identify the previously unrecognized dualism of two souls, the Aristotelian and Christian souls, which posed a massive problem for Renaissance culture, and a question defining much of Renaissance literature and philosophy in ways that we haven’t acknowledged. I initially approached Renaissance texts through the lens of science and the medical discourses of anatomy and physiology. However, I came to realize that placing such a heavy emphasis on science and the body was overlooking a huge part of early modern culture: the soul, and its place in Renaissance theology. This oversight on my part was actually extremely fortuitous, because I was simply repeating an error that early modern criticism in general has been making for the past several decades, which is an overzealous emphasis on the body. Analyzing the materiality of the body

---

has become the default mode of studying Renaissance texts, turning the soul into a boring and theoretically uninteresting topic in contemporary criticism. I am attempting to rebalance the critical landscape so we can reclaim the soul as an exciting way to read Renaissance literature in a completely new manner.

My argument’s placement of the Aristotelian and Christian souls in tense apposition draws from Leslie Lockett’s recent work on the “psycho-physiological” or “hydraulic” model of the mind in *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies in the Vernacular and Latin Traditions*. In Lockett’s study of Old English texts, cognition and emotion are not just metaphorically explained by heat and liquids. Rather, in Anglo-Saxon psychology, the mind was defined in terms of the body’s physiological processes, the movement of fluids and the pressure and heat experienced by the internal organs. For Lockett, medieval psychology is a physiology. Lockett’s study sets an important precedent for my own argument because she recognizes that “Early Christian thinkers disagreed about the number of substances that make up the human being,” disagreeing as to whether the human is composed of two substances (body and soul), or three (body, soul, and spirit.) It is precisely this confusion over the number of substances making up the human that Renaissance thinkers inherited, and which underwrote the crisis of two souls. Lockett’s work on the “psycho-physiological” or “hydraulic” model of the mind in Old and Middle English texts reflects the work of Gail Kern Paster in early modern criticism, which has grown in prominence in recent years to become the dominant mode of reading the body and its passions in Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Paster and Lockett concur in claiming that in the premodern world, “psychology and physiology are one”.

Early modern theories of behavior needed spirits coursing through the neural pathways because the categories of experience were not yet constituted by anything named psychology; that place was occupied instead by the passions as experienced by the organic soul. Here...substance embodied significance, because there was no way conceptually or discursively to separate the psychological from the physiological. The physical model for what Renaissance philosophers called the organic soul - that part of the tripartite soul governing the emotions - was, Katharine Park has argued, “a simple hydraulic one, based on a clear localisation of psychological function by organ or system of organs.”

Paster’s body of work has popularized a reading strategy that reads the passions and cognition in terms of the body’s humoural system, and its “neural pathways,” a network of spirits. In her attempt to merge psychology and physiology as “conceptually or discursively” indissociable, Paster’s humoural reading practice transforms the soul into something that ceases to differ from

---

32 Lockett, p. 17.
33 Paster, p. 14.
34 Paster, p. 12.
the body, and can no longer be called a soul. For Paster, the soul simply becomes a synonym for
the body. Paster’s soul-as-body is simply an undifferentiated mass of liquids. My argument on
the crisis of two souls attempts to retain the Aristotelian organic soul qua soul that
counterintuitively blends material physiology and immaterial psychology, and is not simply an
exotic reimagining of the body and its material processes or a reductive flattening of the
difference between physiology and psychology. Rather than completely neutralize the peculiar
unfamiliarity of a soul that is defined by organs, as Paster does, I argue that the project of a
“historical phenomenology” she proposes needs to account for early modern definitions of the
human that do not neatly fit into our preconceptions of bodies defined by organs, and souls or
minds defined by cognition or immortality. Contra Paster, I argue that in order to begin to
understand the complexity of early modern thought, we need to embrace the confusion posed to
the modern reader of a seemingly paradoxical soul defined by organs, but which is not reducible
to the body’s physiology. To define the problem in logical terms, the body’s organs are necessary
for defining the Aristotelian organic soul, but they are not sufficient to encompass the totality of
that soul. Early modern physiological criticism has mistakenly assumed that they are.

Paster’s effective reduction of the Aristotelian soul and its organic faculties to the level of
the body’s materiality and physiology hinges on her oversight of the Aristotelian faculties as the
organizing structure of the organic soul. In the Aristotelian model of soul prevalent in the early
modern world, it is the concept of the faculty, and not the humours, that is the governing
principle of human life. Paster’s account of the organic soul directly cites Katharine Park’s
influential account of the organic soul, but ignores the fact that in Park’s explanation of the
Aristotelian soul and its use in early modern culture, the humoral “hydraulic” model composed
only a portion of the soul, and was subordinated under the general rubric of the three faculties of
nutrition, sensation, and reason.\(^\text{35}\) In general, the recent vogue of reading the early modern body
in terms of humoral physiology places a disproportionate, and inaccurate, emphasis on the
humours and spirits in governing the passions, senses, and cognition. My argument reemphasizes
the importance the concept of the faculty as the dominant structure defining the early modern
understanding of the organic soul, and repositions the humours and spirits as components of a
broader intricate system of organs and faculties defining human life. In an offshoot of the
humoural emphasis in literary criticism, readers of the early modern body in the past decade have
increasingly been interested in the problems of the five senses. However, this recently popular
“sensory” criticism confronts a similar problem in its lack of recognition that the senses
composed one faculty of the Aristotelian soul, and were almost always conceptualized as part of
this soul, and not simply as part of the body and its humoural apparatus.\(^\text{36}\) Overall, recent
materialist criticism of the early modern body has studied different aspects of the Aristotelian
organic soul in piecemeal fashion, focusing upon humoural physiology or sensation, without


adequately acknowledging the overarching governing structure of the three faculties as the basis of the soul and its subordinate physiological components. Ironically, however, these materialist readings of the body’s humours and senses support my argument, since they recognize the ubiquity and intensity of the concept of the organic soul in early modern culture as I do, and highlight the persistence of the vocabulary of Aristotelian faculty psychology in the literature of the time. But their theoretical commitment to the body’s materiality prevents them developing an accurate understanding of the organic soul as an unfamiliar mode of premodern psychology, and not simply an exotic physiological explanation of the body. Rather than reduce the organic soul to a materialist critical agenda, my project attempts to retain an understanding, however unfamiliar or paradoxical to the modern reader, of the Aristotelian soul as a physical or organic soul that cannot simply be reduced to the materiality of the body. Vitally important in understanding the early modern human is the awareness that the organic Aristotelian soul composed a faculty psychology and not a materialist humoral physiology.

Arguing that two different souls existed in the early modern definition of human life is, to an extent, obvious. Every scholar of early modern literature is familiar with the tripartite faculty psychology of the Aristotelian soul, just as every reader of the period’s texts knows about the unitary, immortal Christian soul. However, no one has integrated these two different, but well known, models of soul into a single narrative or an articulation of a unified problem.

Whenever critics have come close to recognizing the presence of two souls in the composition of the single early modern subject, they strategically brush aside one of the two souls for the purposes of their broader argument. So critics interested in early modern theology and devotional literature dismiss the Aristotelian soul and its faculties as a relatively unimportant pagan artifact in a Christian world. On the other hand, materialist critics of the body have ignored the Christian soul as the metaphysical basis of immortality and salvation as theoretically uninteresting compared to the subversive potential of the body and its materiality. In only the most recent example of this voluntary critical blindness, Ramie Targoff’s important study of body and soul in Donne’s work recognizes the prevalence of the Aristotelian soul and faculty psychology throughout his career, but dismisses the concept, arguing that Donne doesn’t take the organic soul seriously in comparison to the more weighty metaphysics of the Christian soul.37 My chapter on John Donne disproves Targoff’s dismissal of the Aristotelian soul, by demonstrating that the paradox and tension between the Aristotelian and Christian souls gave Donne’s poetry and prose much of its enduring power and characterized his “metaphysical” wit.

Another critical strategy has accounted for the presence of two completely different souls in early modern culture by developing a story of the two psychologies in terms of their diachrony. In this commonplace move in literary and intellectual histories of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Aristotelian and Christian souls didn’t necessarily exist simultaneously in early modern culture, but they represented different stages in the history of the modern mind.

37 “Another theory of the soul that surfaces from time to time in Donne’s writings, but which he never seem fully to embrace, is that the soul comprises three parts: vegetable, sensitive, and intellectual.” Targoff, p. 9.
Thus, in this diachronic history of the two souls, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries witnessed the transition from the premodern soul to the modern mind, from Christian dualism to Cartesian dualism, or in alternative accounts, the move from Aristotelian faculty psychology to the modern psychology of mind. As Fernando Vidal has recently put it, “So (the scientific discipline of) psychology was not invented in the eighteenth century but remade...The science of the soul, often termed ‘psychology’ from the last third of the sixteenth century, was redefined as the science of the mind.”38 This diachronic strategy is equally inaccurate in its selective blindness. My project demonstrates that the contradiction of the two souls existing in early modern culture didn’t form a smooth diachronic narrative of progress from the classical soul leading to the development of the modern science of mind. My readings attempt to more subtly capture the complexities and tensions attending the simultaneous existence of the Aristotelian and Christian souls as an acute synchronic crisis in the early modern world, a crisis precipitated by the overlap and contradiction of two incompatible systems simultaneously defining human nature. My dissertation does not tell the story of one soul’s importance at the expense of the other, or one soul as the historical antecedent of the other in the genealogy of the modern mind. Rather, I am most interested in recounting a story of the psychological conflict between two contradictory souls existing simultaneously in early modern humans, colliding and competing with one another in the theology, natural philosophy, and literature of the early modern period. In the story I develop, the confusion and anxiety provoked by the contradiction of the two souls was constitutive of a model of the early modern human defined by internal difference and fissure, a redundant dualism of two souls, and not exclusively of the body and soul.

Overall, my argument proposes to address a very straightforward question: what if the two souls were both simultaneously important and influential concepts in early modern culture, and what if we can’t simply selectively ignore the presence of one soul for the sake of developing an argument on the other? Rather than selectively focus on one soul by dismissing the other, I argue that the simultaneous existence of two souls, Aristotelian and Christian, was a massive conceptual problem in Renaissance culture, and the contradiction of the two souls motivated the creation of some of the most prominent and fascinating literary and philosophical texts of the period. The crisis provoked by the paradox of two souls was not limited to an isolated subculture of early modern England; its traces fill the pages of the most prominent works of the time, written by Shakespeare, Donne, Davies, and Milton. The crisis of two souls has been unrecognized only to the extent that critics haven’t seen the problem right before our eyes, developed in the most canonical works of the period. The tension between, and the contradiction of, the two souls provides a novel way of reading some of the most familiar texts of the early modern world with completely new eyes.

38 Vidal, p. 2. For similar diachronic accounts of the soul, see: James, Susan. op. cit.; DesChene, Dennis. Life’s Form: Late Aristotelian Theories of the Soul. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000; and Crosbie, Christopher. “Oeconomia and the Vegetative Soul: Rethinking Revenge in The Spanish Tragedy.” English Literary Renaissance 38.1 (Feb 2008).
The Argument Ahead

Although the presence of two souls in each human had been acknowledged since the days of the early Christian fathers, it was not a concern because of the widely accepted explanation of St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century. Aquinas argued that the two souls did not contradict one another since he claimed that the highest faculty of the Aristotelian soul, the faculty of reason, was actually identical to the immortal Christian soul. 39 Aristotle did not realize this in composing *De Anima* since he did not have access to a Christian vocabulary. The Thomist solution caused a great deal of relief for several centuries, since it united the best qualities of both souls. The Christian soul was now intrinsically rational, and the Aristotelian soul was now immortal and capable of being redeemed. The crucial turning point in my research came in discovering the work of a single man in early sixteenth century Italy: Pietro Pomponazzi. Pomponazzi triggered a massive cultural crisis in the first decades of the sixteenth century by arguing in a series of lectures beginning in 1500 that St. Thomas Aquinas’ accepted solution to the two souls paradox was completely false. Pomponazzi was accused of heresy by numerous Vatican figures, and a movement of clerics and academics called for him to be burned at the stake for his outrageous views. The Vatican felt compelled to refute his arguments by convening the Fifth Lateran Council in 1513 to specifically fight his claims. How could the writings of a single man provoke such a violent outrage? Pomponazzi precipitated such a furor because he argued that St. Thomas Aquinas’ solution to the two souls did not unify the immortal Christian soul and Aristotelian soul, but accomplished precisely the opposite: linking the two souls turned the immortal Christian soul into something mortal. For Pomponazzi, the bond between the two souls meant that the Christian soul would die when the body did, and therefore it could not attain immortality and salvation. In Pomponazzi’s critique of Aquinas, the intellectual faculty possesses a great debt to the lower faculties of the body. The intellect is "the act of a physical and organic body," and as such, its higher cognitive activities "depend in all its functioning on some organ." 40 Rather than lift the Aristotelian soul onto a higher plane of Christian immateriality and immortality, Pomponazzi argues that the Thomist solution has the unfortunate side-effect of dragging the immortal Christian soul into a necessary relation with the fallen, flesh-bound state of the body. The immortal soul "will never be totally released from some organ," unexpectedly turning the Christian soul into something that is "absolutely mortal."

After the initial outrage provoked by Pomponazzi subsided in the first two decades of the sixteenth century, Protestant thinkers from the 1540’s to the 1590’s attempted to logically refute his claims and reassert the immortality of the Christian soul. Major Protestant figures such as Philipp Melanchthon, John Woolton, and later Richard Hooker and William Perkins all contested Pomponazzi by redefining the two-souls paradox as a question of absolute obedience to God’s system of natural law, as we have already explained. In the Protestant response, it was not surprising, and in fact completely natural that humans should be divided into two conflicting


souls since we are all fallen, and since the stain of original sin cleaved our souls in two. Therefore if the contradiction of the two souls marks us as fallen humans, absolute obedience and voluntary servitude to natural law redeemed the Christian subject. These natural law solutions to the two souls crisis were extremely popular in Elizabethan England. However, the prominence of the natural law account of the two souls provoked a forceful critique from some of the most prominent poets and playwrights of the time. For these literary figures, such as Shakespeare, Donne, John Davies, and later Milton, the use of the two souls paradox as a political fiction sounded like a thinly-veiled justification of totalitarian rule, and a system of brainwashing compelling Christian subjects to strip themselves of any form of agency in order to become servile puppets of law. For all of these poets, the story of the two souls could not be explained in terms of law: they insisted instead upon the language of poetic verse as the correct medium to understand the two-souls paradox. By shifting from the language of prose law to the language of verse, these English poets turned the two-souls problem into a specifically literary issue, and attempted to use the crisis of two souls as an unprecedented way to open up the concept of the soul, previously fixed by Christian law, to renegotiation in literature. Therefore all of the poets I analyze use literary language as a medium to rewrite the two souls so as to identify a completely new form of Christian freedom. By mapping out how the two souls work in the language of poetry and drama, these poets created a new writerly poetics capable of literally rewriting how the two souls constitute individual Christian subjects as agents with the capacity for ethical decision-making. In all of these English poets, I identify a sustained work of contesting and redefining the parameters of the word “soul” as the basis of the free Christian subject, and a reconfiguration of the two souls paradox into a problem rendered comprehensible by literary language and the craft of poetry.

Chapter 1 describes what I call the “crisis of two souls” precipitated by Pomponazzi in early sixteenth century Europe in reaction to his claim that the Thomist solution attempting to synthesize the two souls in each Christian subject in fact turned the ostensibly immortal Christian soul into something mortal like the Aristotelian soul’s organs. I give an account of the influential Protestant refutation of Pomponazzi’s assertions, which reconfigured the two-souls paradox as evidence of man’s fallen and divided state, requiring the binding force of natural law to guide humanity back to grace. In Chapter 2, I argue that Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* contests these Protestant accounts of the two souls paradox, by struggling to chart a path between obedience to natural and divine law, and the effort to identify a form of Christian freedom in literary language. *Hamlet* is therefore the most striking dramatization of the immortal Christian soul bound by God’s law in direct conflict with the Aristotelian soul’s faculties and passions. Hamlet struggles to reconcile the constrained Christian soul bound by law, but commanded by his murdered father’s ghost to break that law by executing physical violence, with the Aristotelian soul’s freedom to be molded and altered by rhetorical language and theatrical performance. In Chapter 3, I argue that Sir John Davies inverts Shakespeare’s logic seen in the previous chapter. Davies offers a completely different relation between the two souls, reimagining the Christian soul in terms of consent and free will, and refiguring the Aristotelian soul as a farcically mismanaged imperial state. In his poetry, Davies proposes to unite the two souls into a political harmony, and a more useful model for the political state, through the meter and rhythm of lyric poetry. For
Davies, the organized structure given to the chaotic Aristotelian soul by the metrical regularity of poetry is the most powerful metaphor for understanding the English commonwealth in terms of consent and not violent coercion. My argument identifies Davies' early poetry, and specifically the figure of the two souls as a commonwealth structured by the metrical "dance" of lyric developed in this poetry, as a vitally important influence on his later thinking on common law and the viability of imperial expansion articulated during his tenure as colonial administrator in Ireland. I conclude my study in Chapter 4 with a reading of John Donne's *Anniversary* poems and later sermons as rejecting the conventional interior/exterior model of soul and body. Donne proposes the alternative figure of the two-sided sheet, in which the two souls are inscribed as the reverse faces of a single sheet of the poetic text. Donne maintains that the unrecognized power of poetry is to translate the living soul to the medium of the two-sided sheet encoding our two souls in the malleable space of poetic language.

In 1683, Thomas Willis, considered to be the father of neuroscience and the scientific study of cognition, takes stock of the paradox of two souls in blunt terms in the epigraph to this introduction, demonstrating that the problem resonated well into the late seventeenth century.

And indeed I know not, whether it will be pleasing to all, that instituting the something Paradoxical Doctrine of the Animal Soul, that I should assign to that Soul, by which the Brutes as well as Men live, feel, move, not only Extension, but Members, and as it were Organical Parts...and that moreover, I should form this...Man, a Two-soul'd Animal, and as it were a manifold *Geryon.*”

Natural philosophers like Willis extensively used the vocabulary of the “Animal” or Aristotelian soul shared by all animals, including humans, composed of the faculties and “Organicall Parts” permitting the body to “live, feel, move.” This is the standard Aristotelian account of the organic soul and its faculties. However, the simultaneous presence of the Christian soul in defining the human’s relation to God turns “Man” into a “Two-soul’d Animal” that is monstrous like a “manifold *Geryon*” with a grotesque amalgamation of heads and limbs. The “Paradoxical Doctrine” of the Aristotelian “animal soul” counterposed with the immortal Christian soul transformed the human into a “two-soul’d” monster. It is precisely this fear about the “Paradoxical Doctrine” of the human as a “Two-soul’d” monster voiced by Willis at the end of the period that is the focus of all of the texts studied in this dissertation. I demonstrate that all of the literary figures studied in the development of my argument harness the anxiety attending the possibility of the human as a “Two-soul’d” monster into the motivation for articulating a new model of the free Christian subject, and identify how rhetorical language possesses the power to shape this newly imagined “two-soul’d” agent. My project as a whole demonstrates the vital importance of literature and rhetoric in early modern debates about the soul, cognition, and the imagination of a new mode of Christian subjectivity, internally divided by psychological paradox, but free. My argument tracing the contours of the cultural crisis precipitated by the two souls therefore foregrounds the historical power of literature and poetic rhetoric to intervene in scientific or theological debates in ways that we haven’t recognized. If we acknowledge that the modern definition of the human emerges from a historical genealogy extending back to the
premodern subject divided into two souls, I argue that we can reimagine ourselves as open to rewriting and redefinition precisely as Shakespeare, Donne, and Davies did. Renaissance writers harnessed the internal contradiction of the subject to articulate a new mode of writerly self-definition. Literary history can show us how we might begin to imagine ourselves in the 21st century as malleable discursive subjects capable of transforming internal dissonance, a “self out of phase with itself,” in Levinas’ words, into the substance of a reimagined mode of agency, as Renaissance poets once did.
Chapter 1: "The Crisis of Two Souls: Pomponazzi, Melanchthon, Woolton"

In a series of lectures beginning in 1500 on Aristotle's definition of the soul in \textit{De Anima}, a professor of natural philosophy at the University of Padua, Pietro Pomponazzi, concluded that Aristotelian principles could not be used to prove the immortality of the Christian soul. Using Aristotle's \textit{De Anima} as the basis of defining the soul, which had been the canonical position of the Church since at least St. Thomas Aquinas, could only lead one to the conclusion that the human soul was mortal. Pomponazzi assumed that his conclusions were an innocuous scholastic matter, leading him to state at the end of his \textit{Tractatus de immortalitate animae} that "we must say that the question of the immortality of the soul is a neutral problem."\(^1\)

Unfortunately for Pomponazzi, his conclusions were anything but "a neutral problem." Pomponazzi's lectures and book incited a public outrage with a degree of violence unusual even for the Renaissance. Pomponazzi was accused of heresy by numerous Vatican figures, and a movement of clerics and academics called for him to be burned at the stake for his outrageous views. The leaders of several Italian cities informed Pomponazzi that he would either be burned by the public authorities, or "handed over to the boys in the street to stone and pelt him with dirt."\(^2\) The Venetian Doge forbid the sale of his book and ordered all published copies of his text to be burned in a public ceremony. Pomponazzi feared for his life and withdrew to the relative safety of Bologna.\(^3\)

The public furor over Pomponazzi's thinking ultimately incited a vigorous response from the Vatican, culminating in the Fifth Lateran Council meeting under the leadership of Pope Leo X in the St. John Lateran Basilica in Rome. On December 19, 1513, the Council published a polemical papal decree on the "the nature of the rational soul."\(^4\) The Council condemned Pomponazzi for "playing the philosopher without due care" in asserting that philosophical logic demonstrates the mortality of the rational soul. The Bull confirmed the immortality of the soul by citing both Aristotle's \textit{De Anima} and scriptural authority. The reassertion of the basic Christian truth of the immortality of the soul aimed to modify the pedagogical strategies of "every philosopher who teaches publicly in the universities" by "strictly forbidding teaching contrary to the enlightened truth of faith." According to the Lateran Council, not only was it necessary to acknowledge the immortality of the soul, it was additionally necessary to enforce a pedagogical
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regime in European universities confirming this doctrinal stance. The Vatican's confirmation of the immortality of the soul as the bedrock of Church law represents the culmination of the seething public controversy initiated by a single professor of philosophy on a seemingly obscure scholastic subject.

The extreme intensity of the response to Pomponazzi's work leads us to ask why Pomponazzi's self-described "neutral question" triggered such a violent furor and forced the Vatican to reaffirm Church law. The Lateran Council's decree states that Pomponazzi's assertion of the mortal soul called into question the basic truth of Christian doctrine: the possibility of salvation and the reward of afterlife.

Whoever hates his life in this world, will keep it for eternal life and when he promises eternal rewards and eternal punishments to those who will be judged according to the merits of their life; otherwise, the incarnation and other mysteries of Christ would be of no benefit to us, nor would resurrection be something to look forward to, and the saints and the just would be (as the Apostle says) the most miserable of all people.

If the soul were indeed mortal, the entire Christian faith would be a lie. Without the promise of immortality, the "incarnation and other mysteries of Christ would be of no benefit to us, nor would resurrection be something to look forward to." Calling the immortal soul into question would turn the holiest Christians, the saints and the just, into simply "the most miserable of people." Pomponazzi's work provoked a great deal of anxiety since it implied that the bedrock of Christian doctrine, the immortality of the soul, was proved on extremely flimsy logical grounds, and as such, Christian faith was built like a house of cards.

Although the explicit purpose of the papal decree aimed to renounce Pomponazzi's positions and force a change of pedagogical method in universities, the Lateran Council's document itself does not question the basic logic that made Pomponazzi's work so controversial: the human possesses two souls, one mortal, and one immortal, and the combination of the two drags the immortal Christian soul into the flesh-bound condition of the mortal Aristotelian soul.

For the soul not only truly exists of itself and essentially as the form of the human body, as is said in the canon of our predecessor of happy memory, pope Clement V, promulgated in the general council of Vienne, but it is also immortal...this is clearly established from the gospel when the Lord says 'They cannot kill the soul.'

The Lateran Council's proof of the soul's immortality affirms, as does Pomponazzi, that the human soul has two parallel definitions. First, the soul is defined as "the form of the human body," which is the most basic version of the soul introduced in Aristotle's *De Anima*, canonized as Church law by the 1312 Council of Vienne (which was used by Clement V as a proof of Jesus
Christ's mortal corporeal state). A second, parallel definition of the soul is described by the statement "but it is also immortal." The immortal definition of the soul draws from scriptural evidence: "They cannot kill the soul." Although the Council's mission was to prove the immortality of the soul, the syntax of this crucial sentence confirms that the soul is divided in two within its own definition. The conjunction "but" interrupts the logic of the sentence and shifts to the supplementary and parallel logic of "it is also immortal." According to these two parallel definitions proposed by the Lateran Council, the soul is "the form of the body," using Aristotle to cast the soul as the form of the body's mortal state, while on a second, parallel track, the soul is understood as immortal. Thus the soul is pulled in two directions within this definition - on one pole toward the human body and its mortality, and on the other pole toward immortality. Even as the Lateran Council insists that "truth cannot contradict truth," their definition of the immortal soul counterposes two equally true souls existing within each Christian subject.

The division of the soul within the Lateran Council's own definition of the immortal soul illuminates the main reason why Pomponazzi's thinking provoked such a violent controversy. Pomponazzi argues that two souls are built into the Christian definition of the soul, with one mortal soul defined in the Aristotelian tradition, and an immortal soul based on scripture. The Lateran Council's own proof of the soul's immortality demonstrates the extent to which these two souls exist implicitly, though poorly recognized, in the canonical definition of the soul. Although medieval Christian thinkers had acknowledged the presence of two souls, no one prior to Pomponazzi had adequately recognized its consequences. In proving that the mortal faculties of the Aristotelian soul could not justify the existence of an immortal Christian soul, Pomponazzi brought the existence of two souls into the foreground, and drew attention to the fact that the existence of two souls was a major problem destabilizing the unity of Christian thought.

The problem Pomponazzi identified was very simple. The immortal rational soul draws on the mortal faculties of the Aristotelian soul for the great majority of its functions (i.e. the senses for raw data about one's situation, the humoral system for emotional self-regulation, and the vegetative soul for basic nutrition). Since the immortal rational soul has such a great debt to the mortal faculties of the Aristotelian soul, the operations of the immortal soul must be understood as being partially composed of mortal, bodily functions. As such, the immortal soul is partially tainted with a trace of mortality. Alternatively stated, the physiological conjunction of the two souls drags the immortal rational soul down to the level of the mortal Aristotelian soul, binding the immortal soul to the mortal constraints of the Aristotelian faculties.

6 The Lateran Council's position has traditionally been understood as a refutation of the doctrine of "double truth" developed by medieval Averroists, who claimed that a premise could be "true in philosophy but false in theology, and vice versa. They could therefore quite literally claim that the truth of philosophy was mortality while the truth of theology was immortality." (Pine, Martin. “Pomponazzi and the Problem of ‘Double Truth.’” Journal of the History of Ideas Vol. 29, no. 2 (1968): 163.) For a more recent evaluation of the doctrine of double truth, see: Constant, Eric. “A Reinterpretation of the Fifth Lateran Council Decree Apostolici regiminis (1513).” Sixteenth Century Journal Vol. 33, no. 2 (2002).
Pomponazzi’s use of the two souls as a proof of the soul's mortality touched an extremely sensitive nerve in early modern Europe, and in doing so, turned the "neutral" philosophical observation of two souls into the fuel for a major cultural crisis. In this chapter, I argue the problem of two souls identified by Pomponazzi set the terms for a major crisis dominating much of 16th century philosophy and theology. The crisis of two souls triggered by Pomponazzi at the beginning of the century has been insufficiently acknowledged in the literary and philosophical history of the period. Recognizing the crisis of two souls changes our understanding of early modern thought. It is a basic assumption that a paradigm shift occurred in early modern Europe, from the Christian dualism of the flesh-bound body and the redeemed soul, to the Cartesian dualism of body and mind that paved the way for modern epistemology and philosophy of mind. This account of the Christian dualism of body and soul grossly simplifies the nature of the soul in early modern thought, and completely fails to account for the problem of two souls that motivated some of the major works of the period. Once we recognize that the crisis of the two souls was a major cultural concern across Europe, and specifically in late 16th century and early 17th century England, we can reread major literary and religious figures of the period with new eyes. I argue that the crisis of two souls strongly influenced the thought of prominent religious and scientific figures such as Philipp Melanchthon, John Woolton, Richard Hooker, William Perkins, Francis Bacon, William Harvey, Henry More, Ralph Cudworth and Thomas Hobbes, and the writing of literary figures interested in the soul, such as John Donne, William Shakespeare, Sir John Davies, and John Milton. In reading these major intellectual and literary figures as engaged in a fierce debate over the problem of two souls, we gain a new understanding of some of the most canonical figures of early modern period. Therefore in this chapter, I demonstrate that the crisis of two souls, and not the pre-Cartesian dualism of body and soul, was the urgent cultural problem motivating some of the most influential literature and philosophy of the era.

In this account of the two souls, the outcome of the debate is somewhat unexpected. The crisis of two souls does not lead to a refinement of received theological or philosophical doctrine. As my analysis shall demonstrate, the problem of two souls became a crisis because it touched a deep cultural nerve concerned with questions of obedience to law and the possibility of free political agency. Pomponazzi set the tone for this move from theology to politics and law in his controversial assertion that anyone believing in the immortality of the Christian soul was bound in a state of political servility, and that true Christian freedom lay in the use of the mortal Aristotelian faculties for virtuous ends. Pomponazzi’s position was outrageous since it cast the Christian soul as the mechanism of turning political subjects into abject slaves. By the end of the century, the prominent English theologian John Woolton argues that fallen humans can never be truly free, and must enter into a state of “willing service” to God’s natural law written on the mortal organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul. For Woolton, “immortality” does not describe the state of the Christian soul in the fallen living body, but rather the outcome of the voluntary decision to subjugate oneself to God’s eternal law. This chapter will explain how Pomponazzi’s justification of political freedom based on the faculties of the Aristotelian soul changes by the end of the century into Woolton’s claim that humans must freely serve the natural law inscribed upon their Aristotelian faculties. If at the outset of the crisis of two souls, the faculties of the
Aristotelian soul represent a path to Christian freedom, by the latter decades of the sixteenth century the Aristotelian faculties underwrite a voluntary servitude to an internalized Christian law.

It is this discourse of law, and the Christian subject’s absolute obedience to that law, which dominates the sixteenth century understanding of the two-souls paradox. The authoritarian solutions developed by Protestant thinkers in response to the crisis of two souls precipitated by Pomponazzi became so widespread and accepted by the late sixteenth century, that the English literary figures studied in this dissertation felt motivated to resist this narrative of legal obedience. The Protestant discourse of law outraged the literary culture of late Tudor and early Stuart England, and motivated the poets at the heart of this study to develop an alternative account from those of Pomponazzi, Melanchthon and Woolton, swinging the two-souls problem from the pole of servitude to law, to the pole of Christian freedom. This chapter will outline the problem at the center of this dissertation as a whole. How did the presence of two souls in the composition of the individual Christian subject become a cultural crisis in early sixteenth century Europe? How did Protestant theology turn this crisis of two souls into a mode of justifying the Christian subject’s absolute obedience to natural law? And why would this discourse of law provoke such a forceful counternarrative from the prominent English poets studied in this project? In the story I tell, the sixteenth century theological account of the two-souls conflict as a matter of obedience to law and political servility served as the impetus for a novel articulation of Christian agency reimagined in the space of poetic language and rhetoric.

Pomponazzi: Two Souls and Human Servility

In the Tractatus de immortalitate animae, Pomponazzi turned the existence of two souls into a major crisis by overturning the definitive solution unifying the two souls accepted by the Church. First introduced by the Islamic philosopher Averroes in the 12th century, and expanded by St. Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century, the Averroist/Thomist solution stated that Aristotle's highest faculty, the rational soul, was actually identical to the immortal Christian soul, although Aristotle did not realize this in composing De Anima since he did not have access to a Christian vocabulary. The immortal Christian soul could be simply substituted for the rational soul at the apex of the Aristotelian faculties since St. Thomas identified a large degree of analogy between the two souls - both were immaterial, both were capable of contemplating transcendent metaphysical questions, and both were superior to the material state of the body. The Aristotelian rational soul and the immortal Christian soul had been called different names, but St. Thomas affirmed that the two souls were actually identical, only misidentified by previous philosophers. The Thomist solution caused a great deal of relief, since it united the best qualities of both souls. The Christian soul was now intrinsically rational, and the rational soul was now immortal and
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capable of being redeemed. According to this logic, it was the human's rational capability that permitted the proper worship of God, and served as the path to salvation.

Pomponazzi precipitated such a furor since he demonstrated that the Thomist/Averroist solution was completely wrong: "unless I am mistaken, the Commentator, St. Thomas, and whoever thinks that Aristotle judged the human intellect to be truly immortal are far from the truth."9 Pomponazzi's critique proceeds according to the following logic. Superimposing the Christian soul, assumed to be immortal and immaterial, onto the Aristotelian rational soul necessarily places the rational Christian soul into relation with the two lower Aristotelian faculties of sense and nutrition, since Aristotle's intellect is always tethered to some operation of the body.10

The intellective soul is the act of a physical and organic body. Since, therefore, in its being the intellect is the act of a physical and organic body, it will thus also depend in all its functioning on some organ, either as subject or object. Hence it will never be totally released from some organ.11

In Pomponazzi's reading of Aristotle, the intellectual soul possesses a great debt to the lower faculties of the body. The intellect is "the act of a physical and organic body," and as such, its putatively immaterial cognitive activities "depend in all its functioning on some organ."12 The unexpected by-product of the Thomist solution therefore turns the mortal and material operations of the body's organs into the necessary adjunct of the putatively immortal and immaterial rational Christian soul. Rather than lift the Aristotelian rational soul onto a higher plane of Christian immateriality and immortality, Pomponazzi argues that the Thomist solution has the unfortunate side-effect of dragging the immortal and immaterial Christian soul into a necessary relation with the fallen, flesh-bound state of the body. The immortal, immaterial rational soul "will never be totally released from some organ." In the Thomist solution, the Christian rational soul becomes trapped in the materiality and mortality of the body's organs, and cannot never be "totally released" into a purely immaterial or immortal state.

Following the Thomist solution to its logical conclusion then, simply mires the Christian soul in the body's fallen organs. Based on this conclusion, Pomponazzi argues that previous medieval solutions unifying the Aristotelian and Christian souls cannot be upheld. Rather than
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9 Pomponazzi, p. 296.
11 Pomponazzi, p. 288.
attempt a false unification of the two souls, Pomponazzi suggests that one must acknowledge that the human possesses two different natures that cannot be unified into a single soul.

Man is clearly not of simple, but of multiple, not of certain, but of ambiguous nature, and he is to be placed as a mean between mortal and immortal things…For in performing the functions of the vegetative and of the sensitive soul, which cannot be performed without a bodily and perishable instrument, man assumes mortality. However, in knowing and willing, operations which are held to be performed without any bodily instrument, since they prove separability and immateriality, and these in turn prove immortality, man is to be numbered among the immortal things.\footnote{Pomponazzi, p. 282.}

Human nature cannot be unified, and must be understood as "multiple," encompassing both mortal, physical characteristics alongside immaterial activities such as knowing and willing. The inaccurately "simple" and "certain" solution proposed by the medieval scholastics must be replaced by an understanding of the human that is "multiple" and "ambiguous." Pomponazzi carefully articulates the division between the two souls in asserting the multiple and ambiguous nature of human life. The Aristotelian soul's faculties of sense and vegetation require a "bodily and perishable instrument," and therefore assumes a mortal, physical condition. The rational soul's faculties of "knowing and willing," understood in the Thomist tradition as being "performed without any bodily instrument," enables humanity to strive toward the plane of "immortal things." However, Pomponazzi insists that even if certain isolated functions of the rational soul gesture to immortality, human nature as a whole can in no way be called immortal. Each person is a composite of mortal and material faculties on one hand, and immortal and immaterial faculties on the other. This difference between the two souls is irreducible.

Pomponazzi's dramatic shift in linguistic logic over the course of this particular passage demonstrates the extent to which the Christian soul becomes bound in the mortal condition of the Aristotelian faculties. The beginning of the passage describes man "placed as a mean between mortal and immortal things," citing a standard Thomist and Averroist position. Although the "mean" describes a mathematical average between mortal and immortal, Pomponazzi's statement turns the human into a physical barrier between the two poles. The human does not simply define an abstract mathematical mean, she must be physically "placed" as a grammatical object separating two different domains of "things." Therefore the human does not simply passively live at the stable border between mortal and immortal, the human functions as the wall that is physically "placed" between the two to confirm their difference in the first place. The human placement as a mean interposed at the junction of mortal and immortal ensures the separation "mortal things" from "immortal things," ensuring that a "between" exists between mortal and immortal at all. Without the placement of the human as a mediating wall, both "mortal and immortal things" would come tumbling down into a confused philosophical jumble. Human nature must therefore be "ambiguous" and "multiple" so as to ensure that the difference between mortal and immortal is not.
The human's place as the literal wall segregating the domain of "mortal things" from "immortal things" is further confirmed in Pomponazzi's summary of the Thomist and Averroist proof of the human soul's immortality. Since the cognitive operations of "knowing and willing" are performed without use of a "bodily instrument," the rational soul must be separate from the material, Aristotelian soul and its organic nature. "Proving separability" seems to clinch the Thomist proof's victory: the separability of the rational soul from the organic soul proves the soul's "immateriality," which in turn "proves immortality." Happily, in the Thomist proof, "man is the be numbered among the immortal things." Pomponazzi demonstrates that the clinching move of the Thomist proof of the soul's immortality relies upon a logic of "separability" - the rational soul is segregated from the fallen functions of the body's organs, and such separability proves both its immateriality and immortality. In both of these moves, Pomponazzi confirms that the standard scholastic assumptions, that the human is a mathematical mean between immortal and mortal things, and that the rational soul is immortal and immaterial, are buttressed upon a literal logic of spatial separation. Human nature as a mathematical mean performs the function of a wall physically placed in space to keep the domains of "mortal and immortal things" segregated according to an orderly division. In turn, the Thomist proof relies on the rational soul's "separability" from the mortal organs of the Aristotelian faculties as a first principle proving the soul's immortality. What occurs in these two descriptions of the physical separation of the two souls is a curious circular logic. If the human mean must be placed by Thomas and Averroes as a wall dividing mortal and immortal, this fabricated placement subsequently serves as the naturalized proof of the rational soul's immortality taken as an \textit{a priori} fact. The philosophical placement of the human soul as a wall between mortal and immortal by the Averroist and Thomist traditions magically transforms into the basis of an \textit{a priori} proof of the rational soul's "separability" and immortality as a given fact, as if the rational soul was always segregated from the physical body, and no philosophical work of placement establishing the soul's "separability" was ever necessary.

In the conclusion of this sequence, Pomponazzi explodes this convenient philosophical fiction that had underwritten the Thomist and Averroist solution to the problem of the two souls.

From these facts the whole conclusion can be drawn, that man is clearly not of a simple nature, since he includes three souls - the vegetative, the sensitive, and the intellective - and that he claims a twofold nature for himself, since he exists neither unqualifiedly mortal nor unqualifiedly immortal but embraces both natures.\textsuperscript{14}

Pomponazzi asserts his own position that human nature is far more complicated than a simple separation or mean between two souls. The rhetoric of the mean and "separability" gives way in the concluding logic to a very different rhetoric of two intermeshed souls that cannot be separated. The human "includes" three souls, the vegetative, the sensitive and the intellective, two of which are mortal and physical, and one which is ostensibly immortal and immaterial.

\textsuperscript{14} Pomponazzi, p. 282.
However, in using the term "include" to describe the relation between the three Aristotelian faculties, Pomponazzi breaks down the "separability" of the rational, immortal soul and the faculties of the body established above in the summary of the Thomist solution. There is no "separability" of the rational faculty from the sensitive and vegetative faculties, and all three must be included in a confused mixture of mortal and immortal qualities. By "including" all three faculties in one set, the separation or mean between mortal and immortal is dissolved, and the rational faculty is pulled into the mortal, organic domain of the other faculties.

The logic of subsuming in the rational soul into the circle of the organic faculties by its inclusion develops even further in the human's "claim" and "embrace" of the "twofold nature" or the two souls. The physical segregation of the mortal and immortal faculties in the Thomist solution, either as a mathematical mean, or by proof of the rational soul's separability from the body, turns into its precise opposite in Pomponazzi's final claim. The two souls are not separable, but are physically bound by the human's "claiming" of a "twofold nature for himself," grasping the two souls at once as a possession. No longer are the two souls separated, but are rather "claimed" simultaneously as a human possession. Based on such a "claiming," human nature can no longer be separated according its purely mortal or the purely immortal faculties. In "claiming" both souls "for himself," the human must "embrace both natures," recognizing the physical embeddedness of the mortal and immortal souls, as two intermeshed bodies locked in an "embrace" where it is impossible to discern where one individual ends and the other begins. By this point, the movement from the Thomist mathematical separability of the two souls to Pomponazzi's alternative "embrace" of the two souls has run its course. No longer can the two souls, one mortal and organic, the second immortal and immaterial, be understood according to the Thomist rhetoric of mathematical means and immanent separability. Pomponazzi pushes the two souls into an almost uncomfortably close contact, "claiming" both souls as a possession, swallowing up the rational soul into the domain of the mortal faculties by "inclusion," and ultimately insisting upon the physical embrace of two souls in a situation where spatial separation is impossible. In such a tight physical embrace, the two souls are neither "unqualifiedly mortal nor unqualifiedly immortal." The rational soul is not separable from the body on a pure plane of immortal and immaterial ideation. The physical embrace between the two souls locks the rational soul into the workings of the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul. By this point, Pomponazzi's claim that the rational Christian soul can "never be totally released from some organ" becomes clear. The physical organs of the Aristotelian faculties "claim" and "embrace" the immortal Christian soul, and won't let go; it will "never be released."

Articulating the inextricable embrace of the rational Christian soul with the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul leads Pomponazzi to conclude that both components of the human soul are "absolutely mortal." In making such a controversial claim about the mortality of the human soul, however, Pomponazzi realizes counterarguments will be directed his way. Most significantly, he anticipates the contention that the existence of a purely mortal soul would mean that all religions, and all philosophers from Plato to the Renaissance, were false.
All religions, not only those which have been, but those which now exist, maintain that the soul remains after the body; and so this is of very great renown and celebrated throughout the whole world. Wherefore either we must say that the soul is immortal or that the whole world is deceived and that a widespread belief is completely false.15

Pomponazzi's answer to this counterargument unexpectedly moves his analysis into the domain of politics, and the final third of his treatise is dedicated to questions of law and the political subject. Pomponazzi states that the religions of the world and the arguments of philosophers are not mistaken. Rather, all religions and philosophers know very well that the soul is not immortal, but have used the possibility of the immortal soul as a "noble lie" necessary for maintaining political order.16

The statesman is the physician of souls, and the purpose of the statesman is to make man righteous rather than learned. Now, according to the diversity of men, one must proceed by different devices to attain this end. For some men are of ability and of a nature well formed by God, who are led to the virtues by the nobility of the virtues alone...Some, however, are made righteous on account of the hope of some good and the fear of bodily punishment...Therefore they have set up for the virtuous eternal rewards in another life, and for the vicious, eternal punishments, which frighten greatly...And the lawgiver regarding the proneness of men to evil, intending the common good, has decreed that the soul is immortal, not caring for truth but only for righteousness, that he may lead men to virtue.

Nor is the statesman to be blamed. For just as the physician feigns many things to restore a sick man to health, so the statesman composes fables to keep citizens on the right path.17

In asserting that the "statesman," and not the natural philosopher or theologian, is the "physician of souls," Pomponazzi mimics Plato in the Republic in framing the soul as an explicitly political matter.18 Claiming that the statesman and not the philosopher is the "physician of soul" reconfigures our understanding of the problem of two souls set up by Pomponazzi. The "lawgiver" and not the philosopher or cleric, is the agent responsible for resolving the problem of two souls, in precisely the same manner that the physician is responsible for healing sick bodies. The ultimate resolution of the problem of two souls, and their mortality or immortality, will emerge as a political solution concerning matters of natural and civil law, and not simply be limited to the domain of philosophy or theology.

15 Pomponazzi, p. 348.
17 Pomponazzi, p. 364.
Pomponazzi argues in this remarkable sequence that the immortality of the soul is a necessary fiction useful for leading citizens to virtue. For the "purpose of the statesman," unlike the philosopher, is to make the soul "righteous" and not necessarily "learned." Thus the immortality of the soul does not need to be absolute true in order to fulfill its purpose as an incentive guiding citizens to a virtuous life. The fiction of the soul's immortality is necessary since humans have diverse natures. Some citizens are rational and "well formed by God," requiring only the incentive of virtue in itself as a motivation to live virtuously. The vast majority of citizens, do not possess such a virtuous temperament, however, and must be either tricked or coerced into virtue by the prospect of reward or punishment. Thus the common citizen is "made righteous" by the incentive of eternal rewards for the virtuous, and the corresponding fear of "vicious, eternal punishments, which frighten greatly" for the wicked. Therefore lawmakers "decree" that the soul is immortal to counteract the fallen human's natural tendency to act sinfully, and to provide an incentive rewarding virtuous behavior. Pomponazzi extends the metaphor of the physician even further by claiming that "caring for truth" matters little in this scenario, just as the physician will do anything possible to save his patient from the brink of death. Just as the physician of the body is pragmatically willing to "feign" the truth for the patient to save their life, the statesman understood as the "physician of the soul" must "compose fables" in order to heal sick, sinful souls and preserve the "common good."

Pomponazzi's justification of the noble lie of the immortal soul draws directly from Plato's account in the Republic of the stratification of society according to the three faculties of the soul. According to Plato, society's class structure must mirror the internal division of the human faculties. The faculty of reason reflects the ruling class of guardians who protect the society as a whole, the passionate faculty reflects the warrior class who bravely defend the society, and the basest faculty of instinctive appetite and desire reflects the lowest class which must be controlled and disciplined. Pomponazzi blends these three Platonic faculties of the soul with the three Aristotelian faculties in defining the political ends of the human race.

We say that the end of the human race in general is to participate in these three faculties, by which men communicate with each other and live together; and one is either useful or necessary to the other, just as all the members in a single man share in vital spirits and have mutual operations together.

Pomponazzi completely redefines the "end" or purpose of humanity in relation to the two souls. If the immortality of the soul has been recast as a necessary political fiction needed to regulate human behavior, then the promise of immortality and the reward of an afterlife can no longer be understood as the true end of human life. If we recognize that "lawmakers" have fictitiously framed the immortal soul as the ultimate human end, we can properly understand immortality as a purely mortal means to political subjection. In acknowledging that the immortal soul is no
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19 Pomponazzi draws primarily from Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics here in linking the political and the ethical, and in dividing the practical knowledge of ethics from its theoretical basis.
20 For this, see: Plato, Republic, Book 4.
21 Pomponazzi, p. 355, see also p. 283.
longer our ultimate purpose, Pomponazzi argues that using the mortal faculties of the classical soul represents the true end of humans, defined in their social being. The Aristotelian faculties enable humans to enter into social life. "Participating" in the three faculties of the organic soul permits individuals to "participate" in social relations with others. The faculties of the classical soul serve as the basis of society in two ways. First, the three organic faculties represent the literal means by which individuals engage with others - using the faculties of the soul leads to the possibility of "communication" and "living" together. Second, the organic faculties serve as a figural model for political life in general. The organs and faculties of the human can be used as a metaphor to describe the "mutual operations" of individual citizens living together in macropolitical arrangements. Thus, as the organs, the vital spirits of the humoral system, and the operations of the faculties work together in the living body, individual citizens joining together in their individual roles makes social harmony possible. With this move, Pomponazzi radically alters the relative importance of the immortal soul in relation to the faculties of the organic soul. The immortal soul, redefined as a political lie, is no longer understood as the final end of humanity. In its place, the faculties of the organic soul are brought to the foreground as the basis of any possible human society. Actively using and "participating" in the faculties of the organic soul permits each person to "participate" in social life.

Pomponazzi extends his emphasis on the political consequences of the organic faculties even further, by claiming that the active "participation" in the faculties of the mortal soul, in contrast to the false hope of an immortal soul, leads to the only true form of human freedom or free will. Unquestioning belief in the noble lie of the immortal soul leads to a state of abject servility.

Those who claim that the soul is mortal seem better to save the grounds of virtue than those who claim it to be immortal. For the hope of reward and the fear of punishment seem to suggest a certain servility, which is contrary to the grounds of virtue.22

Those who believe in the immortal soul are motivated only by the "hope of reward" and the "fear of punishment." Such a crude basis for decision making sinks the human down to the level of the animal or the slave, who are motivated by fear of the whip, or the reward of bodily pleasure. Hoping for immortal reward in heaven, and fearing immortal punishment in hell, are not truly free or virtuous bases for making decisions, since the motivation of reward/punishment operates at the level of crude animal instinct. Thus believing in the immortal soul drags the human to a level of base "servility" that is antithetical to true virtue. In contrast to the "servile" believers of the soul's immortality, Pomponazzi prefers the true virtue of the person who understands the soul to be mortal.

On the contrary, thefts, robberies, murders, a life of pleasures are vices, which make man turn into a beast and cease to be a man; hence we ought to abstain from them. Note that one who acts conscientiously, expecting no other reward than virtue, seems to act far

22 Pomponazzi, p. 375.
more virtuously and purely than he who expects some reward beyond virtue. And he who shuns vice on account of the foulness of vice, not because of the fear of due punishment for vice, seems more to be praised than he who avoids vice on account of the fear of punishment.\textsuperscript{23}

The noble human acts virtuously and shuns vice without the incentive of immortal rewards or the threat of punishment. Truly virtuous decisions are motivated by the reward of virtue and the aversion to vice in themselves, without need for external coercion. Thus the non-servile individual will act virtuously purely in pursuit of the happiness attending virtue, in contrast to the servile person motivated by the false happiness promised by immortality.

Pomponazzi specifies that the believers of the immortal soul are servile since they exhibit "uncertain action, and without any end."\textsuperscript{24} Belief in the immortal soul leads to a state of utter confusion, and all decisions lead to "uncertain action." Believers of immortality tend toward the servility of reward and punishment since their actions are "uncertain" and require external coercion. In opposition to the confused "uncertain action" of the immortal soul ultimately leading to a state of servility, Pomponazzi contrasts the freedom of the mortal human to choose between the faculties of the organic soul.

Wherefore the human soul has some of the properties of the Intelligences and some of the properties of all material things; whence it is that when it performs functions through which agrees with the Intelligences, it is said to be divine and to be changed into a God; but when it performs the functions of beasts, it is said to be changed into a beast...Some have said that man is a great marvel, since he is the whole world and can change into every nature, since to him is given the power to follow whatever property of things he may prefer. Therefore the ancients were telling the right fable when they said that some men had been made into gods, some into lions, some into wolves, some into plants, some into stones, and so on; since some men have attained intellect, some sense, some the powers of the vegetative soul, and so on. Therefore those who place bodily pleasures above moral or intellectual virtues rather produce a beast than a god; those who put riches first, rather gold; whence the former are to be called beasts, the latter insensate.\textsuperscript{25}

In many ways, this passage represents the culmination of Pomponazzi's argument. Pomponazzi proposes that the recognition of the soul's mortal nature leads to true human freedom, in contrast to the servility of reward and punishment occurring with the false promise of the immortal soul. This passage therefore defines human freedom as the ability to configure the three faculties of the organic soul in different arrangements as one "prefers." Humans are unique among living creatures insofar as they can "change into every nature." Pomponazzi emphasizes that such possibility of human change is volitional, and driven by the power of choice; human possess "the power to follow whatever property of things he may prefer." The human being's "great marvel"

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{23} Pomponazzi, p. 375.
\textsuperscript{24} Pomponazzi, p. 377.
\textsuperscript{25} Pomponazzi, p. 376.
\end{flushleft}
and its defining power lies in the possibility of free choice to the extent that one can "prefer" and "change" the various properties of its soul. In these moves, Pomponazzi redefines what is worthy of wonder in the human soul. No longer is the possibility of immortality the primary "marvel" and "power" of the human soul. The human soul is a "great marvel" and has a unique power above animals since it has the capacity to "prefer" the operations of some faculties over others, and has the power to modify the condition of the mortal faculties according to their "preferences."

In Pomponazzi's model of choice, each human has the power to choose and configure the faculties of one's soul either in pursuit of an ethical life, or in pursuit of bestial pleasures and sin. Therefore when individuals strive to perfect their intellectual faculties, they are "said to be divine and changed into a God," whereas individuals who "place bodily pleasures above moral or intellectual virtues," spiral downward into the sub-human state of a "beast." Even further, those who "put riches first" sink even further into the "insensate" state of an inanimate object, such as gold. The transformations of each type of individual correspond directly to the three organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul. Thus the individual who "changes into a God" emphasizes the powers of the intellectual faculty, the individual sunken into the lower state of a beast prefers the pleasures of sense faculties, and the lowest individual preferring the pursuit of riches can barely be called living, resembling an inanimate rock such as gold, and exhibiting only the barest vital functions of the vegetative soul, such as breathing and heartbeat, for survival. In each of these cases, individuals have the power to choose the specific faculty of the organic soul they "prefer" to use as a template in defining the ultimate trajectory of their lives. The power of human choice in Pomponazzi's model is defined as the selection of the mortal organic faculties of the Aristotelian faculty, and as the ability to be fundamentally changed according to such a choice of faculties.

For Pomponazzi, then, concepts such as free choice and servility are not defined in relation to God or a king. Rather, the ultimate power of the mortal human soul lies in our relation to the state of our own faculties, and in the ability to choose, and be changed by, the selection of such faculties. Acknowledging that the faculties of the soul are mortal leads humans to a state of free choice and power in relation to their own souls, as opposed to the "servility" and "uncertain action" of the fictitious immortal soul. The lie of the immortality makes humans "servile" subjects to their own souls, while the mortal soul gives the power to choose and to change the nature of one's own faculties.

We can now see why Pomponazzi's thinking incited such a violent outrage in early sixteenth century Italy. If we agree with his positions, then believing in the immortal soul leads individuals to be powerless slaves, in a state of servility to the church and the state who would actively lie to their citizens to maintain social order. In contrast, the mortal soul leads citizens to freedom, but a freedom not defined in relation to God or the prince, but in relation to their own organic faculties. Pomponazzi's position would be highly insulting both to devout Catholics, who would be slandered as impotent slaves in this narrative, and to the Vatican clerics and Italian politicians who are cast as perpetuators of a massive fraud. For his part, Pomponazzi chooses the
path of "servility" at the end of his text, in order to save his life in the face of the angry mobs seeking to burn him at the stake for heresy.

And therefore these are the things that seem to me must be said in this matter, yet always submitting myself in this and in other matters to the Apostolic See. At Bologna, in the fourth year of the Pontificate of Leo X. To the praise of the indivisible Trinity, etc.26

In the final lines of his text, Pomponazzi himself chooses a path of "submission" to the Apostolic See and Pope Leo X, opting for subjection under Vatican law.27 Such a move, however, came too late. The outrage incited by Pomponazzi's teachings had triggered a major crisis in Church thought, with dozens of texts and pamphlets (including the decree of the Lateran Council V) attempting to refute Pomponazzi's logic. More importantly, Pomponazzi's work set the terms for the debate over the nature of the two souls which would continue through the 16th century and into the 17th century. Most importantly, Pomponazzi's explicit effort to frame the crisis of two souls as a question of the political subject's freedom or servility influenced all subsequent responses. Throughout the 16th and 17th centuries, theologians, political thinkers, and prominent literary figures would struggle to answer the basic questions asked by Pomponazzi that provoked so much anxiety: is the immortality of Christian soul a fiction of law used to lead citizens into a servile state of obedient subjection? And is the mortal state of the Aristotelian soul the true condition for free will and political agency? All subsequent works on the crisis of two souls in early modern Europe directly followed Pomponazzi in defining the immortal Christian soul in relation to the mortal Aristotelian soul as a political problem of free will versus servility.

The Protestant Response: Melanchthon on the Freedom and Despotism of the Soul

We have already examined the Fifth Lateran Council's decree refuting Pomponazzi's description of the mortal soul. The Vatican response was the most influential Catholic renunciation of Pomponazzi's position. In this section, we shall see that the Protestant response to Pomponazzi's articulation of the two souls differed greatly from the official Vatican reaffirmation of Church law. In the decades after the initial furor over Pomponazzi's teachings, Protestant thinkers inveighed against Pomponazzi's position from various points of view. However, between 1540-1553, Philip Melanchthon's Liber De Anima emerged as the most convincing Protestant refutation of Pomponazzi. Melanchthon's critique of Pomponazzi fundamentally differed from the Vatican response. As can be assumed, Melanchthon did not fall back to the tradition of Catholic law. Melanchthon's Protestant response attempted to turn Pomponazzi's argument on its head, in effect turning a weakness into a strength, by insisting on the Aristotelian soul as the best means to prove the freedom of the immortal Christian soul.

26 Pomponazzi, p. 381.
27 Although Pope Leo X officially condemned Pomponazzi's work, he is thought to have enjoyed a good controversy, and fanned the flames of the debate by encouraging some of Pomponazzi's fiercest critics to publish their work. For this, see: Allen, Don Cameron. Doubt's Boundless Sea: Skepticism and Faith in the Renaissance. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1964. p. 31.
Melanchthon accomplishes such a proof reversing Pomponazzi’s main contention by drawing inspiration from Andreas Vesalius' recent work on human anatomy, the 1543 De humani corporis fabrica. Melanchthon was fascinated by Vesalius’ section on brain anatomy, particularly in his concession that anatomical dissection could yield little new insight into the workings of the rational soul.

I ventured to ascribe no more to the ventricles than that they are cavities and spaces in which the inhaled air, added to the vital spirit from the heart, is, by power of the peculiar substance of the brain, transformed into animal spirit. The animal spirit is presently distributed through the nerves to the organs of sensation and motion, so that these organs, with the help of this spirit, and by means of a construction fitted to their functions, perform their office. Thus the muscles move, the eye sees, the olfactory organs smell, the auditory organs hear, the tongue distinguishes tastes, and every part reached by a nerve estimates and distinguishes tactile impressions.

Now I do not deny that the ventricles bring the animal spirit into being, but I hold that this explains nothing about the faculties of the Reigning Soul...And accordingly, singing songs of praise to God, the Universal Creator, we shall render thanks to Him that He has bestowed on us a Rational Soul which we have in common with the angels.

In this moment of the Fabrica, Vesalius describes how his anatomical work provides a fresh understanding of the sensitive and nutritive souls. The spaces of the brain's ventricles converts the vital spirit into animal spirit, which is distributed through the body's nerves, permitting the sense organs to perceive, and the muscles to move toward food sources. Although Vesalius argues that his anatomical method can refine Aristotle's definition of the sensitive and nutritive souls, he admits that dissection of the brain can add little new knowledge to our understanding of the "Reigning" immortal rational soul and its faculties. According to Vesalius, the ventricles of the brain at the boundary between the lower faculties of sensation and nutrition, and the higher "reigning" faculty of intellect, represent the outer limit of the anatomical method. The functions of the rational soul beyond the brain's ventricles reach into the domain of theology and its "songs of praise to God," inaccessible to anatomy.

Melanchthon was greatly inspired by Vesalius' text, and in his Liber De Anima, attempted to pick up where Vesalius left off in studying the anatomical operations of the rational and immortal Christian soul. Melanchthon aimed to use the novel definition of the sensitive and vegetative souls developed in Vesalian anatomy to come to a complete understanding of how the

---

30 Although Vesalius has been celebrated for his refutation of Galenic anatomy, no one has properly recognized his continued understanding of Aristotle’s three faculties as the basic structure of the soul.
mortal Aristotelian faculties work in harmony with the immortal Christian soul, which Vesalius had great difficulty explaining. If Vesalius' chapter on the nervous system states that the brain's ventricles represent a fissure between the organic sensitive soul and the immortal Christian soul, Melanchthon insists that no such fissure exists. Although Vesalius did not recognize it, the Vesalian anatomical method could be used as a way to bridge the mortal Aristotelian soul with a free and immortal Christian soul.

For Melanchthon, Vesalian anatomy represented a rigorous scientific way to respond to Pomponazzi on the servility and freedom of the human soul. Thus anatomical knowledge could redefine the nature of the Christian soul's immortality and its free will in an empirically sound way. Melanchthon applies Vesalian anatomy to affirm the immortality and freedom of the Christian soul, contra Pomponazzi, by articulating the concept of the soul's "double leadership."

In man there is a double leadership, one the despotic kind, by which mind and will force motion, so that the outward limbs are either restrained or impelled, as in even the fiercest thirst the mind and the will can control the hands so that it not touch a cup. The nerves are so created that they may be set in motion by the rule of the mind and the will. So through the locomotive faculty, the outer limbs, like prisoners, can be coerced even if the emotions in the heart struggle against it. Indeed even appetites for food and drink are restrained in this way. Nor is there any obscurity in this freedom and authority, which is in fact the guardian of all external discipline.

[...]
The second form of rule in man is that which is called the political, when the external limbs are not just coerced through locomotion, but the heart itself agrees with right reason and by honest will is moved to agreement...Whenever there is agreement of right judgment, will, heart, and the outer limbs, that action is rightly called virtue. But it is rare in this weakness of mankind.32

Melanchthon describes the relation between the faculties of the soul and the body's anatomy as a "double leadership," split between "despotic" and "political" modes of rule, competing to govern the actions of each person. Under the despotic mode of leadership, the rational soul's powers of mind and will exert firm control over the "outward limbs" of the body, either through restraint or impulsion. Thus even if the vegetative soul experiences the "fiercest thirst," the rational soul can "control the hands" to not touch a cup filled with water.

The despotic rule of the mind and the will is enforced by the sensitive soul's network of nerves, described in great detail by Vesalian anatomy. The nerves function as the instruments of coercion, implementing the "rule of the mind and the will" in forcing or restraining the motion of the limbs. It is important to emphasize that Melanchthon's understanding of the nervous system's anatomy differs completely from Vesalius. Vesalius flatly describes the nervous system in terms of the neutral operations of a machine: the heart links to the brain through the circulatory system,

the brain converts the vital spirits into the animal spirits, and the nerves conduct the animal spirits to the sensory and locomotive organs. In contrast, Melanchthon's description of the nervous system reads like an exciting political drama, in his characterization of the relation of the three Aristotelian faculties as an ever-shifting power struggle. In this political definition of the three faculties of the soul, the mind and will of the rational soul coercively control the locomotive powers of the vegetative soul through the nerves of the sensitive soul.

By creating this political definition of the faculties, Melanchthon completely redefines the ultimate ends of the soul. The nerves of the sensitive soul are "created" so as to function as instruments of force in soul's despotic regime. The nerves' primary purpose is therefore not to stimulate movement or to relay sensory stimulation back to the brain. The nerves were originally "created" for the specific role of enforcing the rule of the rational soul in a power network extending to the body's outermost limbs. The power relations in Melanchthon's model are emphasized even further by the possibility of internal conflicts arising between the various faculties of the soul competing to control to body's actions. The "emotions of the heart" may disagree with the orders of the rational faculty and "struggle" against the locomotive nerves' coercive movement of the muscles. The muscles and limbs of the body are "prisoners" locked in the power struggle between the emotions of the sensitive faculty (traditionally located after Aristotle in the heart) and the despotic rule of the rational faculty's mind and will seated in the brain. Melanchthon's portrayal of the soul literalizes the "organic" nature of Aristotle's faculties, with each faculty tightly linked to an organ or anatomical locus: the despotic rational faculty in the brain, the emotions of the sensitive faculty in the heart, the vegetative faculty in the locomotive power of the limbs, and with the sensitive and rational souls "struggling" to control the coercive power of the nerves. Ultimately, the "prisoners" of the muscles and limbs will be "coerced" to move in accordance with the orders of the rational soul, despite the opposition of the emotions of the sensitive soul centered in the heart. Melanchthon reimagines the interconnection between the faculties of the Aristotelian soul as a political struggle, in which the body's anatomy serves as the physical space where the tension between the different faculties are played out.

Melanchthon transforms the basic function and the ultimate ends of the Aristotelian faculties into an explicitly political struggle characterized by despotic rule. Where Pomponazzi argued that belief in the immortal soul manipulated citizens into an undesirable state of political servility, Melanchthon contends that the organic faculties of the mortal Aristotelian soul are always already in a state of servility, locking the body's anatomy as "prisoners" in a despotic system of control. In marked contrast to Pomponazzi, Melanchthon insists that the soul's faculties are always complicit in a political system of despotism and coercion, in which some of the faculties are responsible for coercion, and others are "prisoners" coerced to act. Melanchthon transforms the political drama of the two souls, from Pomponazzi's external relation of the citizen to the state's "lawgiver," to a political struggle internal to the human, where each person plays the role of both the tyrannical coercers, and the abject coerced.

33 Aristotle locates the faculties of the soul in the heart in De Partibus animalium, 665a27-668b32.
Why does Melanchthon think that humans live in such a divided state of despotism and abjection? The need for internal despotism becomes clear in his description of the second mode of “leadership,” that of the "political." In the second mode of self-rule, the coercive force of the nerves is not the primary means of motivating action. Rather, in the political system, harmony exists between the different faculties, with the "emotions of the heart" agreeing with the reason and will of the rational faculty in determining the proper movements of the limbs. The "agreement" of the different faculties leads the body's limbs or "citizens" to "willingly obey" the orders of the heart and brain, and "they do not fight the law." (p.248) The ideal state of harmony between all three faculties leads the emotions of the sensitive soul and the reason and will of the rational soul to agree upon a course of action, and "persuades" (p.248) the limbs to "willingly obey" the set of "laws" declared by the two higher faculties without the internal fight"weighing down the despotic mode of rule. When the political harmony of the faculties and the body's anatomy occurs, Melanchthon defines the resulting action as "virtue."

The harmonious state of the political rule seems to be obviously preferable to internal strife of the despotic rule. Yet why does Melanchthon then place such a heavy emphasis on the prevalence of the soul's internal despotism? The answer, very simply, is that humanity is not frequently virtuous after the fall, and the scar of original sin makes it extremely difficult for the soul's faculties to come into a harmonious state of "agreement." Since mankind has been plunged into a state of "weakness" after the fall, the harmony of the faculties and anatomy leading to virtue is an extremely rare occurrence.34

The questions remains as to what Melanchthon means in stating that there is absolutely no "obscurity" in articulating the "freedom and authority" of the soul. The notion of "authority" should be clear enough in reading Melanchthon's political definition of the two souls. Where exactly does Melanchthon identify "freedom" in this model? He explains that the concept of human "freedom" must be understood in relation somewhat counterintuitively to the problem of "complete obedience."

Freedom in the divine will, and in rational creatures, angels and men, is a faculty of the will, which is able to act or not act, or to act either in one way or another...It is first of all true that men are not able to achieve complete obedience to the law of God, nor be free of sin and death...But there is some freedom left, since God wants a distinction between a free agent and agency without plan or freedom to be understood to some degree, and wants it known that he is the freest agent, not bound by any causes. He even wants us to control our outward actions with some vigilance and labor of our own.

This therefore is the true rule. It is absolutely certain that, in this weak nature of man, even in those who are not regenerate, enough freedom was left for controlling motion, that is, restraining the outer members lest they do any outward deeds hostile to

---

34 Melanchthon’s brief suggestion of the prefallen harmony of the faculties, is later expanded greatly by Woolton in the analysis below, and becomes a centerpiece of his model of the soul.
Furthermore Paul expressly says that the righteousness of the flesh which is the performance of external works by natural forces, is in harmony with the law of God. When he affirms that such justice can exist in those who are not regenerate, it is clear that it is a certain freedom of the will that rules the outer limbs. Also, God gave the human race magistrates and laws, so that the outer limbs may be restrained. This entire governance, indeed the very voice of laws would be completely useless if the outer limbs could not be restrained. Thus it must be admitted that there is some freedom...Since this governing of external actions is to some extent in our power, God wants us not to be slothful or slack, but to force our limbs by his law and the fear of punishment as if they were harsh chains.35 (pp. 273-275)

Melanchthon explains in detail the "true rule" of human freedom. Freedom is only found in creatures possessing the rational soul, located in the "faculty of the will." The "will" specifically determines whether the rational soul should initiate an action ("act or not act") and what choice the individual will make when confronted with two different possible actions ("act either in one way or another"). Importantly, Melanchthon identifies freedom as a faculty of the Aristotelian soul, working within the rational soul's "faculty of the will." Freedom is not an abstract concept or a right one is entitled to having, but is a thing located in the Aristotelian faculty of the will, representing the organic power enabling humans to choose and act. Melanchthon contrasts the human freedom physically bound in the "faculty of the will" in the brain to God's limitless freedom unconstrained by the human need for organic faculties. God is the "freest agent," willing actions that are "not bound by any causes." In comparison to God's infinitely free will, human freedom is bound by the need for antecedent causation and requires the organic faculties of reason and will to control and restrain the movements of the body.

Melanchthon also introduces a second striking difference between God's will as the "freest agent" and the fallen human freedom bound by the faculty of reason and will. Even in an ideal state of being, human freedom would not resemble God's creative, positive divine will. Rather, the furthest limit of human freedom is a form of negative freedom. In humanity's current fallen state, individuals are not able to reach a state of "complete obedience to the law of God" and are not capable of being "free of sin and death." What humanity has lost after the fall is not an unfettered freedom to act as one wishes, mimicking God's pure agency. Rather, we have lost the negative freedom to be "free of sin and death," in effect losing the freedom to not be sinful and dead, rather than losing a freedom to pursue a positive goal. We have lost the freedom to move away from sin and death, and not the freedom to strive toward a desired goal.

Melanchthon's definition of an ideal negative freedom is intimately linked to the notion of "complete obedience." In an innocent unfallen state, humans would be free to not be sinful to the extent that they perform "complete obedience" to the laws set down by God. The human freedom to be not sinful hinges on absolutely constraining oneself to the dictates of God's law. Somewhat paradoxically, in the ideal freest state, humans would be negatively free of sin and

---

death to the extent they limit their own freedom in "complete obedience" to an external set of laws.

Humanity's negative freedom becomes clearer when considering Melanchthon's description of the small residue of freedom God has left for humans. In the fallen state, humans can only experience a partial trace of the complete freedom enjoyed by God. God has "left" a small remainder of freedom in order to permit humans to understand to some degree what concepts such as "agent," "agency," and "freedom" signify. Although fallen humans can only be partially free in their actions, they can have some abstract understanding of what a free agent might be. The point of reference in understanding concepts such as "freedom" and "agency" is the exemplary freedom of God, the "freest agent, not bound by any causes."

In contrast to the abstract understanding given to humans so as to conceptualize what God's complete freedom or agency might entail, fallen humans can only perform actions according to the constraints of a very limited freedom. Melanchthon asserts that humans have "enough freedom left" to force the body's anatomy into a state of obedience to the rational soul. Once again, as in the description of prefallen humanity's negative freedom founded upon "complete obedience" to the law of God, the small residue of freedom left to the human will follows a logic of constraint. If prefallen freedom was a negative freedom based on "complete obedience" to God's law, the small remainder of freedom left to the fallen human is a freedom to coerce the body's anatomy into an abject state of obedience. This tyrannical control of the body's movements is necessary since the fallen "outer members" of the body tend to veer toward sinful actions "hostile to the law of God." The "faculty of the will" possesses just enough freedom to restrain and punish the body's anatomy when it strays toward actions contrary to God's law.

Melanchthon cites the Apostle Paul in arguing that the exercise of the Aristotelian faculty's freedom to bind the body's errant anatomy in chains can be called "justice." Surprisingly, Paul admits that such internal justice that works in harmony with the law of God exists even in humans who are "not regenerate." In citing Paul, Melanchthon identifies that the faculty of freedom is not contingent on an individual's Christian faith. Even nonregenerate, non-Christian individuals can be "justly" free in controlling their body's sinful tendencies in agreement with the law of God. "Just" freedom exists as a faculty of the will in the Aristotelian rational soul, independent of Christian immortality or redemption. In admitting that both Christian and non-Christian souls can be free and act justly, Melanchthon insists that the "freedom of the will" is dependent on the "natural forces" of the rational faculties that are shared by all humans. Melanchthon's description of free actions performed by the "natural forces" of the soul clarifies his original definition of freedom as a faculty of the will in "rational creatures." All creatures with the Aristotelian rational soul, whether Christian or otherwise, possess the faculty of the will and can therefore be free. Christian faith or the belief of an immortal soul is not a necessary condition for human freedom. Freedom does not result from the immortal Christian soul, but rather is a "natural force" of the Aristotelian soul's organic faculties of reason and will.

---

36 Romans 6:12-7:25.
Even though Melanchthon roots the possibility of human freedom in the faculties of the Aristotelian soul, this does not mean that such freedom based on the organic faculties becomes less important for the Christian subject. The "faculty of the will" leads Christians to the "righteousness of the flesh." Christians must use the "natural forces" of the unredeemed faculty of the will as means to follow the law of God and to restrain the body's errant anatomy. For Christians, obedience to God's law requires the free use of the organic faculty of the will in binding the motions of the body. Thus Melanchthon's Christian ideal of "complete obedience" depends on the freedom of the Aristotelian faculties to control the body. Melanchthon goes so far as to say that all forms of law, whether human or divine, would be "completely useless" without the limited freedom of the faculty of the will to constrain the body's anatomy. The rational soul's faculty of the will is therefore free in a very unexpected sense. For Melanchthon, the faculty of the will is free to bind its own body in "harsh chains." Fallen humans possess the freedom to obey their faculties, and are free to "force" and "punish" themselves into a state of "complete obedience."

Melanchthon's model of the soul fundamentally changes Pomponazzi's understanding of the two souls as the basis of human freedom and servility. Pomponazzi framed the question of two souls as a basic problem of the political subject. For Pomponazzi, the immortality of the Christian soul was a noble lie used by "lawgivers" to trick their subjects into a state of virtuous obedience. Recognizing that the Christian soul is mortal leads political subjects away from a state of "servility" and "uncertain action," to a state of freedom based on the uniquely human ability to modify and choose which organic faculty of the Aristotelian soul guides their actions. If belief in the immortal Christian soul leads to political servility, harnessing the faculties of the mortal Aristotelian soul leads to freedom.

Melanchthon completely disagrees with Pomponazzi, and in his Protestant model of the soul insists that freedom and servility are not opposite poles pulling the Christian subject in two directions. For Melanchthon, no one can be completely free in humanity's sinful fallen state. For fallen humans, freedom and servility (or despotism) always coexist in the two souls of each individual. Melanchthon partially concurs with Pomponazzi in identifying the faculties of the Aristotelian soul as the primary locus of freedom in the individual. Melanchthon specifically defines the "faculty of the will" contained with the rational soul as the basis of human decision making and freedom. However, the freedom of the Aristotelian faculty of will does not license humans to enjoy unfettered action. Rather, the Aristotelian faculty's power of freedom, when used correctly, must be harnessed by the Christians to restrain and bind the body's sinful anatomy in "harsh chains." The freedom of the Aristotelian faculty leads the Christian subjects into a proper state of "complete obedience" to the law of God. Thus for Melanchthon, contra Pomponazzi, humans do not have the liberty to choose between the freedom of the Aristotelian soul or the servility of the immortal Christian soul. Rather, the presence of two souls divides each person in half between freedom and obedience: the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul give humans the power to be free, but free to willingly bind the body into a state of obedience to the law of God.
The final reward for such free obedience to God's law is salvation, and the promise of immortality. Therefore in Melanchthon's model, the importance of the Christian soul's immortality has changed. The immortality of the soul is not an original noble lie used to compel subjects into obedience to civil and divine law. Rather, the promise of immortality can only become possible for subjects who have already been freely obedient to law. If for Pomponazzi, the immortality of the Christian soul precedes obedience to law, for Melanchthon, the possibility of an immortal soul is the result of such political obedience.

John Woolton's "Willing Service": Writing Natural Law upon the Fallen Faculties

Melanchthon's refutation of Pomponazzi was the most influential treatise on the nature of the two souls in the decades after the Reformation. In 1576, John Woolton, the influential Bishop of Exeter, simultaneously published two texts greatly inspired by Melanchthon's doctrine of the two souls: *A Treatise on the Immortalitie of the Soule*, and the *New Anatomie of the Whole Man*. Woolton's two texts, though, were not simply translations of Melanchthon, and ultimately took on a life of their own in shaping English debates on the soul. Woolton declared his texts to be the first systematic treatise on the soul in the English language, since "none have hitherto written anything in our English tongue of so worthy an Argument." The accuracy of Woolton's claim notwithstanding, his texts were incredibly popular, and they had an enormous impact on the English response to the problem of two souls, particularly on the later famous political theologies of the Anglican Richard Hooker and the Puritan William Perkins. Woolton's texts greatly expand Melanchthon's Protestant interpretation of the problem of two souls, and add a level of historical depth to the question by synthesizing the positions of all philosophers, from Plato to Pomponazzi, who had written on the matter in some fashion.

Woolton's two anatomies of the soul were so popular because they were far more stylistically exciting than the dry philosophical treatises of Pomponazzi and Melanchthon. Woolton turned the problem of the two souls, which had heretofore been debated in the 16th century in the form of scholastic logical proof, into a dramatic narrative of humanity's fall and redemption. Woolton therefore did not view the existence of two souls to be a logical problem requiring the proof of the Christian soul's immortality through the operations of the mortal Aristotelian faculties. Rather, Woolton transformed the crisis of the two souls into the basis of telling the most fundamental story of human nature - our original innocence, our fallen state, and our ultimate salvation. In turning the crisis of two souls into the narrative defining our human nature with a beginning, middle, and end conforming to Aristotle's definition of plot (*mythos*) in the *Poetics*, Woolton identifies plot and the narrative arc of human history as the basic structure of understanding the human soul. In essence, Woolton accents the literariness of the problem of

two souls, and transforms the soul from a set of philosophical premisses into a narrative in which each human is always implicated.

According to Woolton's narrative, the two souls were in a continual state of harmony prior to the fall.

The Image of God in man gratuitous or create, had before his fall many excellent qualities. First, in respect of the Minde, Will, and Harte, wherein was a marvellous divine Harmonie and consent.

Prior to the fall, the "Image of God in man" was constituted of a "harmonie" between the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul, which Woolton locates throughout his texts in the brain (the mind and will) and the heart (the senses and emotion). Woolton follows both Melanchthon and Vesalius in emphasizing the organic nature of the faculties, tightly coupling the faculties with their organs, in this case the heart and brain. The faculties of mind and will of the rational soul and the "harte" defined by Aristotle as the organic locus of the sensitive soul's appetites existed in a state of "consent," in stark contrast to Melanchthon's description of the lower faculties' coercion to the despotic rule of the rational soul. In Woolton's account of the pre-fallen faculties, there was no need for coercion since all operations of the soul embodied the law of God in their very operation.

In the hart all affections and appetitions did obey his minde and will, neither was there dissention in any thing. So that there was a Divine harmonie of the minde, will, and harte. For as the minde did rightly knowe god and his wyll: so the hart and the will did thinke one thing...And every orgaine parte and instrument of mans substance had facultie infused into them by god, that they were both willing and hable to doo the the things required by god at their hands, which god according to the law of obedience had imprinted, and as it were stamped in Reasonable natures. There was also in this image of god in man, a preheminencie and superioritie above all other inferior creatures, both in reason and quicknes of senses.

Woolton expands his definition of the "harmonie" existing in between the faculties of the prefallen soul. The "hart" defined since Aristotle as the seat of the sensitive faculty agrees with the decisions of the "minde and will" of the rational faculty located in the brain. The harmony between the two organs associated with the faculties is so complete that the many different operations of the faculties unite as if they "thinke one thing" with the greatest ease.

---

40 Woolton, Anatomie of Whole Man, Folio 11.
41 For the “image of God in man” as the harmony of the faculties, see also Anatomie of Whole Man, Folio 9.
42 Though not directly examined here, large sections of Woolton’s texts are detailed explanations of Aristotle’s model of the tripartite soul. For this, see: Immortalitie of the Soule, folios 31-37 for a description of the faculties, and folios 43-49 on the relation between the brain and the heart.
It is precisely the ease of obtaining this harmony of the faculties that Woolton emphasizes in the prefallen human. Woolton associates each "orgaine parte" of the body's anatomy with a "facultie" infused by God. In this case, the word "facultie" describes both the powers of the Aristotelian soul assigned to each organ, but also the natural aptitude and facility with which the organs are able to follow the law of God. In combining these two definitions of the word "facultie," Woolton exploits the fact that the Latin *facultas* and *facilitas* were basically two forms of the same words defining a sense of easiness. If early modern English usage largely preferred the definition of "facultie" as a power of the soul, Woolton reclaims its Latin definition describing "ease" or "facility." The "facultie" infused into each organ describes how the powers of the Aristotelian soul are rooted in the body's organs, but also how such organic powers function with a natural and easy harmony with the law of God. The body's "orgaine partes" infused with the faculties are fully "willing and able" to perform the things "required by god." For Woolton, the harmony of the faculties amounts to an imprinting of God's "law of obedience" onto each organ participating in the operations of the soul. In this manner, Woolton redefines the faculties of the Aristotelian soul as the literal "facultie" or facility and ease with which the body's organs (or specifically, the heart associated with the sensitive faculty, the brain associated with the "Reasonable" faculty, and the "hands" of the locomotive power) harmoniously align into correspondence with the law of God. The faculties of the Aristotelian soul based in the body's organs are the basis of the "willing" obedience to God's law "imprinted" and "stamped" within the prefallen human.

Importantly, Woolton's definition of the "law of obedience" differs fundamentally from both Pomponazzi and Melanchthon, who both understood law to be externally imposed onto the two souls. In the case of Pomponazzi, the immortality of the Christian soul is a fiction of law used by lawgivers to trick inherently sinful citizens into a state of virtuous obedience. For Melanchthon, the faculty of the will freely chooses to coerce its own body into a state of obedience to the law of God. In both of these previous definitions of the two souls as the basis of the Christian subject's obedience to law, the concept of law was external to the soul. In Woolton, the law that is being obeyed is inscribed within the faculties of the Aristotelian soul. No longer does the Christian subject obey a law external to the soul. Rather, in Woolton's story of the two souls as the narrative of humanity's fall and redemption, the law of God becomes "stamped" and "imprinted" within the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul that are "willing and able" to obey God. The "law of obedience" is not an external standard that humans strive to follow. The Christian "law of obedience" is inscribed within the very operation of the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul working in harmony.

Prior to the fall, the harmony of the faculties led Adam and Eve to be a self-consenting, self-governing law unto themselves.

---

44 Cf. “Faculty,” *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed., 1989. “An ability or aptitude, whether natural or acquired, for any special kind of action; formerly also, ability, 'parts', capacity in general.”; “Facultās and facilitās were originally different forms of the same word; the latter, owing to its more obvious relation to the adj., retained the primary sense of ‘easiness’, which the former had ceased to have before the classical period.”
God in the creation of man planted, and as it were ingraffed a kinde of divine nature, and perfect power: whereby without further help of externall doctrine, he was both able to fulfill gods comaindements, and also to be a sufficient lawe to himself, whiles that his owne thoughts and proper conscience giveth true verities, and pronounceth juste judgement unto him in all his actions and cogitations.\textsuperscript{45}

As we all know, this utopian harmony is ruined by Adam and Eve's original disobedience. Woolton tells us that the nature of the two souls as the basis of the "law of obedience" changes dramatically after the fall. No longer is the "law of obedience" inscribed within the workings of the Aristotelian faculties, and humans begin to feel two different sets of internal laws fighting to control the soul.

I feele in my members another law, fighting against the lawe of God, O miserable man that I am, who shall deliver me from the death of this body, &c. In mans hart the love of god is utterly extinct, and flames of raging affections doe burne...For the very nakednesse, whiche man did see in him selfe most evidently: doth not onely signifie the outwarde, but also the inwarde deformitie both of body and soule. By means therefore of Adams fall the image of God was destroyed in mans nature, all his powers and faculties were either depraved or utterly loste. He was spoyled of all his gyftes, in minde, will, and hart.\textsuperscript{46}

At first glance, Woolton seems to recount the basic story of the fall that all Renaissance readers would know. What is new in Woolton's account is the manner in which the effects of the fall are felt most powerfully in the disjointed state of the two souls. The prefallen harmony of the faculties embodying God's "law of obedience" has given way to a conflict between two competing sets of law fighting to control the body's motions. After the fall, one feels "another law" fighting to replace the law of God. The second law is defined by the "flames of raging affections" burning in the heart. If in the prefallen state, the heart was the locus of the sensitive soul harmoniously embodying the "law of obedience," the fallen heart is the source of "raging affections" amounting to a second law working against the law of God. The harmony of the faculties has changed in the fallen human into a conflict between two sets of law - a law of affection and the faculty of sense based in the heart, fighting against the law of God.\textsuperscript{47}

Woolton's second change to the standard story of the fall redefines the shame of human nudity. In his account, Adam and Eve were not only ashamed of their "outwarde" nudity, but more importantly, "nakednesse" defines the "inward deformitie" scarring the fallen soul. Woolton specifically defines the fallen inward nudity as the depraved state of the "powers and faculties"

\textsuperscript{45} Woolton, \textit{Anatomie of Whole Man}, Folio 3.
\textsuperscript{46} Woolton, \textit{Anatomie of Whole Man}, Folios 16-17.
\textsuperscript{47} Other early modern English treatises on the Aristotelian soul examine the need to tame the raging emotions and passions of the mind, with Thomas Wright's 1604 \textit{The Passions of the Minde in Generall} garnering the most recent critical attention. Woolton's major innovation, some 30 years before Wright, is his discussion of raging emotion in terms of two competing sets of law and the relation of the law to the faculties of the soul.
of the Aristotelian soul. The internal nudity of the soul destroys the image of God traced onto the soul, and leads the "powers and faculties" of the Aristotelian soul function in a "depraved" way contrary to the prefallen law of obedience. In Woolton's redefinition of fallen nudity, shame is not centered on outward physical "nakednesse," but more importantly the inward nudity of the soul, whose "powers and faculties" no longer function according to the prelapsarian harmony that embodied a law of obedience to God. Ultimately, the nudity of the soul is proof that Adam and Eve squandered the "gyftes" bestowed by God. The specific gift in question is the harmony of the organic faculties - the concord of the mind and will of the rational faculty and the heart of the sensitive faculty has been utterly lost. For Woolton, the transformation of the soul's "powers and faculties" from embodying the harmonious law of obedience into a deformed and depraved state of affection and emotion represents the most tragic sign that humans have changed after the fall.

In placing such a heavy emphasis on the altered state of the Aristotelian soul's "powers and faculties," Woolton fundamentally changes the story of the fall. For Woolton, humans are not fallen to the extent that they are ashamed of external nudity, that they are now tainted with sin and need to repent, or that they are mortal and will experience death. Rather, Woolton insists that the main byproduct of the fall is a change in the "powers and faculties" of the Aristotelian soul being shaken out of harmony. The disharmony between the mind, will, and heart in the fallen human leads to an internal state of nudity in which the "powers and faculties" of the Aristotelian soul function in a "deformed" and "depraved" state contrary of the prefallen law of obedience. The deformed faculties of the soul comprise a second law, based on the heart's affection and emotion, fighting against the law of God. In Woolton's fundamental modification to the story of the fall, the deformation of the "powers and faculties" of the Aristotelian soul into a state of disharmony creates a conflict of law immanent to each prefallen human. The change of the soul's "powers and faculties" from a condition of harmony to one of deformed nudity places the law of God into direct conflict with a second law of emotion and affection bound in the sensitive soul's organic locus of the heart.

Woolton's narrative of the changes experienced by the Aristotelian soul's "powers and faculties" manifested as an immanent conflict of law leads to his most direct critique of Melanchthon. If for Melanchthon, God has left a small residue of freedom in the Aristotelian soul sufficient to bind the body's anatomy in "harsh chains" of discipline, Woolton argues that what God has left for the fallen soul is a remnant of law, and not of freedom.

But God hath left unto him a certen wisdome in externall accions and vertues apperteining to a power to discerne betweene things honest and unhonest, and to understand the grounds of liberall artes, of good lawes, & of honest accions. This knowledge of reason was not altogether extinct in mans ruyne. For it was Gods good pleasure, that there should be some difference between reasonable man and brute beastes. This remnant of wisdome and knowledge, albeit unperfect, is called the lawe of nature, or naturall lawe: and is set out by Sainte Paule, as that it is the doctrine of God & the worke of the law written in mans hart. Hereof commeth the knowledge of manuarie and liberall
sciences, so needeffull for mans life: hence all civill lawes have their origen, together with
discipline and societie betwene man and man, the desire of praise, the avoyding of
dispraise, the honor of vertue, and the punishment of vices.48

The remnant of prefallen state is a form of "wisdom" or "knowledge of reason," capable of
regulating "external accions" and leading humans to differentiate "things honest and unhonest." However, Woolton disagrees with his main influence Melanchthon, in asserting that the
remainder left to humans in the state of fallen "ruyne" does not lead to a freedom to force one's
lower faculties into a state of obedience. Diverging from both Pomponazzi and Melanchthon,
Woolton does not attempt to identify a spark of freedom in the fallen soul. Rather, Woolton
identifies the remnant of prelapsarian knowledge in the fallen world as a specific difference
between the faculties of the soul. The difference between the faculties in the fallen soul creates a
taxonomy distinguishing the rational faculty specific to humans from the sensory faculty shared
by all animals including humans. Woolton argues in another moment of his text that the fall
compounded the "apparant difference betweene the reasonable soule of man, and the sensuall
soule of brute beastes."49 Humans possess both the animal faculty of sense and the uniquely
human rational faculty, but in the disharmony of the fallen soul, it becomes necessary to
distinguish their functions. Such a difference between faculties is established in the fallen human
by the standard of "natural law."

For Woolton, the main factor differentiating the rational faculty from the sensitive faculty
in the fragmented fallen soul is "natural law."50 The "natural law" of the fallen human is
fundamentally different from the prelapsarian law of obedience built upon the harmony of the
faculties. Prior to the fall, the harmony of the organic faculties embodied a law of obedience in
their very functioning. However, after the fall, the harmony of the faculties is replaced by a
natural law defined by Saint Paul as the "doctrine of God and the worke of the law written in
mans hart." According to Woolton, natural law is not a system of law emergent from the
harmony of the faculties, but is rather a "written" law inscribed onto the heart, which has become
plagued by "raging" emotion and affection. In this model, natural law is a corrective act of
writing directly onto the fallen heart, which has caused the rebellious emotions and senses to
fracture the prelapsarian harmony of the faculties. However, natural law as a writing of the heart
tainted by sense and emotion does not attempt to recover the prefallen harmony of the faculties.
Natural law moves fallen humans to the alternative direction of the "sciences," and serves as the
origin of "civill lawes" determining the "discipline and societie betwene man and man." Thus
fallen humans cannot recapture the harmonious concord of the faculties enjoyed by the
prelapsarian soul. The natural law creates a different solution, leading directly to the formation of
civil law and setting the terms for human society in a fallen world.

50 For a recent review of natural law in the English literary tradition, see, White, R.S. *Natural Law in English
relation of natural law to English common law and covenant theology in *Wayward Contracts: The Crisis of Political
Woolton defines the movement from natural to civil law as creating a "discipline and societie betwene man and man." In Woolton's model, the "discipline" of law is not internalized as was seen in Melanchthon's text, in which the rational soul was free to constrain and discipline the body's anatomy. In Woolton's account of the origin of law, the natural law inscribed onto the organs of the fallen soul leads to the creation of a system of civil law that disciplines humans externally, disciplining individuals in the relation "betwene man and man." Unlike Melanchthon who identifies discipline in the internal relation of the free rational faculty constraining the unruly limbs of the body, Woolton argues that discipline only emerges with the creation of civil law, occurring in the external social relations between individual citizens. Woolton's concept of discipline is enforced according to the logic of the common Renaissance topoi of praise and dispraise, and the "honor of vertue" and the "punishment of vice," transforming these conventional ethical criteria of natural law into the basis of the discipline at the heart of civil law.

Thus for Woolton, if natural law is the remnant of the prefallen soul differentiating the human faculty of reason from the animal faculty of sense, then civil law is a logical extension of natural law that differentiates individuals humans from others by creating a system of discipline between citizens in a network of social relations. In other words, Woolton's articulates two modes of fallen law, natural and civil, as forces creating a constitutive difference both within and between fallen humans. Natural law differentiates the faculties within the fallen human that are no longer in harmony, distinguishing the rational faculty unique to humans from the faculty of sense linking humans and beasts. Before the fall, no such difference existed because the faculties of the soul were fused into a perfect harmony. However, in the fallen world, the sense faculty mires the human action in emotion and desire, and the operations of the rational faculty need to be partitioned from such base appetites that would drag the soul down to the level of a "brute beaste." Subsequently, civil law differentiates individuals in the fallen world, creating a system of "discipline and societie" creating differences "betwene man and man." Both forms of law articulated by Woolton serve as forces emphasizing the difference within and between fallen humans, defining the rational faculty in its difference from the animal faculty of sense, and constructing a framework of "discipline and societie" identifying the differences "betwene man and man."

Unlike his progenitors Melanchthon and Pomponazzi, who are most concerned with the struggle between freedom and servility immanent to the relation of the two souls, Woolton shifts toward the alternative dichotomy between natural and civil law as the logic structuring the state of the soul in the fallen world. Woolton shows little interest in identifying the basis for human freedom in the fallen soul. Rather, he argues that the fallen human is always constrained by a dual system of law, natural and civil. In the fallen disharmony of the Aristotelian faculties, natural law differentiates the rational faculty from the sensitive faculty, and writes the "worke of the law" within the heart unsettled by emotion and sense. Civil law emerges from the internal "writing" of the natural law and constitutes humans as individual citizens, different from their fellows, individually subject to a system of externally enforced discipline. For Woolton, the condition of the two souls, Christian and Aristotelian, is not locked in a struggle between
freedom and slavery, as was the case with Melanchthon and Pomponazzi, but is always defined by the fallen necessity of law binding us from both within and without.

This analysis of Woolton begs the question as to where the immortality of the Christian soul fits into his model of law. After all, the contrast between the mortal faculties of the Aristotelian soul and the immortal transcendence of the Christian soul was vitally important for Pomponazzi and Melanchthon; for Pomponazzi in defining the "noble lie" leading citizens into a state of servile virtue, and for Melanchthon as the final horizon of the free rational faculty capable of successfully binding the body's anatomy in "harsh chains." For Pomponazzi, the lie of the immortal soul led citizens into a state of servility, and for Melanchthon, the immortality of the soul was the ultimate reward for a life of the rational faculty freely choosing to bind its own body in "harsh chains." Since Woolton is far less interested in the question of freedom and servility, he builds his account of the immortal Christian soul from the definition of natural law described above. For Woolton, the Christian soul is immortal only insofar as natural law is written directly onto the mortal organs of the Aristotelian soul.

The veritie and stabilitie of the eternitie of the Soule is as it were ingraffed by the Law of Nature in the Hartes of all mortall menne.51

The fallen soul can regain the prelapsarian state of immortality by recognizing the natural law "ingraffed" in the mortal heart.52 Somewhat surprisingly, the "eternitie of the Soule" is not a transcendent rising beyond the mortal condition of the body, but rather a latent capacity inscribed within the human body as the law of nature. We can now appreciate why the concept of natural law inscribed on the heart is so important for Woolton's narrative of humanity's fall and redemption. The immortality of the Christian soul is the "law of nature" written within us, differentiating our faculties after the fall, and is not a gift or reward conferred from an external source such as God. For Woolton, the entire possibility of an immortal Christian soul is contingent on the natural law written with the body's organs and differentiating the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul in the fallen world.

The natural law therefore performs a vitally important function in Woolton's story of the fall. Natural law is the path leading humans from the fragmented, ruined state of the Aristotelian organic faculties in the fallen world, to the "veritie and stabilitie" of the eternal Christian soul. Thus Woolton's conception of natural law is not simply a set of dictates constraining humans into

51 Woolton, Anatomie of Whole Man, Folio 70.
52 The figure of “writing the heart” has long been recognized in medieval criticism as a dominant literary and devotional topos, but surprisingly little work has been done on this figure in the English Renaissance. Woolton’s innovation is his transformation of the inscribed heart as a figure for natural law written onto the organic faculties. The most sustained recent analysis of this topic in medieval literature is: Jager, Eric. “Writing the Heart: Reading and Writing the Medieval Subject,” Speculum Vol. 71, no. 1 (1996): 1-16. See also: LeGoff, J. “Head or Heart? The political use of body metaphors in the Middle Ages,” in Fragments for a History of the Human Body. New York: Zone Books, 1989. Two studies examining the figure of the heart in relation to Renaissance conceptions of law are: Kahn, Wayward Contracts, pp. 64-73; and Stevens, Scott Manning. “Sacred Heart and Secular Brain,” in The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe, ed. Hillman and Mazzio. New York: Routledge, 1997.
a state of servility or despotic self-discipline, as we saw in Pomponazzi and Melanchthon. Nor does Woolton's definition of natural law conceive of the immortal Christian soul as composed of a fundamentally different substance than the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul. Woolton asserts that the immortality of the Christian soul is not necessarily a transcendent thing or substance, but a condition of law specifically describing the embeddedness of God's law inscribed onto the mortal organs of the Aristotelian faculties. For Woolton, the "eternitie" of the Christian soul relies on the act of writing natural law onto the fallen, mortal materiality of the organic faculties. The concept of natural law is so important for Woolton since it represents a bridge between the two souls, and opens a path from the fragmented disharmony and ruin of the fallen faculties to the possibility of the "veritie" and "stabilitie" of the immortal Christian soul.

In making such a bridge between the two souls, however, Woolton's logic insists that the immortality of the Christian soul comes to depend on the fallen, mortal organic faculties as the substrate upon which natural law is written. Thus, the "eternitie" of the Christian soul is not a state of being rising beyond the mortal condition of the body, but it rather is a mode of writing. The "eternitie" of the Christian soul must be "ingraffed" and graphically imprinted onto the heart, the seat of the Aristotelian soul, as the "Law of Nature." In a fascinating move, then, Woolton turns the immortal nature of the Christian soul into a mode of writing, and a method of inscribing natural law onto our fallen organic faculties. We can now register the radical change that Woolton performs on the problem of two souls. If for Pomponazzi, the immortality of the soul was a political lie, and for Melanchthon, the immortal soul was a reward for a life of self-discipline, Woolton transforms the immortality of the Christian soul into a very specific act of writing natural law onto the organs of the Aristotelian soul. In Woolton's solution to the crisis of two souls, the immortal Christian soul and mortal Aristotelian soul do not contradict one another. For Woolton, the relation of the two souls can be figured as an act of writing - the "eternitie" of the Christian soul is written and "ingraffed" upon the organs central to the workings of the Aristotelian faculties as a form of "natural law" leading us from the fallen state to a state of salvation.

Ultimately, for Woolton, the "eternitie" of the soul requires a "willing obedience and service" (Folio 47-8) to the natural law inscribed upon our fallen organs. Following the tenets of natural law inscribed within the mortal faculties and organs does not entail a freedom to constrain and discipline ones own body, as we saw in Melanchthon. Rather, Woolton argues that fallen humans possess the "willing" freedom to obey a mode of law already written within our organs and faculties. For Woolton, the relation of the mortal organic Aristotelian soul and the immortal "veritie and stabilitie" of the Christian soul requires "willing service" to the natural law always already inscribed within us. Thus unlike Pomponazzi and Melanchthon, Woolton's late 16th century definition of the relation between the Christian and Aristotelian souls is not defined along the axis of freedom and servility. Woolton breaks down the opposition between freedom and servility central to the thinking of Pomponazzi and Melanchthon, proposing instead a form of free servility, a "willing service" to the natural law inscribed upon our organs and faculties. Such "willing service" is not coercive nor is it a state of pure freedom. Contra Pomponazzi and Melanchthon, there is no political mechanism of deception or coercive despotism tricking or
forcing subjects to obey the law. Rather, Woolton's "willing service" describes a condition of voluntary servitude to natural law, and the civil law extending from it, written upon the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul. For Woolton, the problem of two souls leads fallen humans to freely serve.

**Transforming the Soul: Written in Law, Rewritten in Poetic Rhetoric**

This chapter has surveyed the sixteenth century crisis of two souls, beginning with the outrage precipitated by Pomponazzi, to Melanchthon's Protestant response, and finally to Woolton's move to natural law in his influential English text. The anger incited by Pomponazzi in the early sixteenth century laid a foundation for the development of what would become the dominant Protestant model of the soul in the works of Melanchthon and Woolton. Thus the polemical fury surrounding the Pomponazzi incident forced a fundamental revision of the Thomist and Averroist definitions of the soul that had dominated European thinking through the Middle Ages and much of the Humanist Renaissance. What was initially a debate over Catholic doctrine served as the impetus for the most influential sixteenth century Protestant definitions of the soul.

The basic terms being contested in the debate over the two souls changes through the century. Pomponazzi's arguments were so outrageous not only because they claimed that the mortal Aristotelian soul dragged the immortal Christian soul into flesh-bound condition of the body's fallen organs. Pomponazzi caused so much anger since he insisted that anyone believing in the immortality of the Christian soul was in a fundamentally servile political condition, and that the truly free citizen focused on harnessing the organic powers of the mortal Aristotelian soul. Therefore what was terrifying in Pomponazzi's thinking was not that the Christian soul was mortal, but more importantly that believing in such immortality would turn all Christians into slaves. The true controversy of Pomponazzi's work lies in the link he establishes between the immortal Christian soul and servility, and the mortal Aristotelian soul and freedom. Both Melanchthon and Woolton attempt to refute Pomponazzi on this spectrum between freedom and servility, with Melanchthon arguing that no fallen Christian can ever be truly free. For Melanchthon, the forces of freedom and servility are always interlocked in the fallen soul, with the rational faculties freely choosing to bind the lower faculties in "harsh chains." The reward of such free self-binding is an immortal redeemed Christian soul. In Woolton's case, the conflict between freedom and servility becomes a question of law. The only truly free humans were Adam and Eve, and the harmony of their organic faculties functioned as a law unto itself. In humanity's fallen state, the faculties of the Aristotelian soul have been thrown into disarray, and the only remnant of the prefallen harmony of the soul's faculties is the natural law written on our organic faculties. For Woolton, the soul can only be considered immortal when we enter into a condition of "willing service" to the law inscribed upon our disharmonious mortal faculties.

In charting the trajectory of the crisis precipitated by Pomponazzi, we have seen how the problem of two souls shifts from a question of theological substance, to an issue defined by inscription and the writing of law upon the Aristotelian faculties. Woolton’s understanding of the
tense relationship between the two souls moves the issue from Pomponazzi’s initial description of the “noble lie” to an explicitly written mode, as the natural law written upon the fallen and disjointed faculties of the Aristotelian soul. Woolton exploits this act of writing the soul as a way to justify the freely willing abjection of the Christian subject divided by a paradoxical psychology to the law written upon their Aristotelian soul’s disjointed faculties and organs as the clearest evidence of man’s fallen condition. Woolton's metaphor of the law being written upon the organs and faculties of the Aristotelian soul became the dominant figure for describing obedience to law, attesting to the great influence of his work. Although the image "writing the heart" was prevalent since the medieval period, Woolton transformed the image of "writing the heart" from a form of devotional contemplation, to a model of law rooted in the disjointed faculties and organs of the Aristotelian soul that have become the scar of original sin burned into the fallen human. Woolton turns law into the specific of mode inscribing the organic faculties, and in doing so, foregrounds the act of writing in defining the two souls as the basis of the Christian subject’s freedom or obedience.

Therefore, by the 1570’s, the paradoxical composition of the human as two conflicting souls becomes a question of writing the soul and the law governing its fallen state. It is this move turning the question of writing the soul in terms of law that motivates the literary response to the two-souls crisis studied throughout this project. Woolton redefines the two souls conflict in terms of writing, by claiming that the Aristotelian soul should be reimagined as the substrate for writing the law that governs the possibility of the Christian soul being lifted from a fallen state into salvation. Where Woolton turns the problem of two souls into a problem of writing the language of law upon the fallen faculties and organs of the Aristotelian soul, all of the English literary figures considered in this dissertation contest the nature of this writing of law, arguing that the language of law composes the wrong text to understand the two souls paradox in proper terms. For all of the poets analyzed in the coming chapters, the language of poetry and literary rhetoric is the correct textual medium to renegotiate the nature of the two souls in understanding the Christian subject’s possibility of freedom.

The importance of writing in defining the composition of the internally fractured two-souled subject in the years after Woolton leads us to the primary analysis of the subsequent chapters. The problem of two souls leads to the development of a school of English poets, including some of the most prominent figures of the time, who contend that if the two souls involve a question of writing law upon the faculties of the soul, no one is more capable of exploiting this mode of writing than the poet who appeals to, and manipulates, the mind, heart, and senses through their craft. In essence, these poets literalize the discursive imagery of writing law upon the faculties of the soul, arguing that if law is written upon the organic faculties, poets are capable of rewriting this law and in doing so, can reposition the subject in relation to the law governing the Christian soul’s possibility of salvation and grace. Rather than willingly serve the law written upon the organic faculties, the English poets studied in this project argue that such laws, insofar as they are written, can be rewritten, and the possibility of this reinscription can modify the nature of the soul and the subject’s status as an agent. The subsequent chapters will therefore read some of the most prominent early modern English poets with new eyes,
reconceiving their poetry as an effort to rewrite the law etched upon the faculties of the soul, so as to modify the parameters of willingly obeying or willfully resisting the law. For the English poets studied in the subsequent chapters, the conflict between the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul and the immortal substance of the Christian soul reconceives the fractured Christian subject in terms of its ability to be rewritten and recomposed in the language and rhetoric of poetry.
Chapter 2: “Disrupted Subjects: Hamlet’s Crisis of Agency Between Law and Theater”

Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* represents the most striking account of the two-souls conflict in Elizabethan England, and the most direct critique of the Protestant accounts of the two souls in terms of unquestioning obedience to natural law, described in the previous chapter. *Hamlet* can be most clearly understood as a struggle to resolve the early modern paradox of two souls in the rhetoric of theater. In making this claim, I am directly contesting perhaps the oldest line of argument in 20th century literary criticism: that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* inaugurates the modern subject defined by psychological complexity and self-conscious interiority.¹ Lost in the polemical debate over Hamlet's mind, is the play's great emphasis on his soul. *Hamlet* is a drama untangling the vexing psychology (*psyche* + *logos*) of the two souls, and not the modern psychology of the mind and personality dividing him between thought and action, or interiority and exteriority.² Hamlet’s internal struggle can be more accurately described as a fissure between his two souls: a Christian soul bound by God’s law on one hand, but pressured on the other by his slain father’s ghost to violate God’s commandment by committing a vengeful act of murder, and the starkly different freedom of the Aristotelian soul to be transformed by the rhetoric of theatrical performance. Shakespeare's account of the two-souls problem in *Hamlet* forcefully critiques the dominant Protestant position, described in the previous chapter, that the Christian soul is so beholden to law that it takes on the characteristics of a slave or prisoner, portrayed vividly in the play by the punitive confinement of King Hamlet’s soul in the prison of Purgatory. In contrast to the abject enslavement of the Protestant soul, Shakespeare identifies theater, and particularly the power of theatrical rhetoric to disrupt and reshape the workings of the Aristotelian soul’s faculties and organs, as a form of agency giving individuals the ability to redefine how the soul composes them as Christian subjects.

---


² There have been surprisingly few recent studies of the soul in *Hamlet*. A notable exception to this oversight is Stephen Greenblatt's *Hamlet in Purgatory*, which has emphasized the significance of the King Hamlet’s soul locked in Purgatory as reflecting Protestant and Catholic debates of the early modern period. I concur with Greenblatt's effort to reassert the importance of the soul in *Hamlet*, but argue that we must go even further than he does. I contend that the question of the soul in the play is not limited to the ghost of Hamlet's father trapped in Purgatory, but represents the central problem of the play as a whole. Hamlet's struggle to understand the nature of the two souls as the core of the human is the main problem of the play. For this, see: Greenblatt, Stephen. *Hamlet in Purgatory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
Shakespeare’s effort to harness the disordered state of the Aristotelian soul so as to articulate a new mode of Christian freedom is surprising, since every Protestant thinker in the wake of the Reformation claimed that the disturbed workings of the soul’s faculties evinced man’s deeply-rooted corruption after the fall. The corruption of the fallen faculties necessitated the Christian subject’s absolute obedience to law so as to reclaim a path to salvation. Shakespeare directly refutes this interpretation of the Aristotelian faculties as fallen because disrupted. Hamlet insists that the perturbation of the Aristotelian soul out of its normal function specifically occurring in response to passionate theatrical rhetoric, and the susceptibility of the Aristotelian faculties to be reshaped by disruption in general, are emphatically positive by-products of the fall, and represent the most potent means to imagine a new form of Christian freedom in the domain of theater.

This is not to say that Hamlet is an anti-Protestant hero defending Catholic doctrine, as many critics have speculated. Rather, in *Hamlet*, Shakespeare specifically rejects the extremely oppressive, but widely employed, body of tropes defining the Protestant model of the soul in terms of imprisonment, bondage, binding in chains, and servitude. Protestant thinkers writing in the wake of the initial crisis of two souls precipitated by Pomponazzi did not stop at calling for the fallen Christian subject to abject themselves in a state of absolute obedience to God’s natural law. The most famous protagonists of the Reformation, Martin Luther and John Calvin, went much further than “moderate” Protestants such Philipp Melanchthon and Anglicans such as John Woolton and Richard Hooker. For Luther and Calvin, it was not sufficient for the Protestant soul to be merely obedient: Christian subjects needed to consider themselves to be abject prisoners and slaves to God’s law and his election. Luther argued that the Christian soul is bound by God’s law to such an extreme extent, that it takes on the characteristics of a prisoner or captive. In “The Bondage of the Will” (*De Servo Arbitrio*), Luther insists that the Christian soul “has no ‘Free-will,’ but is a captive, slave, and servant, either to the will of God, or to the will of Satan.” For Luther, the Christian soul is confronted with two alternatives: either by a “captive, slave, and servant” to God, or to Satan. In this choice without choice, the Christian soul is always bound in captivity and enslaved to law. Calvin presents perhaps an even more terrifying vision of this

---


6 William Tyndale specifies that God’s law is the key that locks the shackles binding the Christian soul: “So here we have the law of God to judge what is synne and what is not / and who is bounde and who is not...The lawe of God which is ye keye where with men bynde.” (*The Obedience of a Christen Man.* Antwerp, 1528.)
bondage to law: “The Lord does not promise any thing except to the perfect observers of the law; and none such are any where to be found. The results therefore is that the whole human race is convicted by the law, and exposed to the wrath and curse of God.”

The reason for this fallen state of enslavement and captivity is somewhat surprising. Both Luther and Calvin assert that fallen humans freely bind themselves into a state of slavery by inevitably choosing to sin. Therefore Luther and Calvin reject the possibility of free will, since that free capacity to choose will always choose sin. Luther ironically reterms “free will” into the more accurate notion of a “will in bondage,” describing a Christian soul that “when it is free, it binds itself and goes of its own accord into bonds!”

Calvin identifies the corrupt state of the Aristotelian faculties as the reason why the fallen Christian soul is locked into the paradoxical circuit of voluntary servitude. The rational “mind” is knocked out of equilibrium into a “forward bias” toward sin and slavery, and the “passion” of the affective faculty chooses to “move” in the wrong direction. The Protestant identification of a disorder in the Aristotelian soul’s faculties as the cause of the Christian soul’s free choice to enslave itself found its most influential voice in Shakespeare’s time in the work of the Puritan William Perkins. Perkins goes so far as to say that a disease of the Aristotelian faculties is the sole reason why fallen humans resist the law of God: “Wherefore it remaines that originall sinne is nothing else but a disorder or euill disposition in all the faculties and inclinations of man, whereby they are all caried inordinately against the law of God.”

The basic substance of the Aristotelian soul’s faculties has not changed, but their “disposition” has. The “disorder” of the Aristotelian faculties leads fallen humanity to resist the law of God, and binds the Christian soul in chains of sin. Unlike the Catholic Scholastic tradition, which tried to unify the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul with the immortal Christian soul into a single hierarchy, Protestant doctrine turned the Aristotelian faculties into the basis of man’s fallen condition. The “disorder” of the Aristotelian soul pulls the fallen human toward the willing bondage of sin, struggling against the Christian soul that voluntary accepts the bondage of God’s law. In moving from works to grace, and toward the pole of election and predestination in the Calvinist model where the soul is incapable of being changed by human works, Protestant theology transformed human freedom into a “will in bondage,” a free choice to be enslaved either by sin or by God’s law. Protestant thinkers such as Calvin, Luther, and Perkins, redefined the Aristotelian soul, in its “disorder,” as the scar of the fall, exploiting the diseased state of the faculties to rationalize the Christian soul’s binding and slavery to God’s law. In the dominant Protestant account of the two souls, the fallen “disorder” and disruption of the Aristotelian soul’s faculties enslaved the

---


10 Calvin, Book II, Chapter 3.


12 For this, see my discussion of Pomponazzi on Aquinas and Averroes in the first chapter.
Christian subject to sin, justifying the adoption of a punitive vocabulary to describe the Christian soul’s condition as a prisoner and slave to God’s law.

The Protestant definition of the Christian soul did concede, however, that humans possessed an agency in the domain of things indifferent, in choices unrelated to salvation. This is where *Hamlet* becomes an interesting wrinkle in the Protestant model of the soul. The problem of bondage and punishment to law is pressing for *Hamlet* because his father orders him to commit murder, which would lead him to break the commandment of “thou shalt not kill.” *Hamlet* is a drama of the Christian soul bound by God’s punitive bondage because its protagonist is ordered to break the law, leading him to perform an extremely grievous sin, and consigning him to punishment by God. *Hamlet* is presented with an impossible ethical dilemma: either to murder his uncle and disobey God’s law, subjecting himself to God’s severe punishment, or to disobey his slain father’s explicit request and permit a murderer, Claudius, to be king unjustly. Therefore for *Hamlet*, the fate of his Christian soul is bound up in the following or breaking of God’s law. The stakes are very high, because following his father’s order would directly break God’s commandment, and would lead to his damnation and punishment.

Hamlet is not necessarily paralyzed by a decision between thought and action, as generations of critics have speculated. He is rather torn between obeying or disobeying two sets of law: the law of God forbidding murder, and the law of the father directly commanding him to kill in the name of justice. Faced with this ethical dilemma with heavy consequences for the fate of his Christian soul, *Hamlet* attempts to redefine the rules of the game. *Hamlet* does not act to disobey God’s law, but contests the Protestant understanding of the two-souls paradox as a bondage to law. If the dominant Protestant model of the soul identifies the disordered function of the Aristotelian soul’s faculties as the clearest evidence of original sin, justifying the Christian soul’s enslavement to God’s law, *Hamlet* rejects this Protestant understanding of the two souls completely. He instead identifies the disorder of the Aristotelian faculties as the basis of a new mode of Christian freedom in the domain of theater, and not the willing bondage of the Christian soul to law. For *Hamlet*, the disrupted condition of the Aristotelian faculties leads to a unique mode of freedom to reshape the soul through the rhetoric and language of theater. *Hamlet’s*

---

13 My critique of the “Hamlet as first modern subject” tradition should not be confused with the recent efforts to effectively de-psychologize Hamlet, so as to "unmodernize" the character. The most important attempts to de-psychologize Hamlet have redefined the character in terms of blood and dirt. Gail Kern Paster has argued that Hamlet's "inwardness" is an emphatically embodied interiority, marked by blood, humors, and spirits, and not a metaphysical core. For Margreta De Grazia, the centuries-old obsession with the "modern" Hamlet characterized by psychological depth and self-conscious subjectivity has obscured the actual focus of the play: land, inheritance, and patrilineage. In essence, both critiques of Hamlet as the inauguration of modern subjectivity, one centered on embodiment and physiology, and the other on man's relation to land, have swung the pendulum from an overly metaphysical Hamlet, to a hyper-material Hamlet composed of blood and dust. This hyper-materialist line of reading problematically ignores the fact that *Hamlet* is indeed about psychology, but an unrecognized psychology of the two souls, and not simply about dirt and blood. See: Paster, Gail Kern. *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004; and De Grazia, Margreta. *Hamlet without Hamlet.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. See also: De Grazia, Margreta. “When did *Hamlet* become modern?” *Textual Practice* 17.2 (2003): 485-503; “Hamlet before Its Time.” *MLQ* 62.4 (2001): 355-375; and Oort, Richard van. “Shakespeare and the Idea of the Modern.” *New Literary History* 37.2 (2006): 319-339.
heavy emphasis on theater and rhetorical fiction directly rejects the Protestant model of the soul, which ridiculed free will as a meaningless fiction in comparison to the gravity of law.

I was wrong in saying that free choice before grace is a reality only in name. I should have said simply: “free choice is in reality a fiction, or a name without reality.” For no one has it in his own power to think a good or bad thought, but everything (as Wyclif’s article condemned at Constance rightly teaches) happens by absolute necessity.\(^{14}\)

Luther assumes that by turning “free choice” into a “fiction,” he has evacuated the concept of agency of all of its power.\(^{15}\) However, Hamlet disagrees, and sees fiction as an extremely potent way to give back to the Christian subject a power of agency. Hamlet agrees that free choice is indeed based upon a fiction. He harnesses the power of fiction in the space of theater to disrupt and reshape the faculties of the Aristotelian soul as a way for the Christian subject to redefine themselves, in stark contrast to the bondage and fixed destiny described by Protestant theology. Even further, fictional rhetoric enables Hamlet to disturb and alter the souls of others, particularly of his primary adversaries, Claudius and Gertrude. In Hamlet, Shakespeare argues that fiction and theatrical rhetoric give to the Christian subject the power to redefine themselves, and others, in a way that is impossible for the Protestant soul bound by the chains of law, stripped of all agency and the power of self-articulation.\(^{16}\) In the dominant Protestant account, the disorder and perturbation of the Aristotelian soul’s faculties had been taken to be an extremely negative problem, and the main sign of the Christian soul’s fallen and corrupt condition. Shakespeare completely reverses this line of thinking, and turns the susceptibility of the Aristotelian soul to be disrupted and changed by fiction and rhetoric, and not the disease of original sin, into the positive freedom of the Renaissance Christian to redefine themselves as subjects capable of imagining an alternative to the bondage of God’s law.

**The Prison of the Protestant Soul**

Hamlet’s use of theatrical rhetoric as a way to critique the dominant Protestant model of the Christian soul by reshaping the faculties of the Aristotelian soul is surprising, because he

---

\(^{14}\) Luther, *Assertio*, Article 36.

\(^{15}\) Greenblatt has argued that Protestants were skeptical of fiction in general, particularly objecting to the Catholic concept of Purgatory precisely because of its fantastic, literary nature. (Greenblatt, 35). For example, William Tyndale claimed that “Purgatory...is a poet’s fable.” (*An Answer to Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue*. Cambridge: Parker Society, 1849. p. 143.)

\(^{16}\) Alan Sinfield has perceptively argued that the possibility of resistance against Calvinist determinism is bound up in the Protestant effort to turn religious devotion into an individuated, self-reflexive act. Such a relocation of faith in the individual subject gave that subject tremendous power, including the power to critique: “The production of self-consciousness in protestantism was a high-stakes, high-risk strategy. In some instances it might set distinctively subtle hooks in the psyche, interpellating docile subjects in a specially intricate way; in other instances its blatant contradictions might allow its constitutive project to become apparent, and hence afford access to an identity sufficiently unbeholden to any one ideological pattern to form a feasible ground for critique and dissidence. Many of the expounders of protestantism aspired to produce acquiescent subjects, and did so. But they also stimulated a restless self-awareness, one that might allow, in some, a questioning of the system. It is not straight-forward to say whether the Reformation tended to free or repress people.” Sinfield, Alan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992. p. 164-5.
initially demonstrates no interest in the Aristotelian model of the soul. He instead exhibits a single-minded concern with the Christian laws governing his soul. In his first soliloquy, Hamlet appeals directly to canon law.

O, that this too too sallied flesh would would melt,
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew
Or that the Everlasting had not fixed
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter. O God, God,
How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world! (I.ii.129-134)\(^7\)

Critics have traditionally read Hamlet's first soliloquy as a counterpoint to his emphatic declaration of having “that within which passeth show” in his earlier exchange with Gertrude. If the announcement of “that within” has conventionally been read as Hamlet's articulation of an interiorized subjectivity, the “too too sallied flesh” soliloquy has been taken as the first indication of Hamlet’s obsession with suicide, later confirmed in the “to be or not to be” soliloquy.\(^18\) These dominant readings of the soliloquy focused on suicide have missed the basic point of the speech: Hamlet’s description of suicide is purely hypothetical, and serves only to emphasize the extent to which his actions are governed by God’s “canon” law. Hamlet’s first soliloquy is not about self-violence, but the prohibition of violence by law, and is primarily focused on defining how the dualist Christian subject is “fixed” by God’s law. Hamlet's first self-description abides by the conventional Christian dualism of the "sallied flesh" of the body and the soul's fate "fixed" by the dictates of canon law. He voices the traditional desire to renounce the filthy sinful condition of the body, striving toward the pure state of the soul, but he articulates this desire in an extreme manner, describing the dematerialization of the "sallied flesh" to the rarefied immaterial plane of the soul, a "dew" unbound by the physical constraints of the living world. However, Hamlet laments the "canon" law's absolute refusal to permit this suicidal conversion of the body to an immaterial, more spiritual state. Our first introduction to the Prince is an emphatic account of the Christian dualism of body and soul, bound by apostrophic appeals to the "Everlasting" ("O God, God") and absolute obedience to his "fixed" canon law. In the moments before encountering his father's ghost, in response to Horatio's cautionary warnings, Hamlet persistently defines himself in terms of the security of the Christian soul's immortality.

---


Why, what should be the fear?
I do not set my life at a pin's fee,
And for my soul, what can it do to that?
Being a thing immortal as itself?
It waves me forth again. I'll follow it. (I.iv.64-68)

In his initial encounter with his father's ghost, Hamlet boldly claims he has no fear, since the ghost cannot do any harm to his Christian soul assured of immortality. Hamlet exhibits his absolute certainty in the Christian soul's immortality in his use of a tautology to explain its nature: "being a thing immortal as itself?" The Christian soul's immortality is confirmed in a comparison to "itself," requiring no proof other than the tautological confirmation that the soul is indeed unshakably immortal. Hamlet's father quickly corrects his son's flawed logic, by demonstrating that the Christian soul’s immortality is not synonymous with salvation.

I am thy father's spirit,
Doomed for a certain term to walk the night,
And for the day confined to fast in fires,
Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature
Are burnt and purged away. But that I am forbid
To tell the secrets of my prison house (I.v.9-14)

The ghost’s speech is significant because it introduces a model of punishment and confinement defining the Protestant soul. He starkly asserts that the immortality of the Christian soul does not protect one from a violent system of Protestant punishment. The king's soul certainly is immortal, but this immortality makes the interminable punishment of Purgatory all the more tortuous. In contrast to the Prince's confident belief in the unassailable immortality of the Christian soul, King Hamlet describes the fate of the Christian soul as a system of criminal punishment. The dead king's spirit is locked in a "prison house," bound and "confined to fast in fires," violently punished in direct proportion to the "foul crimes" of sin performed during his life. Hamlet's father presents a vision of Christian immortality and afterlife defined in terms of binding and punitive suffering. It should be noted that the play never presents the Christian soul's immortality as the blissful reunion of the elect with God in heaven. For the remainder of the play, Christian immortality is exclusively characterized by a system of punitive juridical consequences in relation to God's law. The account of confinement and imprisonment described by Hamlet’s father reflects the dominant Protestant position in the decades after the Reformation, arguing that the Christian soul is bound by God’s law to such an extreme extent, that it takes on the characteristics of a prisoner or captive. The king’s ghost describes the “captive” and “enslaved” state of the Protestant soul, echoing Calvin and Luther in claiming that the Christian soul is always locked in a “prison house” with no free will.19

19 Greenblatt has noted that Protestants were extremely skeptical of the doctrine of Purgatory. (Greenblatt, 32-40). Luther’s text suggests that the confinement and enslavement limited to Purgatory in Catholic doctrine, becomes expanded in Protestant theology to describe the universal state of the enslaved Christian soul stripped of all agency.
The fate of King Hamlet's soul is so dire because he lacked the proper Christian sacraments necessary to absolve the soul of its sins before his death.

Thus was I sleeping by a brother's hand
Of life, of crown, of queen at once dispatched,
Cut off even in the blossoms of my sin,
Unhouseled, disappointed, unaneled,
No reck'ning made, but sent to my account
With all my imperfections on my head.
O, horrible! O, horrible! most horrible!
If thou hast nature in thee, bear it not. (I.v.74-81)

King Hamlet asserts that a balance sheet of sins and compensatory sacraments determines the fate of the Christian soul. Unfortunately for the abruptly murdered king, without the performance of last rites and the sacrament of extreme unction, the mathematical "reck'ning" of his soul's account yields a surplus of sins and "imperfections", leading to a fate of "horrible" punishment in the "prison house" of the afterlife. Hamlet's father bleakly describes the Christian soul's future as one of binding and juridical punishment, directly refuting Prince Hamlet's initial fantasy of the immortal Christian soul's freedom released from the "sallied flesh" of the corrupt body. The encounter between father and son demonstrates that the immortality of the Christian soul is not a release from the flesh-bound body to a plane of transcendent spiritual freedom, but is a paralyzed state of binding and confinement, locking the soul into a "prison house" burning and "purging" the soul of its "foul crimes." This grim vision of the Christian soul's binding by a system of juridical punishment runs in the family: Claudius defines the fate of his own Christian soul in an identical vocabulary of judgment and punishment before God's law.

My fault is past. But, O, what form of prayer,
Can serve my turn? "Forgive me my foul murder?"
That cannot be, since I am still possessed
Of those effects for which I did the murder-
My crown, mine own ambition, and my queen.
May one be pardoned and retain th'offence?
In the corrupted currents of this world
Offence's gilded hand may shove by justice,
And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
Buys out the law. But 'tis not so above.
There is no shuffling; there the action lies
In his true nature, and we ourselves compelled,
Even to the teeth and forehead of our faults,

20 Kahn has argued that this vocabulary of business transaction was paradoxical, because "although the language of debt and redemption made salvation imaginable, it also dramatized the incommensurability of human and divine transactions. In particular, economic metaphors of accounting very often functioned ironically to indicate an infinite debt, a debt that could never be repaid." (Kahn, p. 50)
To give in evidence. What then? What rests?
Try what repentance can. What can it not?
[...]
O limed soul, that struggling to be free
Art more engaged! Help, angels! (III.iii.51-69)

Claudius argues that the traditional Christian means for absolving the soul's "faults", including "prayer" and appeals for forgiveness, are absolutely useless. Instead of prayer and repentance, God's justice functions according to a discourse defined explicitly in terms of law. Where the "corrupt currents" of the mortal world may "buy out the law" and "shove by justice," God's adjudication is far more stringent. Christian subjects before God's absolute law are judged by their actions laid bare in their "true nature," with the juridical "evidence" of one's faults evaluated by the law. Claudius forcefully demonstrates that the conventional religious model of prayer and repentance does not govern the fate of the Christian soul. Rather, the soul is bound by consequences strictly determined by law and the juridical evaluation of one's "faults" and "evidence." Both King Hamlet and Claudius paint a stark picture of the Christian soul tightly bound by God's law, completely stripped of any semblance of freedom or agency. Claudius outlines the counterintuitive relationship between freedom and binding in his description of the "limed soul," in which the Christian soul ardently striving for a sense of freedom paradoxically locks itself even more firmly in the grip of law: "O limed soul, that struggling to be free / Art more engaged!" A punitive system of law locks the Christian soul into a grim fate, in which any attempt to "be free" simply sinks the soul deeper into the quagmire of punishment. King Hamlet and Claudius emphatically refute the young Prince's initial fantasy of the Christian soul attaining a sense of freedom when released from the "sallied flesh" of the body. Moving away from the medieval model of the body as the prison of the soul that would otherwise be free, both the king and Claudius demonstrate that in death, the Christian soul simply exchanges the prison of the body, for another prison defined by law and punishment. In Hamlet, the Christian soul can never be free.

The ghost contrasts the punishment of his Protestant soul to his son’s Aristotelian soul composed of physical organs. If the king’s ghost defines the afterlife of the Christian soul in terms of the violent punishment dictated by God's law, he defines his son's soul in the completely different terms of the Aristotelian faculties and their organs.

...But that I am forbid
To tell the secrets of my prison house,
I could a tale unfold whose lightest word
Would harrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood,
Make thy two eyes like stars start from their spheres,
Thy knotted and combined locks to part,
And each particular hair to stand an end,
Like quills upon the fretful porpentine.
But this eternal blazon must not be
The king’s ghost is forbidden from recounting the "tale" of the Christian afterlife because of the dramatic effects such a story would have on the faculties of his son's Aristotelian soul. The "words" of the frightening "tale" of the Christian soul's punishment would "harrow up" Prince Hamlet's “soul,” a second soul defined not by an "eternal blazon" of Christian immortality, but in the completely different vocabulary of blood, eyes, hair, and ears. The ghost’s vocabulary of sense organs, hair, and blood to describe the reaction of his son’s “soul” to the “tale” calls to mind the Aristotelian definition of the soul far more than the Christian soul defined by sin and punishment before God’s law. The organs targeted by the “tale” of Christian punishment were important to the Aristotelian account of the soul. The startling effects of the Christian tale are specifically directed at the "soul" of Prince Hamlet, and his organs defined as the basis of his Aristotelian faculties. The forbidden tale would "freeze" the blood and hair of the Aristotelian soul's autonomic vegetative faculty, and the skin, eyes, and ears of the sense faculty. The various organs affected by the king's "words" are not defined as part of the body, understood in terms of the conventional Christian dualism of body and soul, but as part of the "harrowing" of a second soul, the Aristotelian soul defined by its organic faculties. Therefore if King Hamlet defines himself in terms of the Christian soul and its punishment dictated by God's law, he defines his son in terms of a second, Aristotelian soul described in the very different vocabulary of the sensory and vegetative faculties and their associated organs.

The king's ghost specifically describes the powerful effects of the tale on the organs of his son's Aristotelian faculties as a "harrowing" of the soul. The term "harrow" defines both Christ's descent into hell before his resurrection, and a spiked agricultural implement used to tear up plowed land. The king's forbidden tale would "harrow" and tear apart his son's soul's faculties and organs, freezing his blood, ripping his eyes from their sockets, splitting his individual hairs and stunning his ears. The "harrowing" of the soul describes the complete uprooting and disruption of the proper function of the Aristotelian faculties. A third definition of "harrow" describes the distress of the mind or feelings, but the act of "harrowing" Hamlet's soul goes far beyond the mere state of emotional perturbation. The king's ghost specifically articulates the unexpectedly powerful effects of a "tale" composed of "words" upon the condition of the Aristotelian faculties and its organs. Hamlet's father describes the powerful force of a "tale" and "words" to directly alter the physical condition of the Aristotelian soul. Even the "lightest word" possesses the power to tear the sense and circulatory organs apart. This is perhaps the most

21 Note that the ghost’s description of the soul’s “harrowing” follows a mechanism identical to the king’s death by poisoning: “In the porches of my ears did pour / The leperous distilment, whose effect / Holds such an enmity with blood of man / That swift as quicksilver it courses through / The natural gates and alleys of the body, / And with a sudden vigor it doth posset / And curd, like eager droppings into milk, / The thin and wholesome blood. Do did it mine, / And a most instant tetter barked about / Most lazar-like with vile and loathsome crust / All my smooth body.” (I.v.63-73)
23 The “harrowing” and uprooting caused by the ghost’s tale reflects the play’s obsession with earth, as argued in De Grazia’s line of reasoning, but uses the agricultural term to describe the psychological disruption of the Aristotelian soul’s faculties and organs.
startling aspect of King Hamlet's speech. He describes a surprising model of storytelling creating a forcefully disruptive relationship between the "words" and "blazons" of a tale and the state of one's soul and organs. Language is therefore an extremely powerful means to alter and disrupt the physical state of the Aristotelian soul's faculties and organs in a manner beyond conventional Protestant rhetorical theory. Hamlet's father insists that "words," "tales," and "blazons" can directly intervene in and violently disrupt the workings of the Aristotelian faculties, and can fundamentally change the nature of the soul and its organs. Importantly, Hamlet's father does not claim that the content or "secrets" of the "tale" would "harrow" his son's soul: it is the "words" and the literary "blazon" composing the tale that possess the force to disrupt the Aristotelian soul. It is the language of the tale, and not the secret contents of the Christian soul's afterlife, that are so powerfully disruptive to the Aristotelian soul's faculties.

The power of the ghost’s rhetoric to “harrow” Hamlet’s Aristotelian faculties and organs suggests a very different interaction of rhetoric and the soul than the traditional account offered by Protestant theories of persuasive eloquence. In her discussion of Renaissance Christian rhetoric and faculty psychology, Debora Shuger has argued that Protestant sermons explicitly aimed to “move the soul,” by not only appealing to reason, but more importantly by eliciting an emotional response in the audience. For Shuger, Protestant rhetoric’s ability to arouse emotion in the heart and the will, drawing from Augustine’s revision of Aristotelian faculty psychology, ultimately lead the listener to an experience of joy in loving God. Hamlet presents a completely different model of rhetoric forcing the faculties of the soul to the opposite pole of the affective spectrum toward confusion, terror, and dismay. The ghost’s rhetoric is the vehicle for a painful disjointing of the soul, and is not the occasion for religious and aesthetic pleasure. The power of rhetoric in Hamlet corresponds less to Cicero’s movere aiming to persuade, as it emulates Longinus’ sublime seeking to overwhelm the soul’s faculties with the irresistible, almost violent, force of language. The “harrowing” Christian rhetoric described by the ghost approximates the terrifying power of the sublime figured as a “thunderbolt” hurled at the audience, “scattering” the soul into pieces. An even more pointed contrast to the standard Protestant understanding of rhetorical address can be found in considering the target of the ghost’s “harrowing” tale. Shuger notes that Protestant rhetoric conventionally aimed to “move” the higher cognitive faculties of the soul, primarily the passions, will and reason. The ghost’s rhetoric of the Christian soul is so startling because it completely bypasses cognition and the volitional powers of the mind, moving directly to exert tremendous physical effects upon the organs of the Aristotelian soul. Unlike the Protestant preacher who revels in the use of rhetoric to stimulate the cognitive faculties, Hamlet’s father insists that his rhetoric describing the fate of the Christian soul cannot be told, since its language would “harrow” the listener’s organs through involuntary channels beyond the control of reason. Rather than leading to a positive love of God, the ghost’s rhetoric of the Christian soul is terrifically negative, completely bypassing the cognitive faculties to violently “harrow” and shock the physical organs of its audience. The specifics of the ghost’s
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language suggest an inordinately negative physical impact upon the soul’s faculties that cannot simply be assimilated to Protestant rhetorical conventions describing devotion as a mode of cognitive stimulation.

Hamlet's encounter with his father changes the play's definition of the soul in a very important way. Hamlet initially understands the soul in terms of the tautological relationship of his Christian soul to its own immortality, and as the binding of the immortal Christian soul in the sinful "sallied flesh" of the body, following the logic of the traditional dualism of body and soul. However, his father demonstrates that the human is not defined by the relation of the immortal Christian soul to the flesh-bound body, but is rather composed of two different souls: the Christian soul bound by the punishment of God's law and an absolute lack of freedom, and the Aristotelian soul capable of being altered and violently "harrowed" by the language of the "tale" and "blazon" of the Christian soul's fate. In effect, the ghost defines the relation of the Christian and Aristotelian souls in terms of a literary structure: the Christian soul's fate is a "tale" and an "eternal blazon" composed of "words" with the power to tear his son’s Aristotelian faculties apart. As a result, the king's ghost defines the two souls in terms of their necessary partition. The two souls therefore cannot be placed into contact, and the "eternal blazon" of the Christian soul and the laws governing its punishment must be separated from the organs of the Aristotelian soul in order to prevent an extremely violent reaction, a "harrowing" of the Aristotelian soul that would completely disrupt the proper function of its faculties. The Christian soul is a story, an "eternal blazon," defined in terms of immortality and criminal punishment that must never be told to the organic faculties of the Aristotelian soul.

The dead king's redefinition of the Christian soul as a mode of storytelling capable of tearing apart the faculties of the Aristotelian soul has a profound impact on his son, who immediately responds by redefining the organs of his soul in terms of textuality.

O all you host of heaven! O earth! What else?
And shall I couple hell? O, fie! Hold, hold, my heart,
And you, my sinews, grow not instant old,
But bear me stiffly up. Remember thee?
Ay, thou poor ghost, whiles memory holds a seat
In this distracted globe. Remember thee?
Yea, from the table of my memory
I'll wipe away all trivial fond records,
All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past
That youth and observation copied there,
And thy commandment all alone shall live
Within the book and volume of my brain,
Unmixed with baser matter. Yes, by heaven! (I.v.92-104)

It has been popular in recent years to read this sequence in terms of Renaissance commonplace books, the notebooks used by scholars and gentlemen to compile quotes, thoughts, and musings
for future rhetorical manipulation. According to this line of reading, Hamlet defines his higher order cognitive functions as a text "copied" in the commonplace book of his mind. This materialist line of reading is certainly useful, but has completely ignored the specific interaction of the text composing his mind and memory with the organs responsible for these cognitive operations. Hamlet does not so much describe his mind and memory understood abstractly as a textual medium, but rather specifically identifies the organic locus of cognition, the "book and volume of my brain," as a text. Therefore Hamlet very specifically roots the textuality of his thought and memory in the organs of his Aristotelian faculties. In his response to the ghost, Hamlet dramatically moves away from his previous self-characterization as a Christian subject striving to set his immortal soul free from the prison of the "sallied flesh," tautologically assured of salvation by a Christian soul as "immortal as itself." Hamlet's interaction with his father's ghost forces him to reimagine his soul in terms of Aristotelian faculty psychology, placing a great deal of emphasis on the organs composing his mental and physical faculties, specifically addressing the heart, sinews, and brain as the loci of affect, locomotion, and cognition. Hamlet rejects his previous mode of self-definition obsessed with the Christian soul's immortality, in favor of an Aristotelian model of the soul embedded in the function of the organs responsible for feeling, movement, memory, and thought.

In describing the organs of the Aristotelian soul, Hamlet appropriates Aristotle's specific metaphors of the soul as "form," "pressure," and "matter." Aristotle's famous definition of the soul as the composite of form and matter culminates with the figure of the wax impression:

We describe one class of existing things as substance: and this we subdivide into three: 1. matter, which in itself is not an individual thing; 2. form, in virtue of which individuality is directly attributed, and 3. the compound of the two. Matter is potentiality, while form is realization or actuality...So the soul must be substance in the sense of being the form of a natural body, which potentially has life...If then one is to find a definition which will apply to every soul, it will be "the first actuality of a natural body possessed of organs." So one need no more ask whether body and soul are one than whether the wax and the impression it receives are one.

Aristotle defines the soul as the form or actuality of the potentially living matter of a natural body composed of organs. The interrelation of soul and organs, form and matter, is famously figured in the metaphor of the wax seal, in which the soul is the form of the seal impressing and

28 Nigel Alexander has argued that Hamlet's soliloquies work through the cognitive faculties of memory, understanding, and will. For this, see: *Poison, Play, and Duel: A Study in Hamlet*. London: Routledge, 1971.
giving shape to the wax matter. Hamlet explicitly appropriates the most famous Aristotelian
definition of the soul as the composite of form and matter, and defines himself along the lines of
Aristotle's master trope of the soul as the impression of a seal in wax. The jarring shift in 125
lines from Hamlet's initial self-definition in terms of his Christian soul's tautological immortality
("as immortal as itself"), to the subsequent description of his soul in the Aristotelian vocabulary
of "form," "matter," and "pressure," cannot be overemphasized.

Despite these passages’ clear debt to De Anima, how could Shakespeare have
incorporated such an understanding of Aristotle’s faculty psychology with his “small Latin and
less Greek,” since no English translations of De Anima existed in Renaissance England? Unlike
the other figures studied in this dissertation, such as John Donne and Sir John Davies, who could
read Ancient Greek and Latin proficiently, Shakespeare would have required other sources.
Charles Schmitt has influentially argued that Aristotle’s texts became important in Elizabethan
England through intermediary intellectuals such as the Oxonian John Case. In the particular
case of De Anima, a body of widely-read treatises in English, such as Francis Bacon’s
Advancement of Learning, Thomas Wright’s The Passions of the Mind, Helkiah Crooke’s
Microcosmographia, and the 1595 Problemes of Aristotle, exposed the details of Aristotelian
psychology to a vernacular audience. An earlier generation of philologists noting the
pervasiveness of the language of faculty psychology in Shakespeare’s plays attribute his
familiarity to the large body of extremely popular behavior manuals and theological treatises that
made the training and discipline of the Aristotelian faculties a central issue for the education of
Renaissance schoolboys. Other than the Physics, the subject matter of De Anima was the only
non-logical work of Aristotle required to be studied in Renaissance schools. The Protestant
obsession with controlling the disorder of the Aristotelian soul as the scar of original sin
ironically promoted a ubiquitous pedagogical discourse teaching every Renaissance schoolboy
the intricacies of the faculty psychology they needed to control and discipline. Interestingly
enough, Sir John Davies’ exceedingly popular scientific poem Nosce Teipsum, studied in the
following chapter, has been identified as one of the most important vehicles for disseminating
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30 Margreta de Grazia has studied Shakespeare’s specific appropriation of De Anima’s figure of the wax impression. For this, see: “Imprints: Shakespeare, Gutenberg, and Descartes,” in Alternative Shakespeares, Volume 2, ed. Terence Hawkes. London: Routledge, 1996.


knowledge about the faculties of the Aristotelian soul to a widespread Elizabethan audience. Aristotelian faculty psychology derived from *De Anima* therefore pervaded the early modern understanding of the soul, evidenced by the sheer volume of texts published in the period detailing its workings to a lay English readership.

Although Hamlet never hears the forbidden "tale" or "eternal blazon" of his father's Christian prison that would "harrow" the faculties of his soul, the suggestion that such a "tale" exists provokes him to redefine his organic faculties in terms of a textuality similar to his father's description of the Christian soul as a literary object. He sears his father's "commandment" into the faculty of memory by transforming his brain into a malleable textual medium, a "table" or "book and volume" serving as the material substrate for memorial inscription. Hamlet performs such a transformation of the Aristotelian soul by making a crucial modification to the specific figure used to define the soul cited above from *De Anima*. Hamlet changes the relation of form and matter from one mediated by an image impressed in wax, to a textual model of words and "records" imprinting the "tables" of his brain's "book." Hamlet changes Aristotle's famous figure of the wax impression into a method of textual printing, and not the molding of wax. For Hamlet, this conversion of the Aristotelian soul from an idiom of wax to one of textuality and writing books is absolute: he insists that the "book and volume of my brain" will be "unmixed with baser matter," stripping all forms of matter other than language from the textual reimagination of his organic faculties.

Modifying Aristotle's metaphor leads Hamlet to begin to imagine a freedom to rewrite his own soul unbound by Christian law. If his father casts the Christian soul and its imprisonment in terms of its literariness as a "tale" or "blazon" impossible to recount to his son, Hamlet understands his Aristotelian soul in precisely such textual terms, transforming the "brain" as the seat of his faculty of reason and memory into a text capable of being erased or "wiped away" and rewritten. But there is a crucial difference in the textuality of the two souls presented by father and son. Where his father defines the Christian soul as a "tale" or "blazon" firmly fixed by God's law and bound by an interdiction forbidding the revelation of its "secrets," Hamlet redefines the organs of his Aristotelian soul in far more malleable terms, as a textual medium that one has the power to write and to rewrite at will. Hamlet transforms the organs of his Aristotelian soul, specifically the brain responsible for sense, reason, and memory, from something that thinks or cogitates abstractly, into something that one has the power to physically edit. Therefore in recasting the organs of his Aristotelian faculties in terms of textuality and the possibility of rewriting, Hamlet attempts to give himself an unprecedented mode of agency to determine the composition of his memory and reasoning. If the Christian soul understood as a literary "tale" or "blazon" constrained by God's law possesses no freedom and cannot reveal its textual "secrets," Hamlet harnesses the very different palimpsestic textuality of the Aristotelian faculties as a potential way to rewrite the nature of one's soul.
Theatrical Rhetoric: Psychological Disorder as a Mode of Agency

Hamlet is deeply shaken after his encounter with his father’s ghost. He is no longer sure if he is defined by an unshakably immortal Christian soul regulated by canon law, or an Aristotelian soul capable of being “harrowed” by the language of a “tale” of Christian punishment, and of being rewritten like a text. Hamlet’s confusion about his two very different souls hinges on the paralyzing ethical dilemma his father has forced upon him. King Hamlet’s ghost describes the fate of his Christian soul in terms of the extremely violent torture and imprisonment dictated by God’s law to punish him for his sins. Ironically, after painting a terrifying picture of the punitive consequences of breaking God’s law with sinful acts, the ghost commands his son to murder Claudius so as to avenge his death, ordering his son to break God’s commandment forbidding murder. After telling his son how God violently punishes those who break his law, he asks his son to break it, in performing a grievous sin that would lead to his immediate damnation. If he obeyed the ghost’s order, his punishment by law would be far more painful than his father’s. Therefore Hamlet’s most famous speeches after his interaction with the ghost are not lofty metaphysical meditations, but rather struggle with the ethical dilemma posed by his father’s order to murder and break God’s law. Along these lines, Hamlet’s repudiation of Claudius as “he that hath killed my king and whored my mother, / Popped in between th’election and my hopes” (V.ii.64-5) certainly describes a lamentation of losing his line to the throne, but also suggests that his duty to kill Claudius has interfered with his hope to join the elect in a state of salvation. With this understanding, Hamlet’s soliloquies read very differently. For example, the famed “to be or not to be” soliloquy is not so much about being and nothingness, but rather struggles with the raw deal Hamlet is confronted with, of exchanging one system of punishment in life for another, more painful punishment in death: “That dread of something after death...makes us rather bear those ill we have / Than to fly to others that we know not of?” (III.i. 78-82) As Murray Bundy has noted, in the “To be or not to be” soliloquy, “the deterrent to suicide is not, as some think, moral scruple, but the vivid imagination of the penalty of the guilty.” Therefore Hamlet’s paralysis after his encounter with his father’s ghost is not caused by a philosophical conflict between thought and action, as has been conventionally argued by countless readers of the play. Hamlet is confused because he struggles to determine if he must follow the rules of a Christian soul defined by violent punishment determined by law and his father’s command to murder breaking that law, or can reimagine himself in terms of the malleable Aristotelian soul defined by faculties, organs, and their ability to be rewritten like a

34 For a reading of these lines in terms of Hamlet’s disappointed status as heir apparent, see: De Grazia, Hamlet without Hamlet, p. 90.
Some of Hamlet's most famous speeches describe Hamlet's paralyzing anguish in terms of his basic confusion about the two souls.

What a piece of work is man, how noble in reason, how infinite in faculties, in form and moving, how express and admirable in action, how like an angel in apprehension, how like a god: the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals. And yet to me, what is this quintessence of dust? Man delights not me, nor woman neither (II.ii.288-293)

Hamlet's statement of “what a piece of work is man” is more a question registering his confusion rather than a declarative assertion. Hamlet works through a range of different ways of imagining "man," from the faculties of the Aristotelian soul, to the Christian soul's resemblance to angels and God, ultimately concluding in the frustrating irresolution of the "quintessence of dust." He no longer assumes, as he did at the beginning of the play, that he is exclusively defined by his Christian soul tautologically defined by its immortality. Hamlet attempts to synthesize the Christian and Aristotelian souls into a hierarchical chain of being from animals to angels and gods, but this attempted synthesis fails, collapsing back to the level of earthly "dust" rather than rising to the immaterial transcendence of Christian salvation. Hamlet's description of "man" in terms of the Aristotelian "faculties" of reason and locomotion relies upon the grammatical coupling enabled by the copula "is." To the initial question of "what is man?", Hamlet responds that man is the Aristotelian soul defined by the faculties of reason and locomotion, form, and action. The movement to the Christian soul is far less assured, described instead in terms of the metaphorical comparison of "like: "how like an angel…how like a god." In moving from the Aristotelian soul to the spiritual affiliation to angels and gods, Hamlet shifts from the emphatic identity of "is" to the less certain comparative register of "like." Hamlet's confusion between the two souls therefore hinges on the conflict between declarative constative fact ("is") and the rhetorical approximation of figural language ("like"). Hamlet finally evinces his disappointment by describing his negative emotional state: "man delights not me." Hamlet's negative emotional response to the registers his struggle to find the right language, be it Aristotelian or Christian, to describe the soul. In response to Hamlet's lack of "delight," Rosencrantz suggests that perhaps the tragedians will elicit more emotional "delight" from the prince. Upon greeting the players, Hamlet immediately asks for a "passionate speech" to determine their "quality." Passion, be it delight or disappointment, is Hamlet's primary index of evaluating the value of the human soul. Hamlet's initial reaction to the player's Hecuba speech is outrage, since he finds the same fault in the player's performance as he does in the Christian soul: both are figurally "like" something else and do not simply declare a true statement of fact about the human soul. Although Hamlet desires the firm identity established by the copula "is" to describe the two souls (either he is a Christian soul, or he is an Aristotelian soul), he is disappointed to find that both souls are instead

---

[36] Unlike the nonextant Ur-Hamlet, which became the butt of many jokes in Elizabethan London for its signature line “Hamlet, revenge!”, the ghost in the extant version of the play turns the potentially comical command to murder into a very difficult ethical challenge, compelling Hamlet to swear upon “God” and “heaven” to “remember” him and “revenge his foul and most unnatural murder.” For the Elizabethan jokes about the “Hamlet, revenge!” theme, see: Marino, James. *Owning William Shakespeare: The King's Men and their Intellectual Property*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011: 75.
composed of fictions and figures. In his furious response to the player, Hamlet finds that the Aristotelian soul is equally as rooted in rhetoric and figures as the Christian soul defined in the previous speech by the metaphorical "like."

Ay, so God buy to you! Now I am alone.
O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I!
Is it not monstrous that this player here,
But in a fiction, in a dream of passion,
Could force his soul so to his own conceit
That from her working all his visage wanned;
Tears in his eyes, distraction in his aspect,
A broken voice, and his whole function suiting,
With forms to his conceit? And all for nothing,
For Hecuba!
What's Hecuba to him or he to her,
That he should weep for her? What would he do
Had he the motive and the cue for passion
That I have? He would drown the stage with tears,
And cleave the general ear with horrid speech,
Make mad the guilty, and appal the free,
Confound the ignorant, and amaze indeed
The very faculties of eyes and ears. (II.ii.505-522)

Hamlet’s reaction to the player’s “passionate speech” has most frequently attracted critical attention as a way to map Hamlet’s complex intersubjective relation with his parents onto the triangle of Pyrrhus, Priam, and Hecuba. More recently, Gail Kern Paster has popularized a reading strategy emphasizing the player’s heavy focus on humoral physiology, in the description of Pyrrhus with a dark complexion, in his armor covered in blood, and in his physiological state of being “roasted in wrath and fire.” In reading Hamlet’s response to the Hecuba speech in service of filial intersubjectivity on one hand, and of humoral physiology on the other, these critical strategies have missed the most obvious, but crucial, point about Hamlet’s soliloquy: he is most preoccupied with the player’s “passionate speech” as fiction, and in the speech articulates the play’s most explicit account of how fiction and its “conceits” can alter the soul.

Hamlet’s “rogue and peasant slave” soliloquy is decisive since it harnesses the fictionality of theatrical rhetoric as the play’s first means of defining an agency to reshape the soul. For the purposes of my argument, Hamlet’s soliloquy in response to the Hecuba speech is the turning
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point of the play. In it, Hamlet carefully explains the effect of theatrical language and rhetoric upon the organs and faculties of the Aristotelian soul. Based upon the new understanding of the soul he gains in the soliloquy, Hamlet moves past the paralyzing confusion demonstrated in the “what a piece of work is man” speech, to a specific mode of psychological agency in theater. I will therefore present three readings to demonstrate how Hamlet develops this sense of agency by mediating the Aristotelian soul in relation to theatrical rhetoric. First, by defining the effect of theatrical rhetoric upon the Aristotelian soul’s faculties in the “rogue and peasant slave” sequence. Second, in the “purpose of playing” speech before the Mousetrap play, where Hamlet resituates his Aristotelian soul’s “form and pressure” in the temporality of the active present “now,” and not locked in the remembrance of the past as he vowed after his initial encounter with his father. And third, in Hamlet's performance of scenes of “tenting” or disrupting the Aristotelian faculties of Claudius and Gertrude, by turning the power of fictional rhetoric upon the soul away from himself and toward others. The new understanding of the Aristotelian soul’s malleability Hamlet gains in the wake of the Hecuba speech not only gives him the power to reshape the nature of his own soul; it permits him to disrupt and change the soul of the other.

Hamlet is initially horrified by the player's "passionate speech," calling his performance "monstrous." The player's Hecuba speech provokes such a violent reaction from Hamlet precisely because it was extremely successful: the actor was able to wind himself up into a passionate fury, arousing powerful emotions in Hamlet and his spectators. The problem with this effective dramatic performance, and what makes the player so "monstrous," is the fact that his account of Hecuba's grief is fake: it is a "fiction" and simply a "dream of passion." Hamlet berates himself as a "rogue and peasant slave" since he has lacked such fury in response to his father's death. In contrast to the player who can forcefully arouse his passions and senses at whim, Hamlet struggles with his own affective response in the face of an impossibly difficult situation: the murder of his father, and the command break God’s law by murdering his uncle in an act of revenge. At an even more profound level, Hamlet's horrified response to the player centers on their radical difference of agency. Hamlet defines himself in absolutely abject terms, as a "rogue and peasant slave" with no power to control himself or his reaction to his father's command to murder. In contrast to Hamlet's abject paralysis, the "monstrous" player wields a tremendous power to manipulate every aspect of his being. The player is both monstrous and powerful since he can harness the language of, and passions elicited by, a pure "fiction" and "dream" into very real effects capable of transforming himself and his audience. The player has the active power to "force" his own "soul" through fictional language and rhetoric, in contrast to the abject position of the "slave" describing Hamlet who does not know how to feel and act.

Hamlet is very specific in describing the nature of the player's agency to transform himself, by outlining the impact of the rhetorical "conceit" of the "passionate speech" on the player’s "soul." The "soul" in question here is not the immortal Christian soul, as in the case of
Hamlet's father locked in the "prison house" of purgatory. Rather, Hamlet very specifically delineates the effect that rhetoric and fictional language has on the Aristotelian soul's faculties, passion, and organs. What reacts to the player's theatrical rhetoric are the organs of the Aristotelian soul. Hamlet's explanation of the relation of the player's rhetoric is so surprising because it redefines the language of fiction as something with the power to physically change the structure of the Aristotelian soul and its organs. Rhetorical "conceits," therefore, do not only involve the cognitive appeal to passion and reason of conventional Protestant rhetoric, as explained previously. Hamlet turns theatrical rhetoric and performance into a way of actively intervening into the physical "function" of the soul's faculties, capable of directly disturbing the listener’s organs. Therefore the player does not simply stimulate a play of feelings or thoughts, but his rhetoric goes so far as to physically change the body; draining the blood from his face, making his visage pale and altering the circulation of his blood, forcing tears to flow from his eyes, twisting his face into contortions, cracking his voice, "cleaving" the sense organs with "horrid speech" and stunning the "faculties of eyes and ears." The language of rhetoric powerfully moves the soul to such an extent that its organs and faculties are torn apart in a passion. Although the rhetorical "conceit" is completely fictional, the effect it has on the Aristotelian soul is very real. Hamlet describes a model in which the language of rhetoric and theatrical performance can fundamentally alter the organs of sense, circulation, and affect composing the faculties of the Aristotelian soul.

Hamlet’s emphatic declaration that the rhetorical “conceit” targets the organs and “faculties” of the Aristotelian soul directly contradicts Paster’s hyperbolic claim that the player’s Hecuba speech and Hamlet’s reaction present a model of early modern subjectivity paralleling Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of a “disembodied selfhood” anchored in a “Body without Organs”: “nothing more than a set of valves, locks, floodgates, bowls, or communicating vessels.” Such an analogy between Hamlet and Deleuze and Guattari is weak, since Hamlet is decisively talking about a soul necessarily defined by its organs. For all of Paster’s attempts to cast Hamlet as a “body without organs,” Hamlet persistently talks about his organs as the basis of his Aristotelian faculties. Paster herself backtracks in her claim, admitting that “the early modern body is a body with organs - indeed organs given discrete psychological functions,” in an acknowledgement that the early modern subject was defined by an organic faculty psychology in the Aristotelian tradition. My argument, contra Paster, attempts to restore the early modern understanding of the body’s organs as vitally important in defining the early modern soul, and not as a proleptic anticipation of a proto-post-modern “body without organs.” Paster’s project in general notices the pervasiveness of the language of Aristotelian faculty psychology in Shakespeare’s plays, and in Hamlet in particular. However, she construes the vocabulary of faculty psychology in early modern England in terms of humoural physiology, and fails to see

38 Gail Kern Paster has read the player as someone “who so controls his inner bodily processes that he can...flood himself within and without by emotion and cause bodily alteration.” (Paster, p. 46.) Paster is overlooking the actual language of the soliloquy, which explicitly states that the physical change is an alteration “forcing the soul” and its “form” and “faculties,” and not the “inner bodily processes” she claims. The rhetorical “conceit” targets the Aristotelian soul and not the inner humors of the body.

the specifically Aristotelian debt of such a materialist psychology.\(^{40}\) In a way, Paster's work supports my own argument by demonstrating the ubiquity of materialist faculty psychology in Renaissance England, but comes up short in recognizing how such a faculty psychology contributes to a new understanding of the premodern Aristotelian soul, and not the hyper-material fluidity of the Deleuzean body.

Ultimately, Hamlet argues that the "whole function" of the player's soul bends "with forms to his conceit." Hamlet's diction in this case completely reconceives the nature of the Aristotelian soul, by revising Aristotle's famous definition of the soul as the relation of form and matter in *De Anima*. In Aristotle's foundational definition, the soul is the form given to the matter of a "natural body possessed of organs."\(^{41}\) Hamlet fundamentally rethinks the nature of the Aristotelian soul by embedding its “form” in the power of the rhetorical conceit. Hamlet defines the "form" and "function" of the soul as bending to the structure of the "conceit": "his whole function suiting / With forms to his conceit?" Hamlet transforms the concept of "form" central to the Aristotelian definition of the soul into something inflected by the language of the rhetorical "conceit." The "fiction" of theater possesses the power to change the "form" of the soul, "forcing" the Aristotelian faculties and their associated organs to bend to the shape of the rhetorical "conceit." In lamenting the power of the player's fictional words, he gives tremendous power to rhetorical address. Fictional rhetoric alters the nature of the Aristotelian soul's faculties, transforming the "form" and "function" of the soul into something modulated by a "conceit."

Hamlet’s thinking evolves in the second half of the soliloquy, when he harnesses the power of rhetoric as a way to test Claudius, and ultimately to identify his own mode of agency.

Why, what an ass am I! This is most brave,
That I, the son of a dear father murdered,
Prompted to my revenge by heaven and hell,
Must like a whore unpack my heart with words,
And fall a-cursing like a very drab,
A scullion! Fie upon't! foh!
About, my brains. Hum - I have heard
That guilty creatures sitting at a play,
Have by the very cunning of the scene
Been struck so to the soul that presently
They have proclaimed their malefactions;
For murder, though it have no tongue, will speak
With most miraculous organ. I'll have these players
Play something like the murder of my father
Before mine uncle. I'll observe his looks.

\(^{40}\) Paster acknowledges the Aristotelian definition of the soul, but seems to ignore that many of the texts she discusses explicitly talk about a “soul,” rather than the vocabulary of the “body” to which she persistently reverts. For this, see: Paster, p. 135-7.

\(^{41}\) Aristotle, *De Anima*, 412a27-412b9.
Hamlet initially calls himself an "ass" and a "whore" because he can only "unpack" his "heart with words" and is unable to act. However, he realizes that he can redirect those same "words" as a way to "unpack" Claudius' heart, turning the power of rhetoric away from himself and toward his uncle to determine his guilt. Therefore the power of the "conceit" to "force the soul" of the player which frustrates Hamlet in the first half of the soliloquy becomes an extremely potent way to judge Claudius, by "striking his soul." The powerfully disruptive effects of rhetoric on the Aristotelian faculties becomes Hamlet's primary way of determining Claudius' guilt or innocence. Hamlet finds value in the power of fictional rhetoric in the second half of the soliloquy, by turning the effects of the "passionate speech" away from himself, and toward the souls of others. If the passionate effect of rhetoric on the Aristotelian soul is paralyzing when directed to one's own soul, it becomes a powerful way of judging and altering others. The power of rhetoric to "strike the soul" directly bypasses any conscious effort to dissimulate. When "guilty creatures" are struck by the rhetorical "cunning of the scene," the Aristotelian soul and its violently disrupted faculties respond with such immediate force, that it becomes a clear way of determining their true state of mind. Hamlet therefore harnesses the forceful power of theater to "strike the soul" by directing the players to "play something like the murder of my father" in an attempt to provoke a passionate response in Claudius, forcing him to tip his hand. Hamlet exploits precisely the same passionate response of his own soul that he experienced at the beginning of the soliloquy, as a way to "strike the soul" of Claudius and evaluate his guilt or innocence. If Hamlet is at first frustrated by extent to which he could not control his passions, faculties, and organs in response to the fictional rhetoric of the play, he realizes that Claudius will not be able to control himself either. Hamlet's initial lamentation about his abject lack of agency as a "rogue and peasant slave" powerless in the face of the player's rhetorical "conceit" and "passionate speech" becomes the basis for his first decisive course of action in the play.

Hamlet describes the loss of rational agency experienced during the passionate experience of theater through the mechanics of the Aristotelian faculties and their organs. When the "cunning" of a theatrical performance "strikes" the soul of guilty spectators, the soul immediately "proclaims" its "malefactions" and deeds, but will not make this pronouncement with the verbal speech of the tongue. Rather, the "proclamation" of guilt occurs through the "speaking" of other "organs": precisely the same organs of the sensory, vegetative, and affective faculties that were powerfully disrupted in Hamlet's own soul in the first moments of the soliloquy. Theatrical rhetoric can reveal the deep structure of one's psychology by bypassing rational cognition, and "striking" the organs of the Aristotelian faculties to such a forceful extent, that they "speak" and "proclaim" the truth in their physiological and affective response. Theater

---

42 Unlike Hamlet’s understanding of “striking” as a physical act of hitting the body earlier in the soliloquy, in the second phase of the speech, he redefines “striking” as the violent impact of rhetorical “conceits” and language upon the soul and its faculties. (“Am I a coward? / Who calls me villain, breaks my pate across, / Plucks off my beard and blows it in my face, / Tweaks me by the nose, and gives me the lie i’ the throat / As deep as to the lungs? / Who does me this?” (II.ii.528-532).)
is therefore extremely powerful because no one, neither Hamlet nor Claudius, can control the
effect of its rhetoric on one's faculties and organs. Therefore, when the language of theatrical
rhetoric "strikes" the Aristotelian soul, the organic faculties of the soul react in their own mode of
speech, not produced by the words of the "tongue," but by "proclaiming" one's guilt or innocence
in their disrupted emotional state and physical alteration.

By exploiting the power of rhetoric and theater to move and disrupt someone else's soul,
Hamlet unexpectedly gains control of his own faculties and organs, and for the first time in the
play begins to identify his own sense of agency. Hamlet changes his understanding of how the
Aristotelian soul's organs interact with language. The "heart" is initially futile as an ass or whore
since he uses "words to "unpack" the organ. In effect, releasing or "unpacking" words and
language from the heart as the organ of the affective faculty is useless, since it amounts to a
powerless whining about one's emotional distress, reducing one to a "scullion" or menial servant
with no capacity to act. Hamlet finds that he can move away from the abject state of being a
"slave" and "scullion" by directing "words" to "unpack" or disrupt the organs and faculties of
some other soul, in this case, Claudius'. By redirecting theatrical rhetoric and the force of
"words" to move and disrupt the organs and faculties of another soul, that of Claudius, Hamlet
finds a way to control his own faculties, and the "brain" of his rational faculty: "About, my
brains." Hamlet's power to disrupt others and to control his own heart and brain hinges on the
capacity of theatrical rhetoric to anatomize Claudius' soul. In claiming that he will "observe his
looks" and "tent him to the quick," Hamlet is not suggesting that he will erect a tent to shelter
Claudius' soul from the rain. In medieval and early modern English usage, the verb "to tent"
defined the act of probing and dissecting an organ during an anatomical procedure. Hamlet
therefore describes the power of theatrical rhetoric to disturb the Aristotelian faculties as a form
of psychological anatomy, a rhetorical "tenting" or probing of the soul's faculties. Hamlet moves
away from the rhetorical anatomization of his own organs, in "unpacking his heart with words,
to a different mode of anatomy, using the rhetorical "conceit" of theater to dissect and "tent" the
organs of Claudius, exploiting the Aristotelian soul's powerful emotional response to the
theatrical murder scene as a way to modify his soul by disruption.

Ultimately, the power of the rhetorical "conceit" to move and disrupt the faculties and
organs of the Aristotelian soul provides Hamlet with a psychological model capable of
transforming himself from a "rogue and peasant slave" and "scullion" without agency and utterly
paralyzed by passion, into an agent capable of controlling his own soul, and the souls of others.
By harnessing the power of rhetoric to disrupt the Aristotelian soul, Hamlet becomes an agent
capable of manipulating the souls of others, by anatomizing and "tenting" the organs and
faculties of Claudius in the Mousetrap play, and later in his confrontation with his mother. For
Hamlet, the rhetorical "conceit" of theater serves as the linguistic anatomical instrument capable
of probing deep into the Aristotelian soul, provoking a passionate response knocking its faculties
and organs out of proper equilibrium, and eliciting a mode of "speech" from the soul's "organs"

43 Paster has read the act of “tenting” in this scene as a “humoral therapeutic” used to “express corrupt bodily
matter.” (Paster, 52.)
clearly "proclaiming" the truth of one's psychological state. Hamlet defines his own sense of agency for the first time in the play, in recognizing the power of rhetoric and theater to "strike" and reshape the Aristotelian soul.

It is important to specify that the mode of agency Hamlet begins to articulate in this soliloquy is only partial: Hamlet is not an agent with the unfettered freedom to act as he pleases. The partial agency Hamlet recuperates from the effects of theatrical rhetoric on the Aristotelian soul is momentary. For a brief window of time, the stable equilibrium of the soul is thrown into disarray by the theatrical "conceit," and Hamlet recognizes that the unbalanced state of the faculties gives him an opportunity to reshape his soul in a different conformation, albeit only for a brief instant exceeding the rational control of the self. Therefore Hamlet's agency is completely involuntary, defined by the explosive response of the Aristotelian faculties to theatrical language, precisely like the uncontrollable “harrowing” of the soul provoked by the ghost’s tale. However, such an involuntary agency is a stark alternative to the rigidity of the Protestant soul, which Hamlet’s father has shown to be locked into a system of violent punishment determined by God’s law. For Hamlet, the only means to redefine oneself against the inflexible fate of the Protestant soul is in recognizing that the Aristotelian soul's faculties can be changed by language and rhetoric, but with the key proviso that the alteration is profoundly negative. Theatrical rhetoric does not give one the positive agency to remold one's soul as one desires according to an ideal state of being, but rather opens up a negative agency to redefine oneself through disruption, and by throwing one's constitutive faculties out of harmony. Unlike Alan Sinfield’s reading counterposing the Calvinist determinism of the Protestant soul with Hamlet’s effort to attain a “Stoic tranquility of mind” achieved through the “exercise of rational powers,” I argue that Hamlet’s ability to resist the punitive binding of Protestant doctrine hinges on his movement away from a state of “tranquility” and reason, to the opposite pole of the Aristotelian soul’s disordered frenzy reacting explosively to theatrical rhetoric. By redefining himself, Claudius, and Gertrude, in terms of the very brief window of time in which they all experience the chaotic disarray of their faculties, Hamlet imagines that the only counterpoint to the fixed fate of the Protestant soul determined by law is the negative freedom to bend one's Aristotelian faculties to a breaking point of passion. Hamlet forcefully describes how theatrical performance and the rhetoric of its "conceits" opens up the possibility of a very fleeting agency, the agency to define oneself as a disrupted subject.

The second phase of Hamlet’s articulation of a new form of agency in terms of his Aristotelian soul mediated through the rhetoric of theater comes in the “purpose of playing” speech before the Mousetrap play. After his long soliloquy on the rhetorical "conceit's" ability to mold and disrupt the Aristotelian soul's faculties, Hamlet understands the two souls in their direct relation to theater and fiction for the remainder of the play. Hamlet expresses the extent to which his understanding of the soul is now deeply rooted in the power of theatrical rhetoric to function as a "mirror" to human nature.

---

44 Sinfield, p. 222-230.
45 For an analysis of Hamlet’s use of mirroring in defining his struggle to act, see: Kastan, David Scott. “‘His Semblable is His Mirror’: Hamlet and the Imitation of Revenge.” *Shakespeare Studies* (1987).
Suit the action to the word, the word to the action, with this special observance, that you overstep not the modesty of nature; for anything so overdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end both at the first, and now, was and is, to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure. (III.ii.15-20)

The model of theatrical performance Hamlet presents to the player is not based on the model of the sign we understand today as the relation of the signifier and the signified. Hamlet's model of signification is explicitly theatrical, in its emphasis on the chiasmic relation between the "action to the word, the word to the action," establishing a basic link between the uttered linguistic sign and the actor's theatrical gesture in the space of the stage. The relation Hamlet creates between language and theater redefines his understanding of the Aristotelian soul. Hamlet's mention of the "form and pressure" cites Aristotle's master trope of the seal impressed into wax as the figure describing the relation between form and matter. Hamlet's major innovation in this moment involves turning the famous trope of the Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure" into something explicitly theatrical. Hamlet adds a layer of complexity to Aristotle's figure of the wax seal, by specifically describing theater as the mirror to the "form and pressure" of the Aristotelian soul. Theater therefore cannot directly reshape the contours of the Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure", but it possesses the power to show oneself what the "form and pressure" of one's Aristotelian soul looks like. Theater enables a reflexive optics presenting the Aristotelian soul to oneself. If Hamlet was previously confused about the nature of his two souls, and how the Aristotelian soul defines him in contradistinction to the Christian soul, theater provides Hamlet a mirror-like mechanism to reflexively decipher his own soul.

In introducing a model of theater as a mirror to the Aristotelian soul, Hamlet radically revises his earlier understanding of the soul's "form and pressure" as a mode of palimpsestic rewriting in I.v. In response to his father's exhortation to "remember me," Hamlet vows to erase all of the "forms" and "pressures" etched in his faculty of memory and in the "book and volume" of his brain. In the "purpose of playing" speech prior to the Mousetrap performance, Hamlet completely changes his understanding of the Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure." No longer does he claim to be able to erase and rewrite the "form and pressure" of his organic faculties and his memory at will. By placing the Aristotelian soul in relation to theater's "actions" and "words," Hamlet accents the mechanics of mirroring rather than erasure, and articulates a meta-analysis of his soul's "form and pressure" in terms of optical self-reflection rather than linguistic effacement and rewriting. The "form and pressure" of the Aristotelian soul is something to be perceived visually through the mirror of theater rather than directly edited in the "book" or "volume" of the organic faculties.

Hamlet's fundamental shift from the figure of effacement and linguistic editing to the theatrical figure of the self-reflexive mirror image to describe the "form and pressure" of the Aristotelian soul hinges on an important change in temporality. In response to his father's earlier command to "remember me," Hamlet focuses on his faculty of memory, which by its very nature is exclusively concerned with the past: "Remember thee? / Yea, I'll wipe away all trivial fond records, / All saws of books, all forms, all pressure past." Hamlet's previous conception of his Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure" was distinctly focused on the past, "wiping away" past memories and past "forms" and "pressures" etched onto his brain, and replacing these "trivial" memories with the more important act of "remembering" his father's command. Hamlet's initial memorial model of the Aristotelian soul's "forms" and "pressures" involves a substitution of past memories with other, more important, past memories. His early articulation of the retroactive erasure and editing of his Aristotelian soul's "forms" and "pressures" is firmly fixated on a past time.

In his "purpose of playing" speech, Hamlet drastically alters the temporality of the Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure," emphatically moving to the present tense: "the purpose of playing, whose end both at the first, and now, was and is." In placing the Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure" in direct relation with the mirror-like self-reflexive optics of theater, the temporality of the Aristotelian soul becomes far more expansive, encompassing past origins ("the first" / "was"), the present moment ("now" / "is"), and perhaps more importantly, a conclusion or teleology ("end"). In a sense, Hamlet's speech turns the Aristotelian figure of the soul as a "form and pressure" into something best understood in terms of Aristotle's notion of mythos, or dramatic plot, with a beginning, middle and end. Aristotle's theatrical temporality of plot gives Hamlet a powerful tool to define his Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure" as existing in multiple temporalities, and not simply in the faculty of memory locked in a backward looking gaze. The Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure" is therefore not only defined by the retrospective faculty of memory, but has a beginning, middle, and end, or a past, present, and future, precisely as Aristotelian mythos does. Hamlet's "purpose of playing" speech defines the soul’s temporality as something like the narrative temporality of Aristotelian mythos.

Hamlet forcefully emphasizes the immediacy of theater's temporality in specifying that the "form and pressure" being revealed is that of the "very age and body of the time." Theater reveals the "form and pressure" of the immediate present, the "very age" of the present time. By placing the Aristotelian soul into relation with the mirror of theater, the temporality of the soul radically moves away from Hamlet's previous obsession with the past tense, in "remembering" his father's order and in his insistent focus on the faculty of memory. Articulating the "purpose of playing" is a transformative event for Hamlet, leading him to understand himself, and his Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure" in the new temporality of the present tense, of the immediate present of "now". Hamlet's initial understanding of the Aristotelian soul as an erasable text mired the prince in the past, and in a futile memorial project of "remembering" his father's

---

command to murder. Although Hamlet cannot physically alter the "form and pressure" of the soul by turning the mirror of theater to it (as he could with the erasable tablet of the memorial faculty), he gains the power to understand how his soul reflects the "very age" of the present time, and decisively resitutes his Aristotelian soul in the present tense of "now." Hamlet's problem prior to the "purpose of playing" speech had been two souls in misaligned temporalities. In response to his father's injunction to "remember me," Hamlet had defined his Aristotelian soul and its organs exclusively in terms of the faculty of memory, locking the Aristotelian soul in the past. In contrast, both Hamlet's father (in his discussion of purgatory, and the future punishment of the Christian soul) and the prince (in his "To be or not to be" soliloquy) define their Christian soul in terms of its futurity, afterlife, and the coming punishment before God's law. If the Aristotelian soul was fixated upon past memories and the act of "remembering," and the Christian soul is obsessed with futurity and afterlife, for much of the play the present time becomes an empty, dead space. Hamlet is a disjointed subject incapable of action precisely because his own "time is out of joint" (I.v.187), and the two souls constituting him pull him toward the past and toward the future, leaving the temporality of his present completely vacant.

Hamlet therefore is confused about how the two souls define him as a human not only because the Christian soul is bound by God's punitive deterministic law, and because the Aristotelian soul can be molded and reshaped by theatrical rhetoric, but also because of the confusing temporality of this psychological difference. Hamlet could not act in the present tense since his Aristotelian soul, and its capacity to be edited and changed, was locked in a memorial past, and since his Christian soul was bound by a future determined by violence, murder, and punishment for breaking God's law. In the "purpose of playing" speech, Hamlet argues that the Aristotelian soul and its faculties can be fully present in the immediacy of "now" when placed into relation to the mirror of theater. Not only does theatrical rhetoric powerfully disrupt the proper alignment and function of the Aristotelian faculties, it also forcefully changes the temporality of the soul's "form and pressure," moving it from the memorial past to the active present. In redefining his Aristotelian soul's "form and pressure" through theater as something occupying the present time of "now," Hamlet abruptly begins to speak about himself in terms of "choice" and "election" instead of the bonds of memory and the command to murder. Theater's power to place Hamlet's soul in the present permits him to reconceive himself as a subject with choice.

Since my dear soul was mistress of her choice
And could of men distinguish her election,
S'hath sealed thee for herself (III.ii.54-56)

Unlike the grim future of Hamlet's father's Christian soul locked in a "prison house" of confinement and juridical torture, the prince's shift into the present tense through theater's "mirror up to nature" gives him the power to define his "dear soul" in terms of "choice" and "election." Hamlet's juxtaposition of the word “election” with “choice” here is extremely surprising, since it contradicts Calvin’s understanding of “election” as God’s power to predestine
Christian souls to salvation or damnation. In the standard Calvinist account, it is only God, and not the individual Christian soul, who has the “choice” to “distinguish” one’s “election.” Hamlet boldly redefines his soul in terms of the theatrically-inflected ability to choose, and rejects the Calvinist model of “election” stripping the Christian subject of choice.

“The Counterfeit Presentment”: Anatomizing the Soul of the Other

The third phase of Hamlet’s redefinition of agency in terms of the Aristotelian soul’s interaction with theatrical rhetoric involves his performance of scenes of “tenting” or disrupting the faculties and organs of Claudius and Gertrude to determine their guilt and to change their souls. The Mousetrap play is Hamlet’s way of holding a theatrical mirror up to the "form and pressure" of Claudius' soul in order to disrupt his faculties, passions, and organs in a forceful admission of his guilty conscience. Since Hamlet's rhetorical “tenting” of the soul is so profoundly effective with Claudius, he uses the same procedure in his confrontation with his mother. In III.iv, Hamlet forces Gertrude to peer into the mirror revealing the nature of her soul.

> Come, come, and sit you down. You shall not budge.  
> You go not till I set you up a glass  
> Where you may see the inmost part of you. (III.iv.17-19)

Gertrude does not understand that the "glass" visually presenting her "inmost part" to herself is a mirror of the soul, and she fears that Hamlet will physically open her body in an act of violence.

> What wilt thou do? Thou wilt not murder me?  
> Help, ho! (III.iv.20-21)

In response to his mother's cry for help, Hamlet famously kills Polonius in a mistaken act of murder, and continues in his effort to "wring" his mother's "heart." The "glass" Hamlet has in mind capable of exposing the "inmost part" of Gertrude's soul is a fictional image, "the counterfeit presentment of two brothers."

> Look here upon this picture and on this,  
> The counterfeit presentment of two brothers.  
> See what a grace is seated on this brow:  
> Hyperion's curls, the front of Jove himself,  
> An eye like Mars, to threaten and command,  
> A station like the herald Mercury  
> New lighted on a heaven-kissing hill-  
> A combination and a form indeed  
> Where every god did seem to set his seal  
> To give the world assurance of a man.

---

48 For Calvin’s defense of predestination and election, see: Calvin, Book II, Chapters 21-24.
This was your husband. Look you now what follows.
Here is your husband, like a mildewed ear
Blasting his wholesome brother. Have you eyes?
Could you on this fair mountain leave to feed,
And batten on this moor? Ha, have you eyes?
You cannot call it love, for at your age
The heyday in the blood is tame, it's humble,
And waits upon the judgment, and what judgment
Would step from this to this? (III.iv.54-72)

For generations of psychoanalytically-minded critics, Hamlet’s confrontation with Gertrude in her closet represents a sort of primal scene, the son’s most direct attempt to fantasize and seize control of his mother’s sexuality.49 However, as in the case of the Hecuba speech, such predominant reading strategies are so interested in reading between the lines to decipher the psychoanalytical import of the scene, that they fail to acknowledge the text’s explicit focus on how fiction, in this case, the “counterfeit” portraits of King Hamlet and Claudius, can disrupt and change Gertrude’s Aristotelian soul. This is to say that Hamlet’s “glass” up to Gertrude does not reveal her psychology in a psychoanalytical register, as much as it exposes her faculty psychology understood in Aristotelian terms. In exactly the same manner as Hamlet forced Claudius to watch the theatrical performance of his act of fratricide, the prince forces his mother to gaze upon a different fictional mirror, the "counterfeit presentment of two brothers," two "pictures" forcing Gertrude to see the psychological corruption of her faculties and organs. In both cases, Hamlet exploits the power of fictional representation to disrupt and ultimately anatomize or "tent" the faculties of an other's soul. Hamlet has therefore come full circle by this point in the play. If he initially reacts in outrage against the fictional nature of the player's Hecuba speech in Act II, and the player's ability to profoundly disrupt and alter the Aristotelian soul's faculties, he mobilizes the same fictional resources, in this case a pair of "counterfeit" pictures, to provoke precisely such a disruption and change in Gertrude's soul.

The "counterfeit presentment" moves Gertrude's passions so powerfully because it works according to the same temporal logic as the "mirror to nature" moving from past to present ("whose end both at the first, and now, was and is") as Hamlet explicated in the previous "purpose of playing" speech. The admirable physical description of Hamlet's father is punctuated by a specific temporal marker: "This was your husband." In forcing Gertrude to see Claudius' image, he commands her to "Look you now what follows. / Here is your husband." Hamlet's "counterfeit presentment" compels Gertrude to compare her two husbands in a before/after, cause and effect temporal logic that can only be understood as a negative change: the past image of the

---

dead king was better than the present image of Claudius. At a basic level, Hamlet's confrontation with Gertrude hinges on a transformation of time into the arrangement of visual images in space. Framing the optical act of seeing the two "counterfeit" pictures ("look you now what follows") as a movement forward in time forces Gertrude to compare the past and present, and makes her realize that her forward progress in time is in fact a regression, a movement from a better image to a worse image. In the earlier moment, the fictional mirror of theater in the "purpose of playing" speech permits Hamlet to synthesize his multiple temporalities - memories of the past, action in the present, and afterlife in the future - into a cohesive understanding of his soul's potential agency. Hamlet attempts to force Gertrude to acknowledge the causes and effects of her own choices, by representing time in the visual progression of two fictional images in space. At each turn of his confrontation, Hamlet identifies the two fictional images as visual evidence of her flawed decision-making process: "what judgment would step from this to this?", emphatically pointing to each picture as a step in Gertrude's sequence of choices. The pair of "counterfeit" images perceived in space embody Gertrude's progress in time, moving from an exalted image of what "was" to a far less appealing image of what "is". If the "purpose of playing" speech gave Hamlet his first sense of agency in the play by allowing him to see the past and present of his soul, in this moment he forces Gertrude to witness the negative consequences of her own corrupt judgment as a timeline of "counterfeit" images.

What is equally striking about Hamlet's "counterfeit presentment" of his father is its debt to classical theology and psychology. The "grace" of King Hamlet is not the Christian grace rooted in faith, but rather the grace of classical pagan gods - Hyperion, Jove, Mars, and Mercury. Ultimately, all of these pagan gods underwrite the dead king's definition as a "man" in the terms of the Aristotelian soul: a "combination" of physical organs and a "form" approved and "sealed" by the classical gods themselves as Aristotle describes the soul's "form" being "sealed" into the wax of the body's matter. In marked contrast to his father's Aristotelian exemplarity, Hamlet depicts Gertrude's relation to Claudius in terms of corrupt faculties. Their rotting senses do not function properly ("a mildewed ear" / "Ha, have you eyes?"), their nutritive faculties are glutinous and perverted ("leave to feed, / And batten on this moor?"), and their reason's capacity for logical judgment utterly fails ("what judgment / Would step from this to this?") The state of the Aristotelian soul serves as Hamlet's primary way to present the glaring ethical contrast between his father's perfection and his mother's perversion. His father's "grace" and his mother's corruption are rooted in the positive or negative state of the Aristotelian faculties, and not in the virtue or sin of the Christian soul. Hamlet understands the ethical difference between his father and mother in terms of the proper or perverted function of the Aristotelian soul's faculties, and not in terms of the system of moral value binding the Christian soul.

Hamlet pushes even further in condemning his mother's acts by engaging in an extended vivisection of her faculties.

...and what judgment
Would step from this to this? Sense sure you have,
Else could you not have motion, but sure that sense
Is apoplexed, for madness would not err
Nor sense to ecstasy was ne'er so thrall'd
But it reserved some quantity of choice
To serve in such a difference. What devil was't
That thus hath cozen'd you at hoodman-blind?
Eyes without feeling, feeling without sight,
Ears without hands or eyes, smelling sans all,
Or but a sickly part of one true sense
Could not so mope. O shame, where is thy blush?
[…]
Proclaim no shame
When the compulsive ardor gives the charge,
Since frost itself as actively doth burn,
And reason panders will. (III.iv.71-88)

Hamlet specifies that Gertrude's utter failure of judgment, leading her to move from the image of King Hamlet to that of Claudius, reflects the deep-seated infection of the Aristotelian faculties that has taken hold of her soul. The rhetoric deployed here specifically repeats the procedure of "tenting" or anatomically probing the humors, spirits, and organs that Hamlet described in Act II as his way of "striking the soul" of Claudius. Hamlet performs precisely such an anatomization and "tenting" of his mother's faculties and organs in this sequence, diagnosing the decay and "apoplexy" of the organs governing her faculties of locomotion, sensation, and rational judgment. In the case of Claudius, Hamlet used the theatrical representation of his murderous act as a way to "strike his soul" and "tent" his organic faculties to determine his guilt. In his confrontation with Gertrude, Hamlet presents the "counterfeit" images of the two brothers as a mirror reflecting the stricken condition of her soul. Hamlet's choice of the word "apoplexy" to describe the condition of Gertrude's faculties is significant, since the term derives from the Greek *apoplexia*, signifying a "striking or hitting."50 As in the case of Claudius' soul "struck" by a theatrical performance mirroring his murderous act, Hamlet's "counterfeit presentment" of the brothers' images serves as a way to diagnose the extent to which Gertrude's Aristotelian faculties have been "struck" or "apoplexed" into a state of perversion and sickness. Hamlet uses the "counterfeit" image as a mirror reflecting the stricken and "apoplexed" state of Gertrude's Aristotelian faculties and organs. Hamlet "strikes" the souls of both Claudius and Gertrude: through theatrical rhetoric in the case of Claudius, and in the diagnosis of "apoplexy" in that of Gertrude.

Hamlet initially defines the relationship between the faculties of the Aristotelian soul in terms of their interconnectedness: "what judgment / Would step from this to this? / Sense sure you have, / Else could you not have motion." Hamlet's understanding of the Aristotelian soul places the faculties of rational judgment, sensation and locomotion into a mutual defining relationship. The presence of movement and the locomotive faculty necessarily implies the

existence of the sensory faculty, and sense implies the presence of some power of judgment. However, this necessary interrelation breaks apart as Hamlet's description of Gertrude's psychological corruption progresses. The remainder of Hamlet's anatomization of Gertrude's faculties describes how her "apoplexed" state has disrupted the clear path linking the lower faculties of locomotion and sense to her higher cognitive faculties of the common sense ("one true sense"), emotion ("O shame, where is thy blush?") and ratiocination ("what judgment" / "mope" or act without one's wits). Hamlet explains that the rupture between the lower faculties of sense and motion and the higher faculties of affect and judgment has occurred since each of Gertrude's senses have become unhinged from the other adjacent sense organs, in a case of disrupted synesthesia: "Eyes without feeling, feeling without sight, / Ears without hands or eyes, smelling sans all." The interrelated function of the senses has been torn asunder since the senses and their organs no longer correspond. The problem afflicting Gertrude's Aristotelian soul is a dysfunctional misalignment of her faculties and their organs.

Hamlet's choice of the term "apoplexed" to describe the etiology of Gertrude's disease of the soul specifically identifies a problem in her organs. Apart from defining a "striking" or "hitting," the medical condition of "apoplexy" describes the uncontrolled bleeding and hemorrhaging of the internal organs. In claiming that Gertrude's faculties of sense, motion, and judgment are "apoplexed," Hamlet specifies that Gertrude's organs are suffering from a profound disfunction verging on stroke or hemorrhage. If the faculties of locomotion, sensation, emotion, the common sense, will, and rational judgment normally work in harmony, the organs responsible for Gertrude's Aristotelian faculties suffer from the severe insult of "apoplexy," causing her faculties to fall apart in a dysfunctional "ecstasy". According to Hamlet, in the normal chain of faculties, the lower faculties of locomotion, sensation, and the common sense would provoke a reaction in the higher faculty of emotion, in Gertrude's case, "shame," or its physical indication as a "blush" forcing Gertrude's face to fill with blood. However, Gertrude cannot experience such an emotional response since her sense organs are disrupted in an "apoplexed" state, and she cannot "blush" since she is losing her blood in the hemorrhaging of her organs. In anatomizing Gertrude's soul, Hamlet determines that a condition of "apoplexy" or a hemorrhaging of the sense organs has disrupted the proper relation between the lower and higher faculties of the Aristotelian soul. Gertrude cannot feel the proper emotion of "shame" since the organs governing her faculties are traumatically injured.

However, Hamlet insists that even in such a state of "apoplexy," and with a profoundly dysfunctional lack of cohesion between the Aristotelian faculties and their corresponding organs,

51 Hamlet’s interrelation of locomotion and sense corresponds to De Anima 433a10-22, which states that movement is caused by the complex faculty of appetite, incorporating the functions of nutrition, sense, and reason.  
52 Shakespeare’s definition of apoplexy as a disease of the Aristotelian faculties parallels Thomas Adam’s description in Diseases of the Soule of the sickness as specifically disrupting the proper function of the faculties of movement, sense, affection, reason and memory: “The Apoplexie is a disease, wherin the fountain & originall of all the finewes being affected, euer part of the body losth both mouing & sense; all voluntary functions hindred...The parish of his affections is extremely out of order; because Reason his Ordinary doth not visite; nor Memorie his Churchwarden present; (or if it at all, Omnia bene.) Neither doth Understanding the Judge censure and determine.” (Adams, Thomas. Diseases of the Soule. London: George Purslowe, 1616.)
the soul always "reserved some quantity of choice." Hamlet avers that a kernel of "choice" always exists even in the case of a profoundly disturbed Aristotelian soul. In his confrontation with Gertrude, Hamlet articulates a form of bare agency: even in madness and sickness, and even in a condition of severely disrupted and "apoplexed" faculties, the Aristotelian soul always retains a residue of choice. In the case of Gertrude, Hamlet insists that even in a state of "apoplexed" organs preventing the proper function of her faculties, she possesses the "bare quantity of choice" to be able to judge the obvious "difference" between the two brothers. This moment registers Hamlet's considerable change in opinion on the nature of the soul. If in I.iv, Hamlet defines the bedrock of his soul in terms of the Christian soul's tautological immortality ("And for my soul...being a thing immortal as itself?")), in his confrontation with Gertrude in III.iv, Hamlet demonstrates that what is fundamentally immutable is the Aristotelian soul's necessary and irreducible capacity for choice, even in a state of severe organic injury stripping one of the capacity for proper emotional response or rational judgment.

Gertrude clearly grasps the message of Hamlet's incisive critique, evidenced in her description Hamlet's extended rhetorical anatomization of her faculties and "apoplexy" organs as a mirror-like gaze into her own soul.

O Hamlet, speak no more!
Thou turn'st my eye into my very soul,
And there I see such black and grained spots
As will not leave their tinct. (III.iv.89-92)

Hamlet's invective directed at Gertrude's soul is extremely effective, and represents a climactic moment of the play. Hamlet decisively performs an anatomy of the faculties and organs of Gertrude's Aristotelian soul corresponding to the methodology of "tenting" or dissection announced in the rhetorical "striking" of Claudius' soul. Hamlet's anatomy of Gertrude's soul "turn'st her eyes into her very soul" in a literal autopsy or auto-optics of her diseased faculties and organs. Hamlet's use of the "counterfeit" image as a "glass" up to Gertrude's soul most directly corresponds to Cicero's axiom, popular in the Renaissance, that theater should be "imitatio vitae, speculum consuetudinis, imago veritatis" ("an imitation of life, a mirror of manners, an image of truth"). If Cicero is specifically referring to comedy in his statement, Hamlet assigns such mirror-like powers to fictional representation in general, turning the "imitation of life" depicted by the "counterfeit" image into a literally mimetic surface of a mirror showing Gertrude the living organs and faculties of her Aristotelian soul. Hamlet's verbal barrage, serving as a narrative telling the story of the "counterfeit presentment" of two images, forces Gertrude to peer into the dark recesses of her own soul so as to perceive the "apoplexed" condition of her organs, and the cancerous "black and grained spots" of sin staining her faculties. Hamlet's words function like the theatrical "mirror to nature" in the "purpose of playing" speech, revealing to Gertrude the grim state of her faculties and organs. However, Hamlet's

---

53 For this, see: Norland, Howard. Drama in early Tudor Britain, 1485-1558. University of Nebraska Press, 1995: 70.
understanding of the mimetic "mirror" or "glass" revealing the "form and pressure" of the Aristotelian soul has fundamentally changed since his encounter with the player. In the "purpose of playing" speech, the "mirror to nature" was a simply mimetic optical surface, showing the "form and pressure" of the Aristotelian soul at a given time. In Hamlet's confrontation with his mother, the goal of the anatomical "glass" reflecting Gertrude's Aristotelian soul is very different. With the anatomizing "glass" of the "counterfeit" images, Hamlet aims to intervene in the workings of Gertrude's soul, specifically diagnosing the disease of her faculties, and revealing to her the "apoplexed" and "spotted" organs of the Aristotelian soul. The disease of her organs leads Hamlet to give her an ethical command to modify her behavior, and to stop engaging in sexual relations with Claudius. Hamlet's understanding of the "mirror" or "glass" has shifted in an important way, from the crudely mimetic "mirror" revealing the "form and pressure" of one's own soul at the present time, to the "glass" or "counterfeit" image as a way to alter the other's soul, in an effort to compel them to change their future choices. If Hamlet insists that the Aristotelian soul, even in a diseased condition, possesses a bare "quantity of choice," his rhetoric attempts to redirect this psychological agency to different ends.

In his confrontation with Gertrude, then, Hamlet harnesses for the first time the tremendous power to bind the temporality of the Aristotelian soul into a synthesis of the past, present, and future. If Hamlet's initial encounter with his father's ghost leads him to focus on his faculty of memory fixated on the past, and if the "purpose of playing" speech permits Hamlet to resituate his soul in the present, Hamlet's climactic confrontation with his mother leads him to develop an understanding of her Aristotelian soul in a chain of cause and effect linking past, present and future. Hamlet articulates a narrative of the "counterfeit" images as demonstrating the past "grace" of Hamlet's father, the present "apoplexed" state of Gertrude's organs and faculties, and the command to cease all future sexual contact with Claudius. In defining Gertrude's Aristotelian soul in the "counterfeit" narrative of past, present, and future, Hamlet gains the considerable power to alter the other's Aristotelian soul, in diagnosing and revealing the state of their diseased faculties, and in the power to command them to modify their future choices. Hamlet's powerful "words" and "speech" explicating the "counterfeit" images of the two brothers, give him the ability to understand the present state of the other's Aristotelian soul, and the force to change its future.

Gertrude specifies that it is Hamlet's language, his "words" and "speech," which profoundly disturbs her soul.

O, speak to me no more!
These words like daggers enter in my ears. (III.iv.95-96)

Like the player's "passionate speech" in the Hecuba sequence, Hamlet harnesses the capacity of "words" to function like psychological "daggers," and specifically identifies the power of
language and rhetoric to alter the faculties and organs of the other's Aristotelian soul. In a sense, Hamlet's understanding of the relation between rhetoric and agency in molding the Aristotelian soul has come full circle from his initial confusion at the player's ability to "force" his own soul at will in the Hecuba speech. If Hamlet promises to use theatrical rhetoric to "strike" and "tent" Claudius' soul, he comes to fully exploit the tremendous power of fictional representation (or the "counterfeit" presentment" of images) and forceful rhetorical address ("words like daggers") to alter the faculties and organs of someone else's soul. Fiction and rhetoric give Hamlet the agency to change the Aristotelian soul of the other, if not the ability to completely change his own.

The return of the king's ghost to interrupt the confrontation with Gertrude emphasizes the importance of alterity in Hamlet's ability to change the Aristotelian soul of the other through the language of rhetoric and fiction. Not only does Hamlet's rhetorical "glass" to Gertrude's diseased faculties and organs create a relationship between Hamlet's self and the anatomized other, it divides Gertrude within herself.

O, step between her and her fighting soul!
Conceit in weakest bodies strongest works. (III.iv.115-116)

Hamlet's rhetorical "conceit" splits Gertrude in two, dividing his mother between "her" and "her fighting soul." Much like the power of the player's "conceit" to "force" his soul to the form of the "passionate speech," Hamlet uses the force of his own rhetorical "conceit" to alienate his mother from her own Aristotelian soul. The "conceit's" ability to anatomize and reshape the other's Aristotelian soul actively "works" to divide the other within herself, othering herself from her own soul. Hamlet's "words like daggers" and "conceits" function as a "glass" revealing to Gertrude her Aristotelian soul's decaying faculties and organs as an alien, exteriorized object to be seen in a mirror, and an optical specimen to study and understand, and not an immanent part of her self. If in previous moments of the play, Hamlet used theatrical rhetoric to disrupt and anatomically "tent" Claudius' Aristotelian faculties in an effort to unveil his guilt, in his later confrontation with Gertrude, Hamlet uses the power of "words" and the "conceit" to alienate his mother from her own soul, harnessing the "conceit" to fracture her in two. In both cases, Hamlet uses the moving power of the fictional rhetorical "conceit" to reshape his primary adversaries, Claudius and Gertrude, into disrupted subjects with souls fractured deep within their faculties and organs. By this point in the play, it should be clear that Hamlet is far from the champion of
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55 The ability to redefine the soul of the other in terms of rhetorical language takes on its most extreme form in his laudatory description of Laertes: “I take him to be a soul of great article, and his infusion of such dearth and rareness as, to make true diction of him, his semblable is his mirror” (V.ii.110-112). Not only is the soul of another adversary capable of being reshaped by rhetoric; his soul itself is figured as a text, an “article” that requires “diction”.
56 Claudius laments such an internal division of the self in his description of Ophelia’s madness in IV.v.83f: “poor Ophelia / Divided from herself and her fair judgment, / Without the which we are pictures, or mere beasts.” Where Claudius grieves over such a division, Hamlet attempts to provoke such a self-division precisely through the use of “pictures.”
modern subjectivity, and cannot be seen as the advent of the glorious private interior selfhood that marks the modern psychology of mind, as countless critics have claimed. Hamlet instead exploits the powerful link between rhetorical "conceits" and the "counterfeit" of fictional representation and the Aristotelian soul's faculties and organs as a way to disrupt other subjects. In effect, Hamlet discovers through rhetoric's ability to disturb the Aristotelian faculties the agency to reconstitute others as subjects alienated from themselves and from their own souls. Hamlet's rhetorical perturbation of the Aristotelian soul gives him the power to recast others as subjects defined by auto-alterity, an otherness of the soul within the most intimate recesses of their selves.57

The profoundly disruptive effects of the rhetorical "conceit" and fictional language upon the Aristotelian soul are precisely the violently negative consequences of which the ghost warned Hamlet in their initial encounter. The king's ghost vividly told Hamlet that he must never narrate the literary "tale" and "eternal blazon" of the Christian soul's punishment whose "words" would "harrow" and shock the faculties of the Aristotelian soul of all who listen. Hamlet's father argues that it is vitally important to keep the disruptive rhetorical force of the "tale" and "blazon" segregated from the Aristotelian soul in order to prevent a disturbing "harrowing" of its organs and faculties. Throughout the play, Hamlet blatantly disregards his father's interdiction to keep the rhetorical "blazons" and "words" of the "tale" away from the Aristotelian soul. Hamlet's entire development as a character hinges on his increasingly successful ability to harness the powerful effect of "harrowing" the Aristotelian faculties out of equilibrium so as to alter and disrupt the souls of others. Hamlet disobeys his father's command, in insisting that the explosive contact between the "words" and "tales" of rhetoric and the Aristotelian soul must occur. He actively attempts to provoke such a violent "harrowing" and disruption of Claudius and Gertrude's souls by "striking" their susceptible Aristotelian faculties and organs with the provocative power of rhetorical "conceits" and fictional representations in theater and in "counterfeit" images. Hamlet's "harrowing" of Gertrude is so effective that his father's ghost returns to remind his son that he has perhaps gone too far, and she has become so alienated from her own soul that she is "fighting" with herself to destructive effect. If Hamlet eventually obeys his father's commandment to murder his uncle, he reaches such a point of action by disobeying his other commandment to keep the "harrowing" rhetoric of "tales," "blazons," and "conceits" segregated from the easily disturbed faculties of the Aristotelian soul. It is precisely the susceptibility of the Aristotelian soul to be "harrowed" by rhetoric and fictional language that Hamlet identifies as a unique psychological malleability giving him the power to redirect the Aristotelian soul to different ends, in contrast to the Christian soul's grim fate of punishment and torture dictated by Christian law, starkly described by his father's ghost.

57 Hamlet applies this auto-alterity in his own self-representation to Laertes in Act V: “If Hamlet from himself be ta’en away, / And when he’s not himself does wrong Laertes, / The Hamlet does it not, Hamlet denies it.” (V.ii. 208-210)
Hamlet’s Afterlife: “Tell My Story” and Our Act of Reading

And what of the Christian soul? The beginning of the play focuses on the restrictive rules governing the Christian soul: the "canon" law preventing suicide, the law ordering punishment and torture in a "prison house" for unabsolved sins, and the Hamlet's initial tautology of Christian immortality ("a thing as immortal as itself?"). After his encounter with his father's Christian soul returning from purgatory, the play is largely concerned with a second, completely different soul: the explosive interaction of the Aristotelian soul with theater and the rhetorical "conceit." In the wake of his frightening encounter with his father's Christian soul punished by law, Hamlet attempts to find an alternative to a grim Christian future of punishment before law in the Aristotelian soul's ability to be shaken out of equilibrium by the rhetorical "conceit" and the fictional power of theater. Ultimately, in Act V, Hamlet's own afterlife comes to be defined by the Aristotelian soul's relation to theater and rhetoric, and not the immortal punishment of the Christian soul.

In Act V, the play returns to the fate of the Christian soul, in the aftermath of Ophelia's suicide. Act V presents two very different visions of afterlife: the Christian punishment of Ophelia's "willful" death, and the theatrical immortality of Hamlet. The famous gravedigger's scene has attracted much attention for its extended meditation on the materiality of the body after death, and the conversion of human life into dirt. What has largely been missed in these readings of the "materiality" of human death, is the fact that what is at stake in digging Ophelia's grave is the state of her soul adjudicated by Christian law prohibiting suicide.

Laertes: What ceremony else?
Doctor: Her obsequies have been as far enlarged
As we have warranty. Her death was doubtful,
And but that great command o'ersways the order,
She should in ground unsanctified been lodged
Till the last trumpet. For charitable prayers,
Shards, flints, and pebbles, should be thrown on her.
Yet here she is allowed her virgin crants,
Her maiden strewments, and the bringing home
Of bell and burial.

Laertes: Must there no more be done?
Doctor: No more be done.
We should profane the service of the dead
To sing a requiem and such rest to her
As to peace-parted souls.

Laertes: Lay her i'th'earth,
And from her fair and unpolluted flesh

58 Most recently, De Grazia has used the graveyard scene as the point of departure for three of her chapters in Hamlet without Hamlet. For this, see: De Grazia, pp. 32-40, 81-82, 129-140.
May violets spring! I tell thee, churlish priest,
A ministering angel shall my sister be
When liest howling. (V.i.195-212)

The Doctor of Divinity and Laertes profoundly disagree on the fate of Ophelia's soul. The Doctor insists that Christian law dictates that she should be buried in "ground unsanctified" until the "last trumpet," and she should be punished until the final judgment, lest they "profane the service of the dead" reserved for "peace-parted souls" released from their worldly sins. The graveyard scene and its conclusion centers on the afterlife of Ophelia's Christian soul, and determines her fate according to the Christian laws dictating reward and punishment before the final judgment. The Christian soul's aftermath articulated in Act V in Ophelia's case precisely reflects the punitive system of religious law first binding King Hamlet's soul in Act I. Little has changed for the grim fate of the Christian soul bound by a system of prohibition and law.

In contrast to Ophelia's death and afterlife determined by Christian law, Hamlet's death and afterlife follows a very different logic governed by theater and performance on the stage. Act V has long confused critics because Hamlet suddenly takes up a Calvinist vocabulary of election: "Why, even in that was heaven ordinant, / I had my father's signet in my purse" (V.ii.48-9); "we defy augury. There is special providence in the fall of a sparrow." (V.ii.194-5); "I do prophesy th'election lights / On Fortinbras." (V.ii.334-5).

59 In contrast to this Calvinist idiom, Hamlet also defines his life in terms of a "story," exhorting Horatio to "report me and my cause aright / to the unsatisfied" by "telling his story." (V.ii.317-318, and 328) The confusion is compounded by Horatio’s suggestion that Hamlet soul is defined by a Christian fate ("flights of angels sing thee to thy rest!" [V.ii. 339]), but subsequently proceeds to articulate a very different second, theatrical afterlife. Horatio follows Hamlet's command to "tell his story" in extremely literal terms, ordering the bodies of the main characters to "high on a stage be placed to the view" and "presently performed" to an "audience" of spectators. Horatio insists that the "story" of Hamlet's life be performed immediately on stage, while the audience's "minds are wild," preventing errors of "plot" from the passage of time. Horatio turns Hamlet's afterlife into a literal theatrical performance, a "story" with a "plot" that must be "presently performed" before an "audience" on stage. Horatio emphasizes that such a theatrical performance must occur while "men's minds are wild," echoing Hamlet's insistence that rhetoric and theatrical rhetoric must provoke a "harrowing" of the Aristotelian soul's faculties. In effect, Hamlet's theatrical afterlife follows the disruptive logic of theater's "passionate speech," unfolding in the rhetorical frenzy occurring when "men's minds" are made "wild" by the performance of Hamlet's life and death. Hamlet therefore has two afterlives. One, speculatively described by Horatio as crowded with "flights of angels," is definitively Christian, and we cannot be sure if Horatio is overly optimistic or if Hamlet’s Christian soul must endure torture and punishment for breaking God’s commandment forbidding murder. The second afterlife to which we are exposed is a theatrical performance.

59 Sinfield has argued that such a Calvinist vocabulary, and particularly the providence of the “sparrow,” actually reveals the contradictions latent in Protestant doctrine. For this, see: Sinfield, pp. 229-230.
capturing the "wildness" of the rational faculties that he has described for much of the play as the only form of agency resisting the restrictive juridical fate of the Christian soul.

For the purposes of conclusion, the second afterlife calls for attention since it extradiagnostically implicates the audience and readers of the play itself. Horatio explains that the "story" to be "presently performed" on stage is an account of "how these things came about": how the dead bodies strewn about the stage met their violent fates. This story of "how these things came about" is precisely what the playtext of Hamlet itself narrates. In telling Horatio to "tell my story," Hamlet commands Horatio to perform the story of his life and death that is the text of Hamlet that we have been reading or watching for five acts. Hamlet performs a striking act of metatheater implicating the audience or reader in the experience of the main character's theatrical afterlife. Placing the dead bodies "high on a stage" places those bodies on the stage that has been in front of the play's audience since the first act, in effect making the play's final mise en scène the theatrical space that the actual audience has been occupying since the beginning of the play. The play's final moments give an account of why the story of Hamlet's life is being performed: the end of Hamlet's plot is the beginning of the play's text, which will be performed to us, the audience. The audience or reader has been participating in Hamlet's theatrical afterlife for the entire duration of the play, but we can only realize this at the end of the play, in its account of the play's genesis as a retelling of Hamlet's "story." If we are to accept that the "audience" gathered by Horatio and Fortinbras to "hear" Hamlet's story interpolates the actual spectating audience or reader, the "wild minds" in question are our own, and we are equally implicated in the disruptive effects of theatrical rhetoric on the Aristotelian faculties as the play's fictional characters are. In the shock of the final scene's rapid-fire sequence of violence and murder, the audience's stunned reaction demonstrates that our "wild minds" prove to be as susceptible to the power of rhetoric and theater as Hamlet first identified in his encounter with the players. The effect of Hamlet's disruptive rhetorical "conceits" are not only directed at Claudius and Gertrude. Hamlet's theatrical afterlife as the play Hamlet "harrows" our own faculties, passions, and organs, (stirring confusion, elation and sadness, making our hearts race, causing us to feel the tragic effects of drama) implicating the play's audience in precisely the same disruption of the Aristotelian soul's faculties by rhetoric and theater as Hamlet articulates throughout the play. Ultimately, Hamlet's mirror of theater exposing and altering the deep structure of the Aristotelian soul of both Claudius and Gertrude is placed up to the audience itself, showing us how the rhetorical disruption of the faculties driving the play's plot reveals precisely why Hamlet has moved and "harrowed" so many generations of readers and spectators. The "glass" disrupting the faculties and organs of the Aristotelian soul is the playtext of Hamlet itself, facing the reader.
In this chapter, I argue that Sir John Davies’ widely-read poems of the 1590’s, Nosce Teipsum and Orchestra, forcefully reject the ubiquitous early modern metaphor of the human as a body politic or a “little world.”\(^1\) Davies contends that when applied to an understanding of the human defined by the two-souls paradox, and not the conventional dualism of body and soul, the “little world” of man looks less like a well-ordered kingdom, and begins to take on the characteristics of a catastrophically failing empire. For Davies, the two-souls paradox is a contradiction of different models of political governance: the Aristotelian soul and its faculties compose a broken imperial monarchy, while the Christian soul is defined by the "consent" of all humans speaking in "one voice," merging into a "corporation" like a political commonwealth. The failure of thinking of the human soul as a monarchy or empire does not derive from an internal rebellion, where the lower faculties of nutrition and sense attempt to overthrow the rule of reason, as countless Renaissance behavior manuals and philosophical treatises claim. Rather, Davies argues that the faculties of the Aristotelian soul compose a completely disorganized imperial bureaucracy, with the sense faculties as "spies" and "agents" returning from distant foreign lands to report flawed and inaccurate information, and with conflicting layers of intermediary faculties, such as will, wit, the common sense, and fancy, serving as a jumbled tangle of middle managers. The disorder of the Aristotelian soul's "empire" leads the ruling faculty of reason to reject the counsel of the lower faculties and to exist in political isolation, forced to make important ethical decisions with incomplete knowledge and with limited interaction with its subjects. Davies' articulation of the Aristotelian soul's faculties registers his skepticism about the possibility of empire in general, which he echoes a decade later in his prose reports on the Irish conquest.

Davies inverts Shakespeare's logic seen in the previous chapter on Hamlet. For Shakespeare, the Christian soul is locked into a Protestant rhetoric of severe punishment and binding by God's law, in contrast to the freedom of the Aristotelian soul capable of being disrupted and reconfigured by theatrical rhetoric. Davies offers a completely different relation between the two souls, reimagining the Christian soul in terms of consent and free will, and refiguring the Aristotelian soul as a farcically mismanaged imperial state. In his poetry, Davies proposes to unite the two souls into a political harmony, and a more useful model for the political state, through the meter and rhythm of lyric poetry. He argues that the metrical regularity of poetic language gives structure to the otherwise chaotic motions of the Aristotelian soul,
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compelling its faculties and passions to "dance" in an organized unity, in precisely the same manner that individuals in a disorganized mob unite by consent to form a commonwealth. By reimagining the soul's faculties as lyric instruments (for example, a lyre, or as a versified text to be written and read as a beautiful song), and not the apparatus of a poorly governed empire, the Aristotelian soul can enjoy the rhythmic metrical unity of "consent" as the Christian soul does. For Davies, the organized structure given to the chaotic Aristotelian soul by the metrical regularity of poetry is the most powerful metaphor for understanding the English commonwealth in terms of consent and not violent coercion. In his poems, and continuing into his later legal prose, Davies redefines the idea of the English nation as a massive "dance" of citizens regulated by the periodicity of poetic meter, and not as the traditional model of the "body politic" with the king as the head's rational faculty governing over the unruly lower faculties of the soul. My argument identifies Davies' early poetry, and specifically the figure of the two souls as a commonwealth structured by the metrical "dance" of lyric developed in this poetry, as a vitally important influence on his later thinking on common law and the viability of imperial expansion articulated during his tenure as colonial administrator in Ireland. No other reading of Davies in the past half century has offered such an explanation of his later legal thinking's intrinsic debt to his earlier poetry.

More generally, my reading of Davies complicates the overwhelming historical consensus that he was a hyper-conservative legal theorist justifying imperial expansion and the violent suppression of native populations based on common law principles.² Basically, according to this standard account, Davies was something like an Antonin Scalia of the Jacobean era. However, all of these studies on Davies' conservative impact upon the English common law tradition only examine his later prose on Irish colonization, and don't take his earlier poetry seriously. Likewise, literary studies of Davies' popular philosophical poems have examined his interest in the developments of Elizabethan science and anatomy, but haven't studied the impact of his poetry as an intellectual framework for his later legal thinking in prose.³ As in the career of John

---


Donne studied in the next chapter, an impermeable wall between both poets’ early verse and their later prose has been constructed by critics and historians, who have told a story of a drastic change between the playful and potentially subversive tone of their early lyric, and a dismaying conservative turn in their later prose. My argument rejects this dominant, but reductive, account of Davies’ career. If we look at the arc of his thought from his poetry through his legal prose, we can see a latent critique of precisely those conservative imperialist principles that historians have identified to be Davies’ primary legacy upon British law. In arguing for the failure of Aristotelian soul modeled upon an empire, and in his insistence that the two souls must be unified by "consent" through the organizing power of poetic meter into a commonwealth of free citizens, Davies voices a deep skepticism of an imperial model of rule that would simply coerce conquered populations to abject themselves to the English crown through military force.

Before we can understand how surprising Davies’ critique of the "body politic" metaphor as a failed model incapable of accurately explaining the human composed of two souls is, it is necessary to see how extraordinarily ubiquitous the political metaphor was, both in the texts of Elizabethan and Jacobean England, and also in our own recent critical takes on the early modern period. Since Ernst Kantorowicz's *The King's Two Bodies* was published in 1957, the figural interrelation of the body politic with the body natural has become the default mode of unpacking the political import of Renaissance literary allegories. Perhaps the most programmatic expression of this reading strategy can be found in David Lee Miller's *The Poem's Two Bodies*: "the aesthetic body of Spenser's poem mirrors the socio-political body of Tudor ideology." Interpreting the early modern body natural in terms of the body politic has been an extremely powerful tactic since the *topos* is found everywhere in medieval and Renaissance texts. Most critical attention has been directed toward Spenser's representation of the temperate body as a form of "sober government," allegorized in Book II, canto ix as Alma's well-regulated castle. The trope was so prevalent that the King James himself began to understand his power in its idiom: "the proper office of a King towards his subjects, agrees very wel with the office of the head towards the body...the head hath the power of directing all the members of the body to that use which the judgement in the head thinkes most convenient." Without fail, the narrative recounted by the body politic metaphor was not one of efficient government, but inevitably one of rebellion, in which the lower faculties of the Aristotelian soul rise up against the rule of the
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7 King James I. *The True Law of Free Monarchies: or the Reciprocal and Mutual Duty Betwixt a Free King and His Natural Subjects*. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1996. p. 73.
rational faculty. Thomas Wright's *Passions of the Minde in Generall* gives one of the most famous accounts of this psychological rebellion.

Our senses were joint-friends in such sort with Passions, that whatsoever delighted sense, pleased the passions; and whatsoever was hurtfull to the one, was an enemy to the other; and so, by long agreement and familiarity, the passions had so engaged themselves to sense, and with such bonds and seals of sensual habits confirmed their friendship, that as soone as reason came to possession of her kingdome, they began to presently make rebellion; for right reason oftentimes deprived sense of the pleasures he had of long time enjoyed, as by commanding continencie, and fasting, which sense most abhorred: then passions repugned, and very often haled her by force, to condescend to that they demanded...Moreover, after that men, by reason, take possession over their soules and bodies, feeling this war so mightie, so continuall, so neare, so domesticall, that either they must consent to do their enemies will, or still be in conflict.

By two wayes the subjects of every Common-weale, usually disturb the State, and breede civil broyles therein: The first is, when they rise up and rebel against their King: the second is, when they brawle one with another, and so cause riots and tumults: the former is called Rebellion, the latter sedition. After the same manner, Passions either rebell against Reason their Lord and King, or oppose themselves one against another...For these rebellious Passions are like crafty pioneers, who, while soldiery live carelesly within their Castle, or at least not much suspect, they undermine it, and breake in so upon them, that they can hardly escape: in like manner these affections undermine the understandings of men.

Wright defines a faculty psychology plagued by a constant state of rebellion. The lower faculties of sense and passion are bound by such a strong alliance, that they unite in "mightie" and "continuall" war against the faculty of reason, the "Lord" and "King" of the soul. The kingdom of reason is constantly in a state of internal "conflict," with the passions and senses besieging the walls of its "Castle." The cause of this psychological civil war is very simple: the senses and passions want the "pleasures" of "sensual habits," while reason insists on implementing a policy of "continencie" and moderation. In these narratives of the body politic's civil war, almost every author forcefully asserts the rational monarch's royal prerogative to violent suppress the dissident faculties. As Edward Forset argues, if the faculties of the soul "become violent and unruly," they must be targeted as "Rebels by the Justice of the law to be

---

8 One of the most literal Elizabethan accounts of this “rebellion” narrative is found in Thomas Tomkis’ *Lingua*, which M.P. Tilley has argued draws its account of the Aristotelian soul’s faculties from Davies’ *Nosce Teipsum*. For this, see: Tilley, M.P. “The Comedy *Lingua* and Sir John Davies’ *Nosce Teipsum*.” *Modern Language Notes* 44.1 (1929).


suppressed" and "subdued by reason." James I is perhaps the most extreme, in asserting that the seditious elements must be excised like a cancer: "And for the similitude of the head and the body, it may very well fall out that the head will be forced to...cut off some rotten members...to keep the rest of the body in integritie." The metaphor of the body as a kingdom in a state of civil war was at its heart a disciplinary ethical system. The rebellious lower faculties of the Aristotelian soul, namely the vegetative faculty's desire for gluttony, the sense faculty's desire for excessive sensual pleasure, and the passions' alliance with both, justified the rational faculty's regime of forceful restraint and "suppression" of the insurrectionary faculties. This ubiquitous model of faculty psychology as a civil war rationalized both the royal prerogative to squelch rebellion, and the violent constraint of the Aristotelian faculties of nutrition, sense, and passion, by the monarchical force of reason. So goes the standard story.

Davies is unique in Elizabethan England because he is the only writer to claim that the narrative of rebellion and insurrection is the wrong way to describe the faculties of the soul. In his popular elegy Nosce Teipsum, Davies does not trumpet reason's royal prerogative to suppress and control the lower faculties; he rather laments the utter failure of this model of absolute monarchy. As Jonathan Sawday has claimed, "Nosce Teipsum is in essence a ravishing elegy on the prospect of doubt, confusion, dislocation, and the defeat of reason." For Davies, the rational faculty suffers defeat because it attempts to rule through a model of imperial bureaucracy, in which the monarch relies upon her agents, the lower faculties of the soul, to provide her information about foreign lands and to execute her royal commands. However, in this model of imperial government, the Queen of reason is so overly reliant on her bureaucrats and agents that if they fail to perform their duties well, the entire imperial structure corrodes from within. For Davies, any attempt to figure the human soul in terms of an authoritarian political state leads to catastrophic failure, leading the human to ethical paralysis and physiological dysfunction.

The Failure of the Aristotelian Soul's Empire

Nosce Teipsum initially presents a straightforward description of the Aristotelian soul's faculties, reflecting the concepts of De Anima almost verbatim. The vegetative or "quick'ning" faculty of the soul is described in terms of its domestic maintenance of the body.

11 Forset, Edward. A Comparative Discourse of the Bodies Natural and Politique. London: John Bill, 1606. p. 18. See also, Forset, p. 51: “But of all other the loathed impes of tumult and disorder, let this be taken for the deadliest and most detestable; If any parts disdeining the rule of their soule, and disliking their subiected condition, shall not onely neglect their dutious performances, but also conspiringly complot against the head, hart, and other the noblest viols of life, to the vter destruction of the whole bodie, by such their horrible commotions and violent conuulsions: which if it were neuer yet attempted, or once intended by any naturall members ruled by the law of their creation, how commeth it to passe, that any parts of the politcall bodie should so outragiously and sediciously betake themselues to an Anarchie, most vnnaturall and rebellious?”
13 Most critics, other than Sawday quoted below, have overlooked the poem’s explicit status as an elegy and its somber elegaic tone, and have simply read Nosce Teipsum as a straightforward factual description of the soul’s faculties. My reading attempts to recognize the specifically elegaic slant of Davies' account of the soul.
14 Sawday, p. 88.
HER quick'ning Power in ev'ry living part,
Doth as a Nurse, or as a Mother serve;
And doth employ her Oeconomick Art,
And buisy Care, her Houshold to preserve.

Here she attracts, and there she doth retain;
There she decocts, and doth the Food prepare;
There she distributes it to ev'ry Vein,
There she expels what she may fitly spare.

This Pow'r to Martha may compared be,
Who buisy was, the Houshold-things to do.

Like Spenser, Davies compares the vegetative faculty to the function of a "Nurse" or "Mother" whose work preserves the vitality of the "Houshold." The labor of the vegetative faculty as an "Oeconomick Art" suggests at once the domestic labor of maintaining a home, oikos, and the economic vitality of the state. In contrast to the domestic work of the vegetative faculty, Davies defines the sense faculty as the power of interacting with things "abroad."

This Pow'r is Sense, which from abroad doth bring
The Colour, Taste, and Touch, and Scent, and Sound,
The Quantity and Shape of ev'ry thing
Within Earth's Centre, or Heav'n's Circle found.

This Pow'r, in Parts made fit, fit Objects takes;
Yet not the Things, but Forms of Things receives;
As when a Seal in Wax Impression makes,
The Print therein, but not it self, it leaves.

And though things sensible be numberless,
But only Five the Sense's Organs be;
And in those Five, all things their Forms express,
Which we can touch, taste, feel, or hear, or see.

17 Davies, Nosce Teipsum, 53.1-3.
Davies' understanding of the sensory faculty seems at first to be straightforwardly Aristotelian, in his adoption of sense perception as a "Seal in Wax Impression" which transmits the "Forms of Things" or "Print" of objects, but not the materiality of the object itself. What is markedly different from the standard account of the sensory faculties, however, is its expansive global reach. If the senses were conventionally defined as the soul's power to define its immediate local environment, Davies greatly expands the range of sense as a faculty that goes "abroad" beyond the immediate purview of the body, traveling vast distances to gather information of "ev'ry thing / Within Earth's Center, or Heav'n's Circle Found." If the vegetative faculty marks the soul's domestic "Oeconomick Art" with the walls of the home or the borders of the nation, the sense faculty represents the soul's power to interact and gather information about the world "abroad." For Davies, the senses move beyond the body's immediate surround, and range across the "Earth," defining a truly global sense of perception. The senses do not so much compose part of man's "little world," as they have the power to explore the vast expanse of the "Earth." The expansive geographical reach of the sense faculty contrasts markedly with the claustrophobic condition of the ruling faculty of reason.

Yet in the Body's Prison so (the rational soul) lies,
As through the Body's Windows she must look,
Her divers Powers of Sense to exercise,
By gath'ring Notes out of the World's great Book

Describing the faculty of reason as locked inside the "Body's Prison" is entirely conventional, echoing the standard Christian dualist account of the body as the prison of the transcendent soul. What is surprising in Davies' formulation, however, is his insistent repetition of the sense faculty's global reach in extreme contrast to the confined state of reason as an imprisoned monarch. The senses possess the physical freedom to span the globe and the "gather Notes" from diverse regions of the "World's great book," in a way that is impossible for the imprisoned rational faculty. Davies creates an enormous spatial contrast between the confinement of reason, which is ostensibly the ruling monarch of the empire of man, who can only peer through the narrow windows of the body, and the vast power of sense to traverse vast distances across the globe. For Davies, it is precisely this massive disconnect between the imprisoned faculty of reason ruling in confinement, and the expansive global reach of the sense faculty, which leads to fundamental problems in our understanding of man as a political state. Davies moves past all other political allegories of the human as a kingdom in his recognition that the extremely physically isolated state of reason in jarring contrast to the global range of the sense faculty causes an untenable system of psychological government. Because the ruling faculty of reason is so isolated, it must rely exclusively on the organs of sense to gather information about its foreign colonies.

---

18 We have already considered Aristotle's figure of the “Seal in Wax Impression” in detail in the previous chapter on Hamlet. For Aristotle’s original use of the figure, see: Aristotle. *On the Soul*, tr. W.S. Hett. Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, 1936. 412a6-412b6.

19 Davies, *Nosce Teipsum*, 18.4.
Nor can her self discourse or judge of ought,
But what the Sense collects, and home doth bring;
And yet the Pow'rs of her discoursing Thought,
From these Collections, is a diverse Thing.

[...]
Kings their Affairs do by their Servants know,
But order them by their own Royal Will.20

Davies specifies the problematic consequences of Reason's extreme physical isolation in this passage. Her physical imprisonment leads her to have a complete dependence on the information gathered by the sense from "abroad." Reason's "self" cannot "discourse" or "judge" - its primary task - in any way without the data of "what the Sense collects, and home doth bring." In this unexpectedly skewed relationship, the isolated faculty of reason needs the wide-ranging sense faculty far more than the sense faculty needs to serve its ruler well. Davies is careful to distinguish Reason's "Pow'rs of discoursing Thought" from the sensory "collections" of the lower faculty, marking the two as "diverse Things." The difference in power of the two faculties is compared to the "King" who knows their "Affairs" through the report of the "Servants," but ultimately commands power over them through their "Royal Will." However, the invocation of "Royal Will" in this instance rings hollow, since reason is so disproportionately reliant on the foreign fact-finding missions of the sense faculties. Although Davies asserts the priority of "Royal Will" to rule over the lower faculties, he creates in the poem an uncomfortable power relation where the rational faculty can rule and make judgments only based on the information "brought home" by the sense faculties from their voyages abroad. This situation is fine if the data delivered by the sense faculties are sound and accurate. But if the information conveyed by the senses is flawed, then Davies has illuminated a fundamental problem in the imperial model of "royal will." If the data provided by the senses are incorrect or inaccurate, then the Empress of Reason must make important political and ethical decisions with an incomplete or flawed understanding of any given situation, which is no way to govern well, regardless of "royal will." Davies complicates the problem of the rational faculty's necessary dependence upon its servants, by arguing that the monarch asserts its "royal will" to ironically contradict and reject its only source of information.

So, though this cunning Mistress, and this Queen,
Doth, as her Instruments, the Senses use,
To know all things that are felt, heard, or seen;
Yet she her self doth only judge and chuse.

Ev'n as a prudent Emperor, that reigns
By Sovereign Title, over sundry Lands,
Borrows, in mean Affairs, his Subjects Pains,
Sees by their Eyes, and writeth by their Hands;

20 Davies, Nosce Teipsum, 18.5-19.2.
But Things of weight and consequence indeed,
Himself doth in his Chamber them debate;
Where all his Counsellors he doth exceed,
As far in Judgment, as he doth in State.

By them the Forms of outward Things she learns,
For they return into the Fantasie,
Whatever each of them abroad discerns;
And there inrol it for the Mind to see.

Then she the Senses checks, which oft do err,
And ev'n against their false Reports decrees;
And oft she doth condemn what they prefer;

Therefore no Sense the precious Joys conceives,
Which in her private Contemplations be;
For then the ravish'd Spirit th' Senses leaves,
Hath her own Pow'rs, and proper Actions free. 21

In this important sequence, Davies explicitly defines the rational faculty as a monarch, a "Queen," that reserves for herself the power to "judge" and "chuse" a course of action based on the information retrieved by the senses, understood as the "instruments" of reason. He more precisely explicates Queen Reason's relation to the lower faculties by comparing her powers of ratiocination to the governance of a "prudent Emperor." Like Queen Reason's "royal will" to command her lower faculties as "servants," the "prudent Emperor" reigns by "sovereign title" over far-flung "sundry lands" scattered across the globe. Just as Queen Reason's network of senses to survey the globe, the Emperor relies on his colonial agents for his information. He delegates power and trusts their observations documented by their senses in foreign colonies in less important matters - he "sees by the Eyes, and writeth by their Hands." However, in more serious matters of policy, concerning "things of weight and consequence," the Emperor rejects the sensory reports of his agents, and withdraws into his private "Chamber," where he "debates" the issue in isolation: by "himself." Ultimately, because his "Judgment" and his "State" far exceed all of his advisers and subjects, the Emperor makes a decision without consulting any other parties. In the parallel Davies creates between the "Queen" of Reason and the "prudent Emperor," he argues that when important political decisions must be made, the imperial monarch moves away from the sensory facts of those who have actually "seen" and "written" the matter in question, and reverts to a bald assertion of "royal will" that will choose a course of action regardless of its accuracy or ultimate efficacy. Davies describes a monarch making decisions in an extremely counterintuitive manner: the more important the matter is, the more the ruler will ignore the facts presented by his subjects who have actually observed what is happening in the

---

21 Davies, Nosce Teipsum, 19.2-21.3.
"sundry lands" of his colonies, and will isolate himself in his own echo chamber of self-justifying deliberation. Davies observes that this is a pattern with the rational faculty in general, noting that when the soul encounters adversity, "the Mind contracts her self, and shrinketh in, / And to her self she gladly doth retire". In increasingly difficult circumstances, the imperial ruler falls back into a state of isolation.

Queen Reason engages in an analogous process of decision making. Whenever the senses return with information from "abroad," like the colonial agents of the "prudent Emperor," the Queen "learns" of the "outward things" and prepares to deliberate. The problem with this account of the rational faculty as a monarch like the "prudent Emperor" choosing to heed or to ignore their subjects' information based on their royal prerogative, is the fact that Davies has already established that the senses are the only way that the Queen of Reason can gain any information about the foreign world. The rational faculty is so insistent on asserting her exclusive right as "Queen" to "judge and chuse" that she rejects the report of the sense faculty, ironically renouncing her only source of information about her colonies abroad. Because the senses frequently "err," she "decrees" against their "false reports" and condemns their counsel. Davies therefore presents the governance of the Aristotelian soul as a psychological comedy of errors. The faculty of sensation, the soul's only means of gathering information from "abroad," suffers from error and inaccuracy. The ruling "Queen" of the rational faculty exists in complete isolation, and rejects the information provided by her sensory agents, ironically distrusts and casting away the "reports" of her only link to the outside world. In this farcical positive feedback cycle of misrule, the rational faculty's mistrust of her only channel of information leads her to reject its "reports," driving her into ever greater isolation, and an increasingly paranoiac effort to assert her "royal will" to "judge and chuse" over sensory fact. In "condemning" the report of the senses, the rational "Queen" does not share the "precious joy" of her "private Contemplations" and sovereign right of judgment with any of the lower faculties of the soul.

Davies' account of the vexed relationship between the Aristotelian soul's faculties becomes even more complicated when he reveals that the isolated ruling faculty of reason never actually interacts with the raw data of the lower faculties or the organs that retrieve these data. She receives information about her empire relayed through a series of bureaucratic middle managers: the imagination, the Common Sense, Fantasy, Memory, Will, and Wit. The imagination and the common sense are the "porters which all things admit, / Them selves perceive not, nor discerne the things," the fantasy serves as the "handmaid to the mind" where she "sits, and beholds, and doth discerne them all; / Compounds in one, things diverse in their kind," and the sensitive memory is "Lidger Booke" lying in the "braine." After being relayed through the jumbled tangle of the soul's bureaucracy, the information gathered by the sense faculties reaches will and wit, the key advisers to reason.23

---

22 Davies, *Nosce Teipsum*, 8.3.
These Actions in her Closet, all alone,
(Retir'd within her self) she doth fulfil;
Use of her Body's Organs she hath none,
When she doth use the Pow'rs of Wit and Will.\(^{24}\)

Confined in her Closet, "all alone" and "retir'd within her self," the rational faculty is so isolated that she is completely divorced from the function of the organs underpinning the function of the soul: "Use of her Body's Organs she hath none." As an isolated ruler, she can rely only on the "Pow'rs of Wit and Will" as her sole means to process the sensory information upon which she bases her decisions and "Actions." The rational faculty's extreme distance from the "Body's Organs" causes problems, as these organs sometimes fail, leading the intermediary faculties of wit and will to be utterly confused.

For, if that Region of the tender Brain,
Where th'inward Sense of Fantasy should sit,
And th'outward Senses, Gath'ring should retain;
By Nature, or by Chance, become unfit:

Then, as a cunning Prince that useth Spies,
If they return no News, doth nothing know;
But if they make Advertisement of Lies,
The Prince's Counsels all awry do go:
[...]
Ev'n so the Soul to such a Body knit,
Whose inward Senses undisposed be;
And to receive the Forms of Things unfit,
Where nothing is brought in, can nothing see.

But if a Phrensy do possess the Brain,
It so disturbs and blots the Forms of Things,
As Fantasy proves altogether vain,
And to the Wit no true Relation brings.

Then doth the Wit, admitting all for true,
Build fond Conclusions on those idle Grounds:
Then doth it fly the Good, and Ill pursue;
Believing all that this false Spy propounds\(^{25}\).

Davies describes the "brain" as the crossroads between the "outward senses" that "gather" information from abroad, and the "inward sense" of fantasy and the other intermediary faculties

---

\(^{24}\) Davies, *Nosce Teipsum*, 18.3.
\(^{25}\) Davies, *Nosce Teipsum*, 93.3-94.4.
of the mind. The brain is, however, problematically "tender" and susceptible to insult. The vicissitudes of "nature" or "chance" can disrupt the proper physiological function of the organ, causing it to become "unfit." The physical weakness or "tenderness" of the organ poses a problem, because if the brain is possessed by a "Phrensy," the political decision-making process of the rational faculty is completely ruined: "a Phrensy…so disturbs and blots the of Things." Thus the failings of intermediary relay stations of organs such as the brain can distort this originally the information provided by the senses to the Queen of reason about the outside world, even if this information was originally accurate. The "tenderness" of the organs "blots" the data of the senses, and distorting potentially correct information into falsehoods. Wit and reason can only make decisions governing the political state of man based on the report of the senses, but if that information is corrupted and "blotted" in the transmission of the sensory data through intermediary organs, then reason must must "build fond conclusions on…idle grounds," and can create no "true relation" between the facts upon which the monarch must base her decisions.

Beyond the weakness of the "tender" organs such as the brain susceptible to "Phrensy," Davies argues in this passage that the senses aren't simply inaccurate or corruptible; they also actively work to deceive the rational faculty, and sometimes return from their foreign voyages empty handed, with no information to report at all. Davies articulates this problem in a comparison to the "cunning Prince" who sends out "spies" to gather secret information about foreign nations. If the spies make "advertisement of lies," suggesting that they have either been deceived or they attempt to deceive reason, then the monarch's decision-making process is based on lies, and consequently ruined: "the Prince's Counsels all awry do go." Therefore in yet another wrinkle in the government of the soul, the "false spies" of sense do not only unwittingly collect partially inaccurate data, they go so far as to bring back blatant falsehoods and to formulate complete lies. The ruling faculty of reason must make political decisions based on information from her only link to the world abroad, the senses, who betray her trust by actively lying to her and by attempting to deceive her. Basing her decisions on lies leads to a misoriented ethical compass: "it doth fly the good, and Ill pursue." The rational faculty is crippled by an inability to judge the veracity that the senses report to her, and cannot correct or modify their data: "Then doth the Wit, admitting all for true…Believing all that this false Spy propounds." Davies thus gives an account of reason's absolute either/or political calculus, which either unquestioningly, and somewhat naively, accepts the senses as completely true, or paranoiacally rejects the senses as absolutely false and cites "Royal Will" in making a decision in isolation and with blatant disregard for fact. The Queen of Reason swings radically between these extreme poles of naive acceptance and paranoid rejection, ironically leading her to make decisions in an extremely irrational manner.

Perhaps what is most surprising about Davies' extended metaphor of the "false spies," is the description of the "spies" of the sense faculty returning with absolutely no information: "If they return no News, (the Prince) doth nothing know…Where nothing is brought in, can nothing see." The senses do not only lie and deceive, but they sometimes return empty-handed, with zero information to report. When the senses report "no News," the rational faculty must choose a course of action in complete ignorance: he "doth nothing know." The reigning faculty of reason
therefore distrusts her sensory spies because they frequently act as double agents, bringing back
blatant lies, or they are haplessly incompetent, reporting absolutely no information. The senses
are not powerful rebellious factions warring against the firm authority of reason. This is not a
conflict of power matching power. Rather, for Davies, the sensory and rational faculties are
completely impotent: the senses can barely perform their function, and reason rules in blindness
and ignorance. Even if the senses and reason wanted to engage in a civil war, the result would be
a comically inept battle of the deaf fighting the blind. The only faculty that Davies sees
functioning properly is the vegetative faculty that keeps the household of the soul well fed.

It is worth emphasizing here how remarkably different Davies' account of the role of the
senses as "spies" in the mismanaged government of the soul is in comparison to the standard
Renaissance political allegories of Aristotelian faculty psychology. Every early modern account
of the Aristotelian soul's faculties, whether laudatory and critical, unerringly defined the senses
in terms of their richness: "more." On one end of the spectrum, Renaissance allegories of the
body politic argued that the senses are by definition rooted in an insatiable quest for sinful excess:
the senses desire more and increasingly more sensual stimulation and pleasure. Ironically, both
early modern erotic poetry on one hand, and extremely conservative moral texts, such as the
excerpts from Thomas Wright and Edward Forset cited above, on the other, agreed that the
senses were motivated to violently rebel against reason because of their desire for excess and
ever-increasing thresholds of sensual gratification. It is equally ironic that George Chapman, a
close friend and poetic comrade to Davies, who has been taken to be one of the most radical
libertine writers of Elizabethan England in contrast to Davies as the conservative jurist, simply
confirms this conventional position on sensory excess, where Davies surprisingly rejects it. In
Ovid's Banquet of Sense, written as a counterpart to Davies' Nosce Teipsum, Chapman
unstintingly affirms the senses to be the locus of "more" and "more" desire, verging on the
complete overthrow of reason's "Emperie": "To taste and touch, one kisse may work the same. / If
more will come, more then much more I will."26 In a synesthetic interamplification between
the senses, a kiss inflames the senses of touch and taste, leading to a desire for "more," and if
"more" is to come, the poet desires ever more. For Chapman, erotic experience brings "a banquet
of the Gods into his sence, / Which filled him with this furious influence." Sensory experience is
a "banquet," a feast of riches, which powerfully exerts "furious influence" upon the soul. The
result, for Chapman, is the standard outcome of rebellion: "To serve the sences Emperor, sweet
Feeling / With those delights that fit his Emperie? / Shall Subjects free themselves, and bynd
their King?" The sense of touch, "sweet feeling" becomes inflated with self-aggrandizement, and
attempts to become "seances Emperor," challenging the "Emperie" of reason. Chapman neatly
describes the standard account of a psychological civil war motivated by the "furious influence"
of sense in posing the question, "shall subjects free themselves, and bynd their King?"

On the opposite pole of the Renaissance discourses of sensory excess, we have natural
philosophers such as Francis Bacon and art theorists such as Leonardo da Vinci and Leon

26 Chapman, George. Ovid's Banquet of Sense. London: Richard Smith, 1595. For the relationship between
Chapman and Davies, see: Taylor, A.B. "Sir John Davies and George Chapman: A Note on the Current Approach to
Ovid's Banquet of Sense." English Language Notes 12.4 (1975).
Battista Alberti. Throughout the early modern period, both scientists and theorists of perspective increasingly lauded the power of the senses, and particularly vision, as the basis of empirical truth. No longer were the senses defined by an experience of "looking through a glass darkly," but could be harnessed as the extremely clear aesthetic and epistemological instruments of the rational mind. Bacon neatly encapsulates this position in his scathing critique of classical philosophers skeptical of the "report of the senses": "But here was their chief error; they charged the deceit upon the Senses; which in my judgment are very sufficient to certify and report truth." For Bacon, the "report of the senses" was the basis of all human knowledge, and they served as accurate scientific instruments capable of "certifying" and "reporting" truth. In both accounts, whether of the "furious influence" of an increasingly voluptuous sensory desire, or of the scientific and perspectival optimism about the epistemological clarity of the senses, the senses were emphatically defined by a state of richness and plentitude, verging on excess.

Davies' *Nosce Teipsum* is such an intriguing and enigmatic poem because it decisively rejects both predominant Renaissance positions understanding the senses in terms of their baroque richness, either as "more" sensual pleasure leading to rebellion, or "more" sensory clarity leading to a more perfect state of human knowledge. Davies is the only Renaissance thinker I have been able to find who defines the senses in terms of their paucity and the bareness of their function. No other Renaissance theorist of the Aristotelian faculties even remotely claims that the senses completely fail to function by default in a normal, non-pathological state. *Nosce Teipsum* is the only Renaissance text on the soul asserting that senses fail to such a catastrophic extent that they return empty handed, with absolutely no information to guide reason in her capacity as monarch of the body politic, even if the person is not deaf or blind. Davies goes to great lengths to describe the extremely difficult circumstances defining the soul understood as a political state, but does not argue that the empire of the soul is failing because of sensory excess and passionate rebellion. Rather, Davies presents a pathetic vision of reason as a monarch existing in completely isolation, and indeed imprisonment, relying disproportionately on the weak and barely functioning power of the senses as the only source of information. The senses are so vitiated that they either blatantly lie to the monarch, or they can only retrieve a modicum of sense data barely above the threshold for life. Davies' dystopian model of the soul articulates a mode of "bare life," where the ruling faculty of reason is forced to make important decisions in

---


an imprisoned and blind state, struggling with a dearth of sensory data about the outside world and her foreign territories. Davies argues that the commonplace descriptions of the human soul as a perpetual state of civil war, with the senses and passions rising up in arms against the iron fist of reason, fails to understand the actual problems plaguing human life. In Davies' psychological dystopia, reason is an abject imperial monarch, a pathetically isolated and impotent figure, greatly indebted to his sensory agents and "spies" paralyzed by feebleness and decrepitude, and not the power of passionate excess or epistemological clarity. In Nosce Teipsum, Davies figures the human soul as an empire that is barely holding on to life.30

This dystopian vision of the soul is precisely why Davies classifies his poem as an elegy, or an "oracle expounded in two elegies." Davies does not trumpet the rule of reason through a political allegory, as Spenser does in the Faerie Queene. Davies mourns the utter failure of using the political state, and specifically the empire with foreign territories in regions "abroad," as the privileged model for understanding the faculties of the soul. Davies' elegiac critique of the soul figured as the imperial state ultimately leads to a grim sense of hollowness, where individuals are profoundly alienated from themselves.

For why should we the busy Soul believe,  
When boldly she concludes of that and this;  
When of her self she can no Judgment give,  
Nor how, nor whence, nor where, nor what she is?

All things without, which round about we see,  
We seek to know, and have therewith to do:  
But that whereby we reason, live and be,  
Within our selves, we Strangers are thereto.

We seek to know the moving of each Sphere,  
And the strange Cause o' th' Ebbs and Floods of Nile;  
But of that Clock which in our Breasts we bear,  
The subtile Motions we forget the while.

We that acquaint our selves with ev'ry Zone,  
And pass the Tropicks, and behold each Pole;  
When we come home, are to our selves unknown,  
And unacquainted still with our own Soul.31

Davies urges the reader to recognize that we cannot trust the "Judgment" or the "conclusions" of the "busy" rational faculty, since the ruling power of the soul is blind to itself. The faculties of the soul are so obsessed with looking outward to "all things without" surrounding the body, that

30 Davies claims that the soul is a ember buried under ash, barely glowing: it “is now become a Sparkle, which doth lie / Under the Ashes, halfe extinct, and dead.” (Nosce Teipsum, 3.5)
31 Davies, Nosce Teipsum, 5.4-6.2.
humans have become "Strangers" to our "selves," possessing no knowledge of "that whereby we reason, live, and be." Davies compares this self-reflexive blindspot to the constant exploratory strivings of empires, which search for the "strange causes" flooding the Nile, travel to foreign "zones, explore the expanses of the "Tropicks" and the "Poles," just as the senses were described as spatially limitless powers capable of traversing the globe. Davies insists that this perpetual cycle of foreign exploration and colonization has no point, since "when we come home, are to our selves unknown." Figuring the faculties of the Aristotelian soul as an empire with foreign territories does not lead to the internal strife of civil war, but rather causes the very different internal fissure of a self-reflexive alienation of the self from the self. In reading Nosce Teipsum, we are prompted to ask ourselves: how can we travel abroad in an attempt to rule like a "prudent Emperor" when we are paralyzed by ignorance of our domestic affairs, and when we urgently need to attend to the problems of our barely living souls?

Before moving on to contrast Davies' position on the problems of the Aristotelian soul's faculties figured as an empire, to the different political organization of the Christian soul as a commonwealth based on consent, it is illuminating to first consider how his skepticism on foreign imperial expansion prior to domestic harmony is directly echoed in his later, and ostensibly imperialist, prose legal texts. In his 1612 Discoverie of the True Causes of why Ireland was never entire subdued, published thirteen years after Nosce Teipsum, and drawing from his experience as the James I's Attorney General in Ireland, Davies presents a political comedy of errors in his narrative of the manifold errors performed by English kings over several centuries of conflict and insurrection in the Irish colonies. The first problem Davies identifies is in the actual execution of the military campaigns against Irish rebels. Since Henry II's conquest of Ireland, successive generations of English monarchs preferred to prosecute wars and to pacify the Irish countryside by proxy, delegating tremendous amounts of power to colonial lords, who possessed so much freedom to govern and to wage war, that they became sovereigns in their own right. For Davies, these Irish, and later English, lords enjoyed so much autonomy that they merely tipped their hat to the king in "tribute," and did not consider themselves to be true subjects of the crown: "And such as pay only Tribute…in the first degree of Subjection, and are not proper Subjects but Soveraignes. For, though they bee lesse and inferiors unto the Prince to whom they pay Tribute, yet they hold all other points of Soveraignty."

Until the military campaigns of Elizabeth I, English kings were so geographically isolated from the political conflict in the Irish colonies, and they delegated far too much power to the native lords, that the colonies slipped out of the crown's control. When the king's agents, like Davies, arrived in Ireland to restore the crown's authority, they were so weak in comparison to the already-established colonial English and Irish lords, that they had no power or authority to turn the Irish population into subjects of English law. This problem of a remote monarch ruling foreign colonies by proxy, and with an excessive reliance on these weakened proxies, is problematic in both the military conquest of Ireland, and in the Queen of Reason's effort to rule in isolation from, but exclusively indebted to, the proxies of the sense faculty. For Davies, the "weak and

32 Davies, John. A Discoverie of the True Causes of why Ireland was never entire subdued, nor brought under obedience of the crowne of England. London: John Jaggard, 1612.
33 Davies, A Discoverie of the True Causes, p. 14.
faint prosecution of the warre" in Ireland echoes the "weak and faint" power of the senses as the Queen of Reason's agents in foreign lands.\textsuperscript{34} Davies consistently argues, both in the political allegorization of the soul as an empire, and in his actual experience in colonial administration in Ireland, that monarchs cannot rule foreign territories remotely and by proxy.

The second major problem in the Irish colonization that Davies identifies is a poor implementation of English common law replacing the Irish \textit{Brehon} law. Davies finds considerable evidence that the Irish citizenry overwhelmingly consented to become subjects obedient to English common law: the Irish people "would gladly be governed by the Lawes of England...they were humble suitors to have the benefit and protection of the English Lawes."\textsuperscript{35} However, the attorneys general of Ireland refused to apply English law to the Irish for centuries, resulting in Irish citizens to be considered "Aliens" and "Enemies" to the law: "the meere Irish were not reputed free subjects...and were not onely accepted Aliens, but Enemies and altogether out of the protection of the Law so as it was no capital offense to kill them."\textsuperscript{36} Without the protections afforded by English law, the Irish were considered to be enemies in their own homes, causing a paranoid mentality of a "perpetual Warre" where the murder of an Irish person was not considered a crime. Even with the overwhelming consent of the Irish people to be protected by common law to bring them out of a state of "perpetual Warre," English kings refused until the reign of Elizabeth I. The bizarre paradox of the Irish people marked as "aliens" and "enemies" in their own homeland, at risk of violence and death, mirrors the failed imperial governance of the Aristotelian soul's faculties, in which humans experience that they as "aliens and "strangers" in their own "selves." Like the difficult English imperial conquest of Ireland, the definition of the human soul in terms of a political state such as an empire leads to paradoxical situations, precisely like the alienation of the self from the self in one's homeland.

The second problem identified by Davies in the course of the Irish conquest - the monarch's rejection of the citizenry's popular consent to subject themselves to law - also reflects his skepticism about the "perpetual Warre" attending colonization. Davies admits that the Irish people did indeed rebel against English rule, but he argues that the root cause of the insurrection was the English refusal to heed their popular consent to be bound by common law. Davies critiques the early modern paranoia about rebellion, both in the government of the faculties, and in the government of colonies, as leading monarchs to shoot themselves in the foot, ironically rejecting the consent of the people to bind themselves to law as obedient subjects, which would have prevented insurrection in the first place. Imperial monarchs are so obsessed with preventing rebellion and mob rule, that they end up causing the rebellion they seek to avoid, by ignoring the binding power of popular consent. Davies argues that the lesson to be learned in both the English colonization of Ireland, and in the failed imperial metaphor of the soul's faculties, is that imperial expansion leads rulers to foolishly disregard the consent of their people, even when the people's consent clamors to be bound and subjected to the king's law.

\textsuperscript{34} Davies, \textit{A Discoverie of the True Causes}, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{35} Davies, \textit{A Discoverie of the True Causes}, p. 115-116.
\textsuperscript{36} Davies, \textit{A Discoverie of the True Causes}, p. 108.
Renegotiating the Christian Soul: Consent and Commonwealth

Davies' dismay over the imperial monarch's deafness to his subjects' pleas to be bound by law leads us to his very different understanding of the Christian soul as a successful model of government based on consent, in contrast to the resounding failure of the Aristotelian soul's empire. Davies argues that unlike the Aristotelian soul's failed system of monarchy, the Christian soul should be understood as a commonwealth derived from the consent of all humans merged into a political "corporation." Davies' reimagination of the Christian soul into a consent-based commonwealth is innovative, because it transforms the basic foundations of the Christian faith - original sin, immortality, and the promise of salvation - from non-negotiable laws fixed by God, into matters that are true because all humans unanimously consent for them to be true. If the Aristotelian soul's model of imperial rule is broken, with the "Queen" of the rational faculty erratically governing in isolation and disconnected from the lower faculties, the Christian soul, redefined by Davies in terms of the more viable model of political consent, is far more successful. In finding an alternative to the failure of imperial monarchy as a way to figure the soul, Davies rethinks the nature of the Christian soul's original sin and its promise of immortality, the two major theological issues that triggered the crisis of two souls in the early sixteenth century, as described in the first chapter. Davies is far more radical than his readers have given him credit for, particularly because his poetry opens up the governance of the Christian soul to consent, in dramatic contrast to the prevailing Protestant doctrine of God's law as iron chains binding the soul in a state of imprisonment that served as the theological crux of the previous two chapters. In this dominant Protestant narrative of the Christian soul, humans are bound by God's extremely stringent and punitive law, subjecting the Christian soul to a state of perpetual imprisonment and torture, with absolutely no power of negotiation, regardless of whether one stands among the elect or the damned. In this standard Protestant account, God is an absolute dictator, predetermining the fates of all souls, and although he gives humans some choice, our fallen souls would always inevitably choose to sin, leading to damnation. The Protestant doctrine of predestination stripped Christian subjects of free will, and their redefinition of original sin as a spiritual cancer irresistibly compelling our souls down a path of sin, necessitates an iron-fisted God that rules tyrannically over our souls to save us from our own weakness and depravity. Davies forcefully challenges this popular Protestant account of the bound and shackled soul, but in a different way than Shakespeare did in the previous chapter. Davies does turn to the freedom of the Aristotelian soul to be molded by theatrical rhetoric, but rather directly changes our understanding of the Christian soul, by renegotiating central issues such as immortality, original sin, and the promise of salvation into matters determined by the popular consent of all Christian subjects, and not incontrovertibly fixed by the punitive law of God.

---

37 This Protestant account of the always-imprisoned soul is explained in the introduction to the previous chapter on *Hamlet.*

38 Davies clearly opposes the Calvinist model of election in *Nosce Teipsum:* “For what is Man without a moving Mind, / Which hath a judging Wit, and chusing Will? / Now, if God's Pow'r should her Election bind, / Her Motions then would cease, and stand all still.../ Love must free-hearted be, and voluntary; / And not inchanted, or by Fate constrain'd” (47.1-3)
Particularly important for Davies is a renegotiation of the scar of original sin in terms of political contract. For all of the major Protestant thinkers studied in the previous two chapters - Luther, Calvin, Melanchthon, Woolton, Perkins, and Hooker - original sin was a problem of the Aristotelian soul. For them, original sin was the scar of the fall burned deeply into the faculties of the Aristotelian soul, in their decayed and diseased sinful condition. In the standard Protestant account, the Aristotelian soul's change after the fall is the cause of man's depraved state. The scar of original sin is so deep, that individual human cannot change the nature of the faculties; they can only attempt to bind the sinful faculties in chains. Davies contests this ubiquitous narrative turning the soul's faculties into the substrate of original sin, arguing that the fall has nothing to do with the Aristotelian soul. Rather, he argues that original sin was the original motivation for uniting all Christian souls into a corporate entity, like a political state.

For as that easie Law was giv'n to all,
To Ancestor and Heir, to First and Last;
So was the first Transgression general;
And all did pluck the Fruit, and all did taste.

Of this we find some Foot-steps in our Law,
Which doth her Root from God and Nature take;
Ten thousand Men she doth together draw,
And of them all, one Corporation make:

Yet these, and their Successors, are but one;
And if they gain, or lose their Liberties,
They harm, or profit not themselves alone,
But such as in succeeding Times shall rise.39

The "easie Law" forbidding eating the apple was not only given to Adam and Eve, but "was given to all, To Ancestor and Heir, to First and Last." The breaking of God's law did not happen once, in a mythical prelapsarian past, with modern humans only living in the aftermath or negative consequences of the fall. For Davies, the actual act of transgression continues to occur for all of human time. So Davies calls the "first Transgression," the original act of breaking God's law, "general." It was not only Eve who tasted the fruit; we all continue to taste the apple and break the law: "we all did taste." The "general" nature of man's disobedience applied to all of humanity is explained by Davies in a political analogy to the formation of a commonwealth, finding the "Foot-steps" of the unifying power of the fall in "our Law." For Davies, the fall does not lead to the scar of sin emblazoned upon the faculties of the Aristotelian soul, but rather leads to the incorporation of all Christian souls into a unified political state. in the establishment of the political contract, "Ten thousand Men" are "drawn together" by the unifying power of law into "one Corporation," turning thousands of individual subjects into one corporate body across successive generations: "these, and their Successors, are but one." Therefore the original act of

39 Davies, Nosce Teipsum, 43.5-44.2.
breaking God's law binds all humans across time to that law, uniting them into a "Corporation" of the fallen. As one incorporated political body, the destinies of all Christian souls are bound together, for better or worse. If the "Corporation" of fallen Christian subjects "gain, or lose their Liberties," they "harm or profit" as one entity, and not as a federation of individual subjects. By redefining the original transgression of breaking God's law as a form of contract unifying all Christian souls into a political union of the fallen, Davies rejects the widely-accepted story of the fall as a decisive moment of rupture, alienating humans from God's love and dividing humans within their own souls, in the fissure between the sinful condition of the Aristotelian soul and the redeemable state of the Christian soul. In Davies' revised story of the fall, original sin was not a foundational act of rupture splitting the soul in two, but rather a decisive moment for unification, incorporating all Christian souls bound by the breaking of the law into a commonwealth of the fallen. In a sense, Davies turns the breaking of God's law into the motivating force creating the conditions for the incorporation of all Christian souls into one unified political body bound by that law, which "gains" and "loses" their "liberties" as a commonwealth. When humanity "rises" at the moment of judgment, they will be able to "rise" together only because they were united into a commonwealth of Christian souls superseding the demands of individual nations or of time and place. While the binding of all Christian souls into subjects beholden to God's law caused by original sin initially seems like a punishment, such a political incorporation creates the possibility of the fallen Christian soul's redemption in the future.

Davies consistently uses the vocabulary of political "Corporation" in *Nosce Teipsum* exclusively in relation to the central concepts defining the Christian, and not Aristotelian, soul. In a manner similar to his reimagination of original sin as a catalyst for the incorporation of Christian souls into a commonwealth of the fallen, Davies understands the Christian soul to be immortal only to the extent that all humans "assent" for it to be immortal.

Doubtless, all Souls have a surviving Thought,  
Therefore of Death we think with quiet Mind;  
But if we think of being turn'd to nought,  
A trembling Horrour in our Souls we find.  
[...]
If then all Souls, both good and bad, do teach,  
With gen'ral Voice, That Souls can never die;  
'Tis not Man's flatt'ring Gloss, but Nature's Speech,  
Which, like GOD's Oracles, can never lye.

*Hence springs* that universal strong Desire,  
Which all Men have of Immortality:  
Not some few Spirits unto this Thought aspire,  
But all Men's Minds in this united be.

Then this Desire of Nature is not vain,  
She covets not Impossibilities;
Fond Thoughts may fall into some idle Brain,
But one Assent of all, is ever wise.\(^{40}\)

Davies argues that all souls are by their very nature driven by the instinct of self-preservation, or as he puts it, a "surviving Thought." The desire of Christian souls to "survive" responds directly to the thought of its opposite, of being reduced to nothingness after death ("of being turn'd to nought"), which provokes a sense of terror in all humans: "a trembling Horrour in our souls we find." The Christian soul is so powerfully motivated by "survival" and is so terrified by the "trembling Horrour" of complete negation after death, that Davies concludes that all souls, regardless of whether they are "good" or "bad," unite in a "gen'ral Voice" in insisting that "Souls can never die." The revulsion and fear provoked by the "trembling Horrour" of pure negation unites all Christian souls, regardless of their prospects for salvation, in voicing the "universal strong Desire" for immortality. Like the commonwealth of the fallen in which all Christian souls unite in consenting to the political "Corporation" precipitated by original sin, the unanimous desire for immortality motivated by the "trembling Horrour" caused by thinking of death as a negation, links all Christian souls by a common cause. Davies insists that the fear of nothingness is so powerful, that not only a "few spirits" or a patchwork of Christian souls "aspire" to immortality; he argues that "all Men's Minds in this united be." Just as in the "Corporation" binding all fallen Christian souls into a united commonwealth that suffers and profits as a single unit, Davies argues that the universal desire for immortality constitutes "one Assent for all," binding all Christian souls in a corporation of the immortal.

The possibility of immortality by "assent" is significant for Davies because it takes on the value of absolute truth, and the irrefutable status of "God's Oracles." The unified "Assent" of all Christian souls affirming immortality is not a mere "flattering gloss" or a "vain" form of false desire. Davies asserts that because the "Assent" is universal, agreed to by all Christian souls, it must be true. Therefore immortality is not so much a promise given by God, but rather an emergent form of truth, coalescing from the unanimity of all Christian souls bound by "one Assent" confirming that the soul's immortality is indeed true. This assent is emergent because the agreement of all souls takes on the truth-value of God's law and is "ever wise." The claims Davies makes in this sequence are startling, particularly in his assertion that the wisdom of individual subjects "Assenting" and "uniting" can make a concept such as immortality true because their common voice declares it to be true. Therefore the most characteristic trait of the Christian soul, its immortality, is not something firmly imposed by God's law, but is rather forged in a form of self-fulfilling prophecy, where the unanimous "Assent" of all Christian souls confirming immortality simply reflects the fact that the soul is indeed immortal. In redefining the Christian soul as the basis of a "Corporation" uniting fallen humans into an organization like a political commonwealth based on consent, Davies transmutes the seemingly immutable truths of the Christian faith, such as original sin and immortality, into matters determined to be true by the unanimity of "Assent" shared by all souls. In \textit{Nosce Te ipsum}, Davies modifies the conventional understanding of the conditions binding the fate of the Christian soul - its original state of sin and
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its promise of immortality - from fixed truths dictated by the law of God, into concepts that are negotiated and given the value of truth by the power of "Assent" and the incorporation of all humans into a commonwealth of souls.

In making these claims, Davies anticipates a predictable counterargument, which suggests that the immortality of the Christian soul, and its promise of salvation and the threat of damnation, is simply a lie disseminated by political rulers to trick their citizens into a fearful state of virtue and obedience. This line of reasoning attempting to debunk the immortality of the Christian soul is precisely what made the "noble lie" arguments of Pomponazzi in the first chapter so controversial.

Well, well, say these vain Spirits, thought vain it is
To think our Souls to Heav'n or Hell do go;
Politick Men have thought it not amiss,
To spread this Lye, to make Men virtuous so.

Do you then think this Moral Virtue good?
I think you do, ev'n for your private Gain;
For Commonwealts by Virtue ever stood,
And common Good the private doth contain.

If then this Virtue you do love so well,
Have you no Means, her Practice to maintain;
But you this Lye must to the People tell,
That good Souls live in Joy, and Ill in Pain?

Must Virtue be preserved by a Lye?
[...]
For, how can that be false, which ev'ry Tongue
Of ev'ry mortal Man affirms for true? [the general consent]
Which Truth hath in all Ages been so strong,
As, Load-Stone-like, all Hearts it ever drew.

For, not the Christian, or the Jew alone,
The Persian, or the Turk, acknowledge this;
This Mystery to the wild Indian known,
And to the Canibal and Tartar is.

This rich Assyrian Drug grows ev'ry where;
As common in the North, as in the East:
[...]
None that acknowledge God, or Providence,
Their Souls Eternity did ever doubt;
For all Religion takes Root from hence,  
Which no poor naked Nation lives without.\textsuperscript{41}

Davies decry's "vain spirits" such as Pomponazzi, who argued that the immortal fate of the Christian soul, either as the reward of salvation in "Heav'n" or the punishment of damnation in "Hell," is simply a "Lye" spread by rulers and "Politick Men" to "make Men virtuous."\textsuperscript{42} If the immortality of the soul is simply a political lie used to manipulate citizens into virtuous behavior through deceptive means, can this "moral virtue" still be considered "good"? Davies turns Pomponazzi's noble lie argument on its head, by surprisingly answering in the affirmative: "I think you do." Unlike Pomponazzi, and all of his outraged critics who feared the negative consequences of the Christian soul's immortality understood as a political fiction, Davies argues in this sequence that the political lie need not be a worrisome problem. If the Christian soul is understood in terms of a commonwealth, and not in terms of absolute truth determined by God's law, then the condition of the soul is far more flexible than theologians have traditionally assumed. Davies states that the Christian soul's immortality does not have to be proved in relation to the rigid standard of divine law, but rather must correspond to very different standard of the "common Good." If the political lie of immortality contributes to the good of the "Commonwealth" of Christian souls, then concept of immortality, regardless of its truth value, is useful. Therefore according to Davies, even if the immortality of the Christian soul is a political lie, if the citizens of the commonwealth agree to its truth, then the deception doesn't detract from the value of the concept in supporting the "common Good." For Davies, the "good" derived from the idea of immortality in unifying a commonwealth of souls is far more important than the rigid standard of truth and falsity applied to God's law. In moving the soul's immortality from the fixity of God's law to the consent of commonwealth, Davies argues that the virtue of the "common Good," and not the veridical standard of truth and lies, is the most useful way to think about the Christian soul.

Moreover, Davies asserts that the distinction between truth and lies in the evaluation of the Christian soul's immortality is inconsequential, because the agreement of all souls merged in "Assent" to the truth of immortality gives the idea its entire truth value as a unifying force across nations and religions. He asserts that "every Tongue of every mortal man" affirms the immortality of the soul to be true, emphasizing the point in his marginal gloss the affirmation constitutes the "general consent." In articulating the nature of the soul's "general consent," Davies makes a massive claim, in stating that not only the commonwealth of Christian souls, but indeed all souls and all humans, across religions and races, "acknowledge" the truth of the soul's immortality. The "general consent" is not limited to the Judeo-Christian tradition, but encompasses the "Persian," the "Turk," the "wild Indian," the "Canibal and Tartar," linking all souls across the globe. The commonwealth created by the "general consent" affirming the truth of the immortal soul is not restricted to Christian souls, but indeed establishes the conditions for

\textsuperscript{41} Davies, \textit{Nosce Teipsum}, 102.2-103.5.  
a global empire of souls. If Davies models the Aristotelian soul in terms of an empire that fails to adequately govern its foreign territories, the only force capable of paralleling the "general consent" of a commonwealth on a truly global scale is the magnetic power of immortality as a "Load-Stone" irresistibly attracting all souls. Far from being a pernicious lie disrupting the stability of commonwealths, as claimed in the "noble lie" line of reasoning, Davies asserts that the "general consent" of all souls across the globe unanimously confirming the "soul's eternity" is the founding condition of religion, which he identifies to be the bedrock of all political states. Without the concept of the soul's immortality as the "root" of all religions, states would be "poor naked nations" and would not enjoy the "general consent" of its subjects. Davies therefore argues that it is the "general consent" of all souls agreeing to the truth of immortality that motivates the foundation of commonwealths. For Davies, the "Corporation" or "commonwealth" forged in the unanimous agreement upon the Christian soul's immortality is the foundation of a successful model of the political state, in contrast to the failed system of imperial monarchy enforced through arbitrary rule or legal coercion that Davies uses to figure the Aristotelian soul, and that is the primary metaphor of the body politic used by most Christian thinkers.

The Political Science of the Soul: Dancing in Harmony to Lyric Meter

It is worth taking stock here of how far we've come by this point in revising the conventional understanding of Davies as a straightforward conservative defender of absolute royal prerogative, explained most commonly in the metaphor of the body politic with the rational brain or head as monarch, and his subjects as the subservient parts of the body. Davies' figuration of the Aristotelian soul and its faculties makes the case that absolutist monarchy is a fundamentally flawed system of government, because it is based on a farcically poor system of bureaucracy where the ruler, isolated from the social realities of her kingdom, blatantly ignores the facts presented by the lower faculties, and makes decisions wielding an arbitrary royal power directly contradicting the reports of her agents. For Davies, ruling in isolation from one's subjects, and in direct contradiction to the information provided by those subjects, is no way to govern effectively. He turns instead to the Christian soul's far more promising model of psychological governance by "general consent" of the unanimous chorus of all souls affirming the truth of basic concepts such as original sin and immortality. Although Davies acknowledges that original sin is a negative fact of human existence, he disagrees with the Protestant theologians studied in the first chapter who understood the fall as a indelible scar burned into the corrupt function of the Aristotelian faculties. Davies argues, to the contrary, that the fall has a positive benefit of uniting all Christian souls into a commonwealth of the fallen. If fallen Christian souls are one day to be saved, this salvation is only possible because of the unification of their souls into a "Corporation" that suffers and profits together. It is precisely in this unified system of commonwealth, the "Corporation" of souls, that all Christian subjects agree to the immortality of the soul. In these surprising moves, Davies opens up seemingly immutable concepts governing the fate of the Christian soul, such as original sin and immortality, into matters negotiated in the transformation of the "general consent" of all souls into foundation of a "Corporation" or "commonwealth" of Christian souls united in agreement that these ideas take on the value of truth or law. Far from justifying a system of absolute monarchy underwritten by a
divine justification of royal prerogative to understand the workings of the two souls, Davies' poetry unexpectedly opens up the laws governing the soul to the popular consent involved in creating a commonwealth, and uses the power of "general consent" as a latent critique of empire as the wrong way to model the kingdom of the soul. *Nosce Teipsum* uses the two-souls paradox as a way to illuminate the sharp difference between the limitations of imperial monarchy, and the uniting force of "consent" in establishing commonwealths as a far more promising system of government.

Davies ultimately attempts to use the stark difference between the two souls and their associated systems of government as a way to rethink the possibilities and limitations of English monarchy in the waning years of Tudor rule. In *Nosce Teipsum* and *Orchestra*, Davies harnesses the tension between these two completely different models of psychological governance as a way to articulate an unprecedented opportunity to reimagine English society as a commonwealth resembling the commonwealth of Christian souls and learning the lessons of the Aristotelian soul's failed empire. In his attempt to reconcile the two souls and their wildly different models of government, Davies identifies the importance of lyric poetry as a binding force capable of transforming the fractured state of the Aristotelian soul into a political harmony matching the "general consent" of the Christian soul's commonwealth. The key for Davies is refiguring the ruling faculty of reason as a poet or bard playing the lower vegetative and sensory faculties as instruments producing the harmony of a lyric song.

Her Harmonies are sweet, and full of Skill,  
When on the Body's Instruments she plays;  
But the Proportions of the *Wit* and *Will*,  
Those sweet Accords are even th' Angels Lays.

These Tunes of *Reason* are *Amphion's Lyre*,  
Wherewith he did the *Thebanean* City found.  
[...]  
Thus the *Soul* tunes the *Body's Instruments*,  
These Harmonies she makes with *Life* and *Sense*;  
The Organs fit are by the Body lent,  
But th' *Actions* flow from the *Soul's Influence*.

In his revised metaphor of the Aristotelian soul, the rational faculty is no longer a monarch ruling by "Royal Will" over the sensory and vegetative faculties cast as powerless subjects. In this passage, Davies argues that we should rethink the rational faculty in the alternative idiom of a bard "tuning" the body's "Organs" as musical instruments in order to create "Harmonies" with the vegetative faculty (responsible for maintaining "Life") and the sensory faculty ("Sense"). In this new system of metaphors, the musical instruments of the lower faculties and their associated "Organs" that have been "lent" to the rational faculty to produce "sweet" harmonies and the

---
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"Tunes of Reason." The harmony of these musical "Tunes" reflects the creation of a harmony between the different faculties of the Aristotelian soul.\textsuperscript{44} The change in the state of the Aristotelian soul's faculties, from discord to harmony, is registered in Davies' new understanding of Wit and Will, the two cognitive faculties that were haplessly confused mid-level bureaucrats in the imperial model of rule, who now function in "proportion" and in "sweet Accord" with the other faculties. For Davies, the "sweet Accord" of the Aristotelian faculties produced in this new model of lyric song, and not imperial rule, can be compared - it is "even" - to the song of "Angels." By redefining the faculty of reason as a bard "tuning" and "playing" the faculties of "Life and Sense" and the "Organs" of the Aristotelian soul, Davies identifies a form of lyric harmony laying the groundwork for the psychological harmony regulating the "proportion" of the faculties to one another, paralleling the ordered unity of the Christian commonwealth. Davies gives the "Tunes of Reason" and the harmony of the Aristotelian faculties produced in this model of lyric song a decisively political edge in his identification of the instruments as "Amphion's Lyre." The faculties and organs of the Aristotelian soul figured as musical instruments working together to create a lyric harmony function like the lyre of Amphion in creating a city state. In appropriating Amphion's creation of the "Theban City's" political union through his musical harmony, Davies defines the creation of the political state as the act of playing a lyre, transforming political creation into a \textit{lyric} mode. Davies' revised model of the relation between the Aristotelian faculties as the creation of lyric harmony reffigures the soul as an entity to be governed in terms of the political harmony of a city state, like Thebes, and not an empire. The lyric harmony created by "tuning" the faculties and organs like an instrument serves as the basis of \textit{Nosce Teipsum}'s transformation of the Aristotelian soul into the different political framework of the city state based on "accord" and "proportion" and not the internal division and dissidence besieging the poem's initial model of empire.

The power of political creation represented in the "lyre" is important for Davies because it can transform the internal harmony of the Aristotelian soul's faculties into a model for civil order and the foundation of political states. In his 1596 poem \textit{Orchestra}, Davies argues that the "harmony" and "proportion" of the faculties is in fact a form of dancing structured by the meter and harmony of lyric.\textsuperscript{45} The "dance" of the Aristotelian soul's faculties enables an evolution from the lower faculties to reason, leading animals to become rational humans, and eventually leading humans to coalesce into social arrangements based on "consent."\textsuperscript{46}

For what did he who with his ten-tong'd Lute
Gaue Beasts and blocks an understanding eare?
Or rather into bestiall minds and brute
Shed and infus'd the beames of reason cleare?
Doubtlesse for men that rude and sauage were
A ciuill forme of dauncing he deuis'd,
VVherewith vnto their Gods they sacrific'd.

So did Musaeus, so Amphion did,
And Linus with his sweet enchanting song
[...]
And Theseus to his wood-borne slaues among
Vs'd dauncing as the finest pollicie
To plant religion and societie.
[...]
Loe this is Dauncings true nobilitie.
Dauncing the child of Musick and of Loue,
Dauncing it selfe both loue and harmony,
VVhere all agree, and all in order moue;
Dauncing the Art that all Arts doe approue:
The faire Caracter of the worlds consent,
The heau'ns true figure, and th'earths ornament.
[...]
For that true Loue which dauncing did inuent,
Is he that tun'd the worlds whole harmony,
And linkt all men in sweet societie.47

In *Orchestra*, Davies uses the example of Orpheus as an example of a bard, who through the power of his "ten-tong'd Lute" could not only create a harmony between the faculties, but could imbue the lower faculties with the power to evolve into the higher faculty of reason. The conversion of lower faculties to higher, more rational ones, involves an ascension up the taxonomy of creatures, from animals to humans. Orpheus' powerful mode of song was capable of transforming "Beasts" possessing only the faculties of nutrition and sense, and without the power of reason, and "rude and savage" men, into rational humans. Orpheus' song enabled the sense organs, and specifically the "ear" limited to the sense of hearing, to evolve into an "understanding eare," or a sense made more powerful by the capacity for reason. The lyric mode Davies describes in *Orchestra* encompasses the transformative power to sublimate "bestial" and "brute" creatures dominated by the lower faculty of sense into the higher state of the rational faculty's "understanding." Lyric is therefore incredibly powerful in Davies' estimation because it not only bridges the chasm between the different faculties of the Aristotelian soul into a musical harmony, but it is powerful enough to refine lower faculties such as sensation into the higher faculty of reason.

The evolution of mere sensory "beasts" into rational humans that Davies describes serves as his primary account of how humans move from the state of animals to becoming social beings. According to Davies, humans do not enter into social arrangements such as the political commonwealth through war or legal contract, as is conventionally claimed. Davies surprisingly locates the origins of society in the power of lyric to refine the Aristotelian faculties into a condition where reason, and not the lower faculties of sense or nutrition, guide human decision-making. In the narrative of social formation Davies recounts, the harmony and eventual refinement of the soul's faculties through the transformative power of song is the basis of civil society. The refinement and evolution of the faculties provoked by song leads to the creation of society because the harmony of lyric stimulates humans to "dance." The rhythm and melody of song motivates a "civil form of dancing" that is the foundation of the political state in Davies' mind. To prove this somewhat surprising logic of cause and effect leading from the evolution of the Aristotelian faculties by song, to the "dance" that is civil society, Davies cites the examples of classical Greek poets and politicians, such as Musaeus, Amphion (whose "Lyre" was cited above in Nosce Teipsum in the founding of Thebes), Linus, and Theseus, who all used the power of "enchanting song" coupled with the allure of "dauncing" as the "finest pollicie" creating the conditions to "plant religion and societie" among humans. Davies draws from both Greek poets (Orpheus, Musaeus, and Linus) and heroic rulers of cities (Amphion and Theseus) to demonstrate that poetry and song should be considered as potent instruments in the establishment of political rule and the creation of city states, and are not simply aesthetic ornaments divorced from questions of power. For Davies, "dauncing" is an important matter of "pollicie" and the most effective means of uniting rational humans into the political arrangements necessary for civil society. The "dance" provoked by lyric is an aesthetically-charged mechanism of transforming "brute" humans into rational political subjects.

The state of nature Davies describes in Orchestra, then, is not the "war where every man is enemy to every man" in the Hobbesian sense. Rather, the movement from the state of nature to the formation of civil society involves the transformation and refinement of the Aristotelian soul's faculties through the harmony of lyric and song. Davies recounts the story of the soul's evolution, from a mode of being governed by the lower faculties of raw sense and the brute urges of the vegetative faculty, to a mode of rational being uniting humans in the harmony of "societie." Such a refinement of the Aristotelian faculties leading to the harmony of civil society is precipitated by the harmony of lyric song, and the power of the "dauncing" provoked by that song, leading humans into the coordinated set of movements in space that Davies defines as political "consent." In the "consent" emergent from the "civill forme of dancing," Davies argues that "all agree" and "all in order move." For Davies, dancing in harmony is the master trope of political unity, serving as the template or "faire Caracter" of the "worlds consent." The "worlds whole harmony" and the ability of humans to be "linkt" into "sweet societie" relies on the power of dancing to turn scattered and isolated individuals living in a state of brute sensation and

visceral urges, into political subjects using their rational faculty to coalesce into an enormous collective dance that Davies imagines to be civil society.

For Davies, then, the genesis of political consent is not based on the tradition of law, which one might assume given his career as a common law jurist. Rather, Davies identifies the origin of society in the ancient ability of lyric to reshape the faculties of the Aristotelian soul from a brute state dominated by the lower faculties, to a state of consenting political subjectivity governed by the decisions of the rational faculty. Davies' imagination of the political is at its heart a psychology, a transformation of the Aristotelian soul's faculties from animalistic sense to political reason, inflected by the aesthetic power of lyric to create harmonious arrangements within the soul, and between individuals in society. Orchestra therefore construes political harmony as a harmony of the soul enabled by lyric; political consent is a psychology, and not necessarily a legal contract. The power of lyric song to harmonize and refine the faculties of the Aristotelian soul serves as the basis of the "civill forme of dauncing" that unites humans into "societie," compelling humans to "all agree" and "all in order move" in consent. According to Davies, the political consent undergirding civil society is a massive dance regulated by lyric.

I have been consistently calling the "song" identified by Davies as the means to harmonize the previously discordant faculties of the Aristotelian soul and to convert the lesser faculties into the higher faculty of political reason, as lyric since Orchestra specifies that the music in question is literally produced by a lyre, but more importantly because poetic language and meter, and not just instrumental melody, structures the "civill forme of dauncing" uniting humans into society. Note that in the previously cited passage, Davies describes Orpheus' lute as a "ten-tong'd", and not a ten-stringed, instrument. The "enchanting song" compelling humans to dance in ordered social arrangements is produced by the "tongue," and is composed of the metrically organized language of lyric, and not just a catchy tune. Davies frequently reminds his reader that he privileges the power of dancing since it is an evocative way to incarnate the metrical organization of poetic language, turning words on the page into living, leaping bodies:

\[\text{VVhat shall I name those currant trauases} \\
\text{That on a triple Dactyle foote doe run} \\
\text{Close by the ground with slyding passages,} \\
\text{VVWherein that Dauncer greatest prayse hath won} \\
[...] \\
\text{Yet is ther one the most delightfull kind,} \\
\text{A lofty iumping, or a leaping round,} \\
\text{VVWhere arme in arme, two Dauncers are entwind,} \\
\text{And whirle themselues with strict embracements bound,} \\
\text{And still their feet an Anapest do sound:} \\
\text{An Anapest is all theyr musicks song,} \\
\text{VVWhose first two feet are short, & third is long.}\]

\[49\] Davies, Orchestra, Stanzas 69-70.
Davies figures the various metrical feet governing the organization of versified language as different dance moves. So the "triple" stressed syllables of the "Dactyle foote" correspond to the dancer's foot sliding across the ground as the metrical pulse "slydes" across the language of the passage, and the galloping rhythm of the "Anapest" or the Antidactylus in which the "first two feet are short, and the third is long," approximates "two Dauncers" locked "arme in arme" joyfully "jumping" and "leaping round." In both metrical arrangements, the dancers are "bound" in a "strict embracement" following the rules of poetic meter. It is not surprising that Davies turns the metrical organization of lyric poetry as the master discourse to explain the mechanics of dancing, since he is himself writing in the lyric mode in Nosce Teipsum and Orchestra, and not choosing to dance in front of the reader, to prove his point about the political life of the two souls. Davies himself that among all disciplines involved in the "teaching" of dancing, poetry is the preeminent discourse in explicating how language structures the metrical organization of dance.

And those great Maisters of the liberall Arts
In all their seuerall Schooles doe Dauncing teach:
For humble Grammer first doth set the parts
Of congruent and well-according speach:
Which Rhetorick whose state yce clouds doth reach,
And heav'nly Poetry doe forward lead,
And diuers Measures, diuersly doe tread.50

Several "Schooles" are capable of "teaching" dancing among the "liberall Arts." At the most basic level, "humble Grammer" sets the fundamental structure of "speach," which "Rhetorick" attempts to raise language to the lofty heights of the "clouds." However, the path to understanding the mechanics of dancing as it relates to the formation of political consent is "lead" by "heav'nly Poetry," whose "Measures" step forward, "treading" as feet dancing across the ground and as syllables sliding across the page. In this manner, Davies specifies that the "dance" he is interested in describing is a dance regulated by the meter of lyric poetry, and not exclusively defined by instrumental music. In a manner similar to John Donne in the following chapter, Davies gives a tremendous amount of power to the poet as the unique conductor of the metrical rhythm of language and song that governs the harmony of the soul's faculties and unites humans into the political dance of consent.

Davies clinches his argument on the political consent created by the organized metrical regularity of dancing by stating that the civil society formed in the previously cited account is the model of commonwealth that Tudor England has inherited.

Thus they who first did found a common-weale,
And they who first Religion did ordaine,

50 Davies, Orchestra, Stanza 92.
By dauncing first the peoples harts did steale,  
Of whom we now a thousand tales doe faine.  
Yet doe we now their perfect rules retaine,  
And vse then still in such deuises new  
As in the world long since their withering grew.  
[...]  
The richest Iewell in all the heau'ny Treasure  
That euery yet vnto the Earth was shouwne,  
Is perfect Concord, th'onely perfect pleasure  
That wretched Earth-borne men haue euery knouwne,  
For many harts it doth compound in one:  
That what so one doth will, or speake, or doe,  
VVith one consent they all agree thereto.

Concords true picture shineth in thyys Art,  
VVhere diuers men and women ranked be,  
And euery one doth dauncse a seuerall part,  
Yet all as one, in measure doe agree,  
Obseruing perfect vniformitie:  
All turne together, all together trace,  
And all together honor and embrace.51

In these stanzas from Orchestra, our reading of Davies has come full circle. Davies argues that the formation of the "common-weale" and the first establishment of religion were contemporaneous events in a mythical political past. In both of these foundational acts of social genesis, dancing was the compelling power forceful enough, and possessing enough universal appeal, to "steale" people's "harts." In Davies' account here, we hear echoes of his previous rejection of the "noble lie" line of reasoning on the nature of the Christian soul's immortality, forwarded by figures like Pomponazzi. In refuting the "noble lie" hypothesis, we have already seen that Davies argued that it matters little if the immortality of the Christian soul is a lie, as long as the idea of immortality supports the "common good" and binds all Christian souls into a union bound in agreement about immortality. As long as all Christian souls agree upon the issue of immortality, then it takes on the status of truth. Here, Davies uses a similar mode of reasoning in claiming that the first act of political and religious union binding people into a "common-weale" was an organized dance. It matters little if the principles of the commonwealth or the tenets of the religion are incontrovertibly true, as long as everyone dances to its tune. Davies suggests, just as in the "noble lie" of immortality, that the foundation of the commonwealth and the "first Religion" wasn't necessarily true, since the act of political genesis "stole" the people's hearts, and did not buy them in an equitable transaction. The birth of the commonwealth and religion was an act of breaking, and not making, contract. Regardless of the nature of the theft at the commingled origin of commonwealth and religion, the result was political unity in the form

51 Davies, Orchestra, Stanzas 86; 109-110.
of dancing that Davies reveals to be the basis of the English commonwealth as it existed in Tudor England: "yet do we now their perfect rules retaine." Even if the formation of the commonwealth and the "first Religion" were based on an act of massive theft or deception, it matters little because the English people have inherited the "rules" governing the "dance" of the people into a civil polity, and they have no alternative. Regardless of the possibility of a broken transaction, a theft, at the foundation of society, Davies asserts that the model of dancing is necessary for political life because it is the only way of creating "perfect Concord" in the fallen world, since it is capable of "compounding" many "harts" into "one consent" in which citizens "all agree thereto." The poetic "Art" of orchestrating the metrical harmony of lyric, which irresistibly compels all citizens to "agree" in "measure," constitutes the "true picture" of "concord" in the fallen world. For Davies then, the commonwealth of fallen souls described in his account of original sin by consent, is ultimately a commonwealth governed by its subjects dancing in "measure." The dystopian vision of the Aristotelian faculties misgoverned as an empire ruled by the rational faculty abiding by the principles of absolutist monarchy presented in Nosce Teipsum is offset by Davies' alternative utopian account of a truly harmonious commonwealth as the massive dance of its subjects into a unified state of political consent in Orchestra. The utopian horizon of Davies' political vision is the commonwealth that "all turns together, all together trace, / and all together honor and embrace." In Orchestra, Davies asserts the power of the poet to inscribe the "measure" of lyric organizing the dance of the commonwealth as the most powerful "Art" of political "Concord," perhaps superseding even law and faith.

In arguing that England has "retained" the "rules" established in the mythical origin of the political dance, Davies also applies this model of the fallen commonwealth to the specific history of English government. Davies therefore retells the narrative of the creation of fallen societies in general, through the power of lyrical harmony to transform the lower faculties of the Aristotelian soul into the political faculty of reason agreeing to dance in a political union, as the specific genealogy of the English commonwealth which he later comes to represent in his capacity as James I's Attorney General in Ireland. In Orchestra, Davies ultimately reveals that the model of psychological conversion of the faculties leading to the political harmony of dancing is actually the history of the English commonwealth. It precisely the power of lyric that Davies identifies in Orchestra, as the most effective way of thinking about English government and the exemplarity of its monarchs in his later legal tracts on Ireland. Davies argues in the Discoverie of the True Causes of why Ireland was never entire subdued that the harmonizing power of lyric and poetic meter can serve as a mechanism to promote social harmony in the previously discordant Irish colonies.

Briefly, the clock of the ciuil Gouernment, is now well set, and all the wheeles thereof doeomoue in Order; The strings of this Irish Harpe, which the Ciuill Magistrate doth finger, are all in tune...and make a good Harmony in this Commonweale: So as we may well conceiue a hope, that Ireland (which heertofore might properly be called the Land of Ire,
because the *Irascible* power was predominant there, for the space of 400 yeares together) will from henceforth proue a Land of *Peace* and *Concorde*.52

In this crucial moment from Davies' prose text, he claims that England must reconceptualize the attainment of civil peace in Ireland as the lyric "order" of an "Irish Harpe," and not in terms of the violent suppression of rebellious factions. Davies refigures the "civil Government" of Ireland as a clock, whose wheels move in "Order" like the harmoniously patterned dance of political consent regulated by lyric "measure" and meter first presented in *Orchestra*. Thus Davies' experience in Ireland confirms his intuition on the political possibility of lyric harmony first developed in the 1590's as a young poet. Based on his observations in Ireland, Davies concludes that the "Civill Magistrate" needs to redefine their role as the lyricist playing the "Irish Harpe" tuned to a harmonious key, and not as the iron fist of law. The imagination of the Irish colonies as a lyre results in the "good Harmony" of the "Commonweale." This is an important point for Davies. The true incorporation of the Irish colonies into the English commonwealth cannot be accomplished through coercive legal or military means, which he exhaustively describes in the long history of failed conquest that composes the bulk of the *Discoverie of the True Causes*. Four centuries of English armies and jurists attempted to overwhelm Ireland through coercive military and legal domination. Davies insists that this never lead the Irish people to consider themselves part of the English commonwealth, because the adversarial idiom of conquest inevitably cast the Irish as a hostile, alien people to be subjugated by force. For Davies, the constant threat of force cannot underwrite the political consent necessary for the formation of commonwealths. The incorporation of Ireland into the commonwealth is possible only if its population derives pleasure from the experience of joining together into harmonious political arrangements, just like dancers who enjoy the synchronous movements governed by the metrical harmony of lyric and song.53

Just as *Orchestra* contends that the creation of commonwealths requires the psychological conversion of lower faculties, sense and nutrition, into the higher faculty of reason necessary for consent, in the case of Ireland, Davies specifically identifies the entire region with a faculty of the Aristotelian soul. For Davies, Ireland is the "Land of Ire" because the "Irascible" sensitive appetite dominated its history.54 However, recasting the role of the "Civil Magistrate" as the player of the well-tuned "Irish Harpe" can transform the entire island once dominated by the irascible appetite's passions of impossible hope, despair, audacity, fear, and anger, into a land enjoying "Peace" and "Concorde." Davies' reimagination of Irish government as the playing of a

52 Davies, *A Discoverie of the True Causes*, p. 284.
53 Davies applies the same metaphor of musical harmony to the English government, in a 1613 speech to the Irish Parliament: “These Parliaments, thought they consist of three different estates - the King, the Nobility, and the Commons - yet as in music distinct and several notes do make a perfect harmony, so these Councils, compounded of divers states and degrees, being well ordered and timed, do make a perfect concord in a Commonwealth.” (The *Works in Verse and Prose, Vol. 3*, ed. Alexander Grosart. Blackburn: Fuller Worthies’ Library, 1876. p. 223. From the Sloane MSS 4793, fo. 57.)
harp emphasizes the power of aesthetic harmony in stimulating the faculties responsible for affective pleasure to counteract the irascible appetite's predilection for rage and despair that had defined Ireland for centuries. The movement from rage to harmonious pleasure is important for the implementation of governments, since as Davies argues in his Hymne in Praise of Musicke, "Of force conjoined, Conquest is hardly got. / Then Musicke may of hearts a Monarch be." Davies' insistence on pleasure stimulated by psychological harmony, and not rage incited by militaristic force, is precisely why he identifies Elizabeth I to be the exemplary ruler of the English commonwealth. In his *Hymnes of Astraea* praising Elizabeth's virtues, Davies casts Elizabeth as the unique monarch who understood her royal duty as the playing of a Lute.

By Instruments her powers appeare  
Exceedingly well tun'd and cleare:  
This Lute is still in measure,  
Holds still in tune, euene like a sphere,  
And yeelds the world sweet pleasure.

In the *Hymnes*, Davies surprisingly claims that Elizabeth was an exemplary Queen because of the exquisite harmony of her Aristotelian soul's faculties. The powerful "instruments" that Davies praises in this instance are described in the title of the poem: "Of the Organs of her Minde." Likewise, the individual poems composing the *Hymnes* move through each of Elizabeth's cognitive faculties in sequence, describing how her psychological clarity permits her to be an effective ruler: "Of her VVit", "Of her will", "Of her Memorie", "Of her Phantasie." The *Hymnes of Astraea* then, constitute a sequence of psychological blazons praising the exemplarity of her soul's faculties, and not the beauty of her body parts or her moral virtue as conventionally applauded in the lyric blazon. As in Davies' final understanding in *Nosce Teipsum* of the Queen of Reason as the player of the Aristotelian faculties as instruments tuned into harmony, the *Hymnes* figure Elizabeth as the ruler whose political "instruments" are the "exceedingly well tun'd andCLEARE" faculties and "organs" of her Aristotelian soul. Elizabeth is the rare monarch who understands that the success of her rule depends on her ability to harness her soul's faculties and organs as "instruments" to be played like a "Lute" creating harmonious "measures" unifying the individual citizens of the English commonwealth in a state of "pleasure." As Davies asserts in the *Discoverie of the True Causes*, Elizabeth was able to turn the tide in Ireland because her harmonies stimulated "sweet pleasure" in the population, and not ire or violent rage, in the previously insurrectionary subjects of the land. In a similar ode to Elizabeth's lyrical prowess, Davies states that the harmonious "measures" produced by the "instruments" of Elizabeth's faculties and organs ultimately transcend the musical analogy, creating a pure psychological harmony at the core of the commonwealth.

To the Queene:

---

What Musicke shall we make to you?
To whom the strings of all men's harts
Makes music of ten thousand parts:
In tune and measure true,
With straines and changes new.
[...]
So that this center here
for you no music fynds,
but harmony of minds.57

The "tune and measure true" composed by the "strings of all men's hearts" unified into the commonwealth ultimately moves past the domain of sonic harmony, moving to the pure ideation of a "harmony of minds." Elizabeth's symphony is capable of smoothing the chaotic motions of "ten thousand" hearts into the psychological harmony of ten thousand united minds. In identifying Elizabeth as the specific political figure who most successfully exploited the power of her harmonious faculty psychology as the instruments capable of binding "ten thousand parts" into a single commonwealth, Davies argues that the political harmony enjoyed by the late Tudor commonwealth is an exceedingly rare moment of peace, forged in the clarity of Elizabeth's faculties. The historical specificity of the English commonwealth's harmony is evinced in the concluding stanzas of Orchestra, where Davies most clearly answers the question posed in the previous ode: "What Musicke shall we make to you?" The "Musick" most clearly indicating the commonwealth's harmony during Elizabeth's reign is the prolific volume of lyric poetry produced by some of England's prominent poets.

Our glorious English Courts diuine Image
As it should be in this our golden age.
[...]
O that I could old Gefferies Muse awake,
Or borrow Colins fayre heroike stile,
Or smooth my rimes with Delias seruants file.

Yet Astrophell might one for all suffize,
VVhose supple Muse Camelion-like doth change
Into all formes of excellent deuise:
So might the Swallow, whose swift Muse doth range
Through rare Ideas, and inuentions strange,
And euer doth enjoy her ioyfull spring,
And sweeter then the Nightingale doth sing.58

58 Davies, Orchestra, Stanzas 126-130.
The "divine Image" reflecting the political harmony promoted by Elizabeth's "glorious English court" is the English lyric tradition. Invoking Geoffrey Chaucer as an English "Muse," and citing Spenser's Colin Clout, Samuel Daniel's Delia, Sir Philip Sidney's Astrophil and Stella, and Michael Drayton's Idea, Davies concludes Orchestra by demonstrating the English poetic tradition is the symphony reflecting the harmony of the English commonwealth. For Davies, the success of a commonwealth, and the standard for the "Golden Age" in the final years of Elizabethan rule, is not economic productivity or triumphant military conquest, but the flowering of its lyric tradition. The political harmony of the commonwealth is ultimately registered in the harmony of its lyric poetry. Davies admits that he hopes to join the ranks of this pantheon by "borrowing" Spenser's "heroike stile" and "smoothing" his rhymes with Daniel's "file." Despite the popular success of his poetry in the 1590's and early 1600's, Davies' legacy as a lyric poet has been largely forgotten, and overshadowed by his conservative imperialist legal prose.

Despite, or more accurately in response to, these distortions muddying our impressions of Davies' writing, I have argued in this chapter that Davies is perhaps the most eloquent theorist in Elizabethan and early Jacobean England articulating the harmony of the soul's faculties created by lyric as the tissue holding commonwealths together through the "dance" of psychological consent. Davies presents a model of commonwealth matching the sophistication of political theorists like Richard Hooker and nationalist allegorical poets like Edmund Spenser. Davies asserts that the metrical harmony of lyric is the most powerful means of transforming the discordant Aristotelian soul into a form of psychological commonwealth based on consent, matching the harmonious commonwealth of the fallen uniting all Christian souls. For Davies, the state of harmonious political consent defining the Christian soul is the model upon which the chaotic motions of the Aristotelian soul's warring faculties can be resolved into a harmony resembling the beautiful rhythm of lyric song. In this manner, Davies uses the paradox of two souls as a way to test two different models of government as competing systems of figuring human nature. Davies rejects the model of empire, used to figure the Aristotelian soul's faculties and organs, and commonly employed as the template for the ubiquitous "body politic" model of describing the human. Rather, Davies finds the power of the "general consent" grounding the governing concepts of the Christian soul, such as original sin and the promise of immortality, in a psychological framework similar to the harmony of political commonwealths, to be a far more promising model of understanding the soul. Davies subsequently applies the harmony of the Aristotelian faculties produced by lyric "measure" in his narrative of how political commonwealths are founded in general. The power of lyric refines humans from a brutish state of animal impulse dominated by the primal urges of the lower faculties of sense and nutrition, to the plane of social being, where the primacy of the rational faculty leads humans to "dance" together in the political consent upon which the commonwealth is based. Therefore Davies imbues lyric poetry with a tremendous amount of psychological and political influence. He identifies the organized "measure" of lyric as the most powerful means of creating harmony within the previously chaotic Aristotelian soul, and of promoting the harmony of a "dance" between individual subjects in the creation of commonwealths.
In performing these readings of Davies' poetry, our understanding of his career, and the place of his lyric in the broad arc of that career, has changed. In light of his poetry, it is far too simplistic to claim that Davies was a staunchly conservative jurist who served as one of the most eloquent defenders of absolutist monarchy and empire in the first decades of Jacobean rule, as countless historians of law have speculated. Davies' diverse range of writing in verse and in prose resists any effort to cast him as a one-note thinker. If anything, this chapter has attempted to complicate this reductive picture of Davies' legacy as one primarily relating to common law and the justification of conservative legal principles. His poetry of the 1590's demonstrates a deep hesitation to fully support the viability of empire and monarchical rule wielding royal prerogative at the expense of the subjects' consent, whether these subjects be the lower faculties of the soul, or the oppressed population of the Irish colonies. For Davies, these empires of the soul and of foreign territories are doomed in their blatant disregard for the necessity of securing the "general consent." In searching for a counterpoint to empire and absolute rule, Davies identifies the importance of lyric as a formidable political tool, capable of uniting the faculties of the Aristotelian soul into a state of harmony like that of the Christian soul, and of binding individual souls governed by the faculty of reason into the political consent of commonwealth. The basic assumption underwriting Davies' model of the two souls defined in terms of commonwealth and not empire is the recognition of the overriding power of poetic pleasure, beyond law, faith, and military force, as the most effective means of creating psychological harmony within human souls, and political harmony between them. It is the pleasure attending lyric song that binds the faculties of the soul into harmony, and it is the force compelling humans to move in unison toward the organized political consent that Davies calls "dancing." In this sense, we must revise Davies' contribution to the English common law tradition in light of his reimagination of commonwealth and early modern faculty psychology as a lyric mode. For Davies, it is the rhythmic pleasure of lyric, and not exclusively the binding force of natural or civil law, that governs the commonwealth of souls.
Chapter 4: "Both Sides Written Rolls": John Donne and the Textuality of the Two-Sided Soul

The recurrence to oneself cannot stop at oneself, but goes to the hither side of oneself; in the recurrence to oneself there is a going to the hither side of oneself.¹
-Emmanuel Levinas, “Substitution”

He that desires to Print a book, should much more desire, to be a book; to do some such exemplar things, as men might read, and relate, and profit by.²
-John Donne, Sermon Preached to the King, at Whitehall, April 1, 1627

The epigraph cited above, from John Donne's 1627 sermon preached four years before his death, emblematizes the central argument of the present chapter. Throughout his career, from his early poetry to his final sermons, Donne transforms the problem of two souls from a question of spiritual identity and obedience to religious law, into a new model of Christian subjectivity figuring the soul as a textual medium subject to printing, writing, and reading by others. For Donne, the presence of two souls in each Christian subject becomes a vexing paradox only if one forces the Aristotelian and Christian souls to fit into the traditional dualist model of the interior soul housed within the exteriorized body. In his *Anniversaries* and sermons, Donne rejects the interior/exterior model of soul and body, and proposes the alternative figure of the two-sided sheet, in which the poet inscribes the two souls as the reverse faces of a single sheet of text. By articulating a new tropology of the two-sided soul that breaks from the dualist tradition of interiority, and by translating the problem of two souls into a question of textuality, Donne gives unprecedented power to the poet and preacher. For Donne, Christian devotion lies in the poet's linguistic agency to rewrite and reprint the versified text composing the dual faces of the soul. Ultimately, Donne’s sermons use the textuality of the two-sided soul established in the *Anniversaries* as a way to completely rethink Christian salvation as a second printing of our souls, and not exclusively as a promise of eternal life.

In previous chapters, I have established that sixteenth century philosophers such as Pietro Pomponazzi, Philipp Melanchthon, and John Woolton transformed the seemingly innocuous classical and medieval assumption that the human was composed of two souls, Aristotelian and Christian, into a major cultural crisis destabilizing the unity of Christian thought. These philosophers attempted to resolve the crisis of two souls as a question of Christian law, and argued that the division of the subject into two souls reflected the stain of original sin, necessitating absolute obedience to natural and civil law. I have argued in subsequent chapters that English Elizabethan poets, such as William Shakespeare and John Davies, responded to the oppressive legal narratives of English theologians such as Woolton, Richard Hooker, and William Perkins, by arguing that the presence of two souls in fact represented an unrecognized

path to Christian freedom, and not political servitude. For both Shakespeare and Davies, the crisis of two souls served as the impetus for new narratives articulating the Christian subject's agency in literary terms.

In Donne’s writing, produced in the years after Woolton, Shakespeare, and Davies, we see a new phase of the two-souls crisis. For Donne, the presence of two souls within the human does not serve as the narrative content for a new story of the soul, but instead permits a complete reimagination of the tropes used to figure the Christian subject. In moving from the idiom of interiority and exteriority, to the model of the two-sided soul, Donne turns the paradox of two souls into a problem of metaphor and proper figuration. He argues that the Christian tradition has used the wrong figures to describe the composition of religious subjects. Early in his career, Donne rejects the conventional in/out metaphor of the body-as-house and the soul-as-resident, and the up/down hierarchy of the soul as spatially situated above the inferior body. In his lyric poetry, we see various attempts devise a more comprehensive range of figures to describe the relation of the two souls, including the "ecstasy," the "mixture," and the "knotting" of souls. In the Anniversaries, Donne moves the figuration of two souls from a single plane, to the dual planes of the two-sided sheet of text. By introducing the figure of the reversible sheet inscribing our two souls in the language of the poem we read before us, Donne asserts that the poetic text is the privileged medium of resolving the two-souls paradox. A poet, such as Donne, possesses the unique power to translate the two souls from a living human body to the dual-sided textual medium of verse. Late in his life, Donne surprisingly comes to describe precisely such a translation of the two souls into textual form, as the fulfillment of Christian immortality reimagined as a second printing by God. Thus Donne moves the crisis of two souls away from theological or philosophical debate, and transforms the problem into a question of figuration and the translation of the two souls into a poetic medium.

My contention that Donne rejects the standard dualism of interior soul and exterior body in favor of the two-sided soul with Aristotelian and Christian faces, moves our understanding of his oeuvre away from the monist and anatomical readings dominating recent criticism. Early modern criticism of the past thirty years has framed Donne's poetry and sermons as a monist

---

3 For an overview of this prevalent metaphor, see: Mann, Jill. “Allegorical Buildings in Mediaeval Literature.” Medium Aevum 63 (1994).
project obsessed with the body's materiality and its anatomical structure. It has become a critical commonplace to figure the "soul" as a theoretically uninteresting bystander to the scientific and materialist interest of the early modern body. More recent work, notably Ramie Targoff's *John Donne: Body and Soul*, has laudably begun to correct this monist exaggeration of Donne's thinking. Targoff casts Donne as a troubled dualist, and identifies the force and complexity of Donne's work in his struggle to unify the body and soul. Such recent work is important since it has refocused attention on the once-unpopular topic of the soul. However, the problem with this critical return to the soul is its basic blindness to the fact that the word "soul" in Donne's writing, and in early modern literature in general, was a complex problematic placing both Aristotelian and Christian systems of psychology in tense apposition. Any reference to the "soul" did not simply describe the Christian soul, but simultaneously gestured to the classical legacy of the Aristotelian soul composed of three organic faculties.

In many ways, Donne is the paradigmatic figure of the two souls problem in the early modern period since he was doubly implicated in the crisis in his roles as poet and preacher. In his capacity as preacher to the royal household and as a Christian poet, Donne certainly accepted that the term "soul" described an indivisible, immortal, and immaterial Christian soul that represented a promise of salvation. However, throughout his poetry and religious prose, Donne consistently reads the doctrine of the Christian soul against the grain of the Aristotelian soul, placing the two souls in complex juxtaposition. In particular, Donne's constant return to the

---


6 Such a return to the soul in early modern criticism reflects a corresponding interest in the Aristotelian soul in recent medieval criticism. For this, see: Lockett, Leslie. *Anglo-Saxon Psychologies in the Vernacular and Latin Traditions*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011; and Raskolnikov, Masha. *Body Against Soul: Gender and Sowleh in Middle English Allegory*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2009.

body's anatomy and physiology, which has drawn so much recent critical interest, indicates the extent to which he took the Aristotelian model of the soul, based in the function of the body's organs, very seriously.\(^8\) Donne's lifelong interest in anatomy and medicine, which has been misread as a commitment to the "new philosophy" and science, more accurately represents his effort to mobilize the organic faculties of the classical Aristotelian soul as a philosophical counterpoint to the rarefied spiritual ontology of the Christian soul. Navigating the bonds and fissures between the Aristotelian and Christian souls was the dominant concern unifying Donne's entire career, from his early *Paradoxes and Problems*, and the satirical *The Progress of the Soul*, to his valedictory poems and the *Extasie*, to his later *Anniversaries* and prose sermons.\(^9\) Critics are correct in claiming that Donne was obsessed with the fate of the soul. However, we must recognize that Donne was compelled to return to the soul throughout his career in an attempt to grasp the paradoxical nature of two souls defining the Christian subject.

This chapter argues that we cannot read Donne as a monist characterized by a single-minded obsession with conforming the soul to the body's anatomy and materiality. Nor was he a dualist in the traditional Christian or Cartesian sense of the word. I argue that Donne defines the two souls in terms of their textuality, marked by their inscription upon the two-sided structure of the poetic text. If Donne was a dualist, he was a dualist only insofar as he defined the human in terms of the textuality of its two-sided soul.

**Songs and Sonnets: Fantasies of "Interanimation" and the Prosthesis of the Soul**

Donne's earliest tentative efforts to understand the paradox of the two souls occur in his valedictory poems and the *Extasie*. The *Extasie* begins as an effort to unify the souls of the poet and lover in a spiritual "interanimation" (l. 42), but concludes with a meditation describing the division of the individual human into two souls. By the end of the poem, Donne becomes far less interested in "mixing" the souls of two different people, than he is obsessed with finding a way to make sense of the clashing systems of soul cleaving the individual in two.

On man heaven's influence works not so,  
But that it first imprints the air,  
So soul into the soul may flow,  
Though it to body first repair.  

As our blood labors to beget  
Spirits, as like souls it can,  
Because such fingers need to knit  
That subtle knot, which makes us man:

---

\(^8\) For Aristotle's definition of the organic basis of the soul, see: Aristotle, *De Anima*, 412a28-412b9.  
\(^9\) For reasons of space, the current analysis could not examine Donne's early *Paradoxes* and the *Progress of the Soul: Metempsychosis*. See specifically, Paradox 6 ("That the Gifts of the Body are Better than those of the Mind, or of Fortune") and the Epistle to the *Progress of the Soul*.  
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So must pure lovers' souls descend
T' affections, and to faculties,
Which sense may reach and apprehend,
Else a great prince in prison lies. (57-68)  

These famous lines have traditionally been read as an unabashed endorsement of the sensuous body over the purity of the soul. However, the poem turns to the body only to the extent that the spirits, faculties, and affections of the Aristotelian soul can be "knit" with the purity of the "heavenly" soul. For Donne, "heaven's influence works not" on man's body, but rather works by a process of "imprinting" the relation between two souls. Although we might initially assume that the two souls "flowing" into one another are the different souls of the two lovers, the following two quatrains reveal that "heaven's influence" more specifically concerns the "knot" of two souls within each individual.

Lines 61-64 use the Galenic system of humors to establish a series of analogies between the two souls.11 The blood "labors" to create humoral spirits, which strive to link the body's organs to the higher order operations of the soul. The bond between the spirit and the soul is only partial, since the spirits are "as like souls as it can," and can only imitate the souls in a figural comparison. However, such a figural movement from blood, to spirit, to soul, is vitally important since it defines the "subtle knot which makes man." The spirits created by the blood can never actually be identical to the soul, but the effort to figure the spirits as "like" the soul to the greatest extent possible creates a "subtle knot" that is constitutive of man. The "knot" defining us as human is not the chemical conversion of blood to spirit, to soul, but rather a figural effort to create a string of analogies between them.

The "as...so" structure of the final two cited quatrains binds the two stanzas into an analogous relation of causes to effects. Just as the blood and spirits of Galenic physiology use figures to move upward to the operations of the soul, so too must the "heavenly" soul descend to the Aristotelian soul. The "pure" soul of lovers must be placed into relation with the "affections," "faculties" and "sense" of the Aristotelian soul. To the extent that the poem defines the "subtle knot" of man as an upward chain of analogies between blood, spirit, and soul, the poem argues forcefully that we "must" create a downward, reversed "knot" binding the pure soul to the Aristotelian faculties, passions, and sense. Just as the blood and spirits strive upward to figure the soul, so too must the "pure" soul reach downward to the domain of sense and the function of the Aristotelian faculties. The sequence taken as a whole asserts that "heaven's influence" does not

---


work separately on the material body or on the soul, but requires a more "subtle knot" intertwining the blood and spirits of the Galenic humoral system, the Aristotelian faculties, and the "pure" lover's soul. The "subtle knot which makes us man" therefore does not describe the dualism of body and soul. The *Extasie* defines the human as the concatenation of the Galenic humors and spirits, the Aristotelian soul's faculties, passions, and senses, and the "purity" of the heavenly soul.

If we do not reconceive the human in terms of this "subtle knot," we might as well be locked in prison: "else a great prince in prison lies." In a counterintuitive move, we must bind ourselves in a constitutive knot so as to be free. In the *Extasie*, defining humans in terms of the conventional division between body and soul leads to paralysis, locking a "great prince" in prison. Refiguring our understanding of human nature as a "knot" binding the Aristotelian and pure "heavenly" souls, leads to a state of freedom.

Although the *Extasie* proposes the figure of the "knot" interweaving the Galenic humors, the Aristotelian faculties, and the Christian soul into a constitutive relation, Donne's early poetry in general demonstrates great confusion as to how such a knot might be tied. For example, the *Valediction: forbidding Mourning* attempts to identify how the Aristotelian soul differs from the purity of the lover's soul, but the poem admits that it has little idea of how to define the relation between the two souls.

Dull sublunary lovers' love  
(Whose soul is sense) cannot admit  
Absence, because it doth remove  
Those things which elemented it.

But we by a love, so much refined,  
That ourselves know not what it is,  
Inter-assured of the mind,  
Care less, eyes, lips, and hands to miss.

Our two souls therefore, which are one,  
Though I must go, endure not yet  
A breach, but an expansion,  
Like gold to airy thinness beat. (13-24)

The poem divides the two souls in terms of the quality of one's love: "dull sublunary" love corresponds exclusively to the Aristotelian soul's faculty of sense ("whose soul is sense") since it

---

12 John Carey has influentially read Donne’s work in terms of his bad faith - as an ambitious and manipulative social-climber who betrayed his Catholic roots, who must be read as obscuring the truth and engaging in exaggerated displays of braggadocio in love poetry. I argue the problems of exaggerated confidence and irresolution in Donne’s poetry instead registers the extent to which he struggles in frustration to find a solution to an intractable problem with high stakes.
requires the physical presence of perceptible objects. In contrast, the "refined" love of the poem's lovers works on an immaterial plane of pure intellection ("inter-assured of the mind"), and does not need the organs of sense, such as the eyes, lips, and hands. As attractive as such a refusal of the Aristotelian soul's debt to the sense organs may seem, the poet admits that he has no idea of how to create such a distinction between the two types of soul: "ourselves know not what it is."

The following quatrains, far from resolving such confusion, compounds the problem. The poem proposes to unify the "two souls" into one by hammering "gold to airy thinness" so as to bridge the distance between separated souls. It is not entirely clear, however, what "two souls" might signify here. The Valediction: forbidding Mourning is emblematic of Donne's early treatment of the two souls to the extent that it glibly moves between seemingly incompatible definitions of "two souls." Lines 13-24 divide the Aristotelian soul indebted to the sense organs, from the "refined" soul located in a domain of pure ideation ("inter-assured of the mind"), while lines 25-36 refer to the two lovers' souls separated by distance. The Valediction: forbidding Mourning has elicited so much frustration because it moves between two different sets of two souls without explanation. The ambiguity as to which "two souls" Donne is talking about is typical of the Songs and Sonnets as a whole, which frequently use the division between the Aristotelian and Christian souls within each individual as a striking way to think about the difference between individuals. In both the Extasie and the Valediction: forbidding Mourning, the poems initially strive to unify the souls of two lovers, but in both cases cannot consummate such an ecstatic union since each lover is internally divided into two souls. In both poems, the initial motivation to unify the two lovers' souls becomes an extended meditation on the nature of two souls, Aristotelian (rooted in faculties, passions and sense organs) and Christian (defined by pure intellection), which make any union of two individuals impossible. Both poems turn the internal division of individual persons into two souls into an intractable barrier preventing the "interanimation" of different people.

The confusion attending the meaning of "two souls" is magnified by the peculiar imagery of gold hammered "to airy thinness" used to resolve the difference between souls. Readers throughout the 20th century have scoffed at this famous metaphor as evidence of either poor poetry or weak philosophy. T.S. Eliot was ill at ease with the image of "gold to airy thinness" since it stretches the limit of figural logic to an absurd degree.

The figure does not make intelligible an idea, for there is properly no idea until you have the figure; the figure creates the idea - if gold can be beaten out thin, why should not a soul? He is not, and is never, stating a philosophical theory in which he believes.13

For Eliot, Donne does not abide by a coherent theory of the soul, but deploys a clever image simply for the sake of doing so. Ramie Targoff has disputed Eliot's famous condemnation by reading the figure as presenting a vision of the soul as "blurring the lines... between the material

The problem with both of these readings, one canonical, the other contemporary, is that they are searching for a coherent theory of the soul at the wrong level of analysis. Where Eliot is searching for an "idea" or "philosophical theory," Targoff searches at the level of materiality. Donne's poem is coherent only if we read its progression of puzzling figures as actually embodying Donne's struggle to understand the confusion attending the two souls dividing two lovers, and not simply as a vehicle for some other philosophical idea or theory of materiality.

The final lines of the poem state that the figure of beaten gold is not a firm conclusion, but rather one alternative among two different possible ways to figure the difference between two souls.

If they be two, they are two so
as stiff twin compasses are two,
Thy soul the fixed foot, makes no show
To move, but doth, if th'other do.
[...] 
Such wilt thou be to me, who must
Like th'other foot, obliquely run;
Thy firmness makes my circle just,
And makes me end, where I begun. (25-36)

The suppositional term "if" marks the transition from the figure of gold beaten to "airy thinness," to the alternative figure of the compass. The "if" acknowledges that the preceding figure of hammered gold might not have been sufficient to unify the two separate souls into one. "If" the figure of hammered gold could not bridge the gap between the two souls, then the poem admits that "they be two," but divided in two only insofar as they can be figured as the two arms of a compass. If the figure of the gold hammered into a sheet does not work, then the alternative figure of the compass might. The "if" indicates Donne's struggle to find the correct metaphor to describe the problem of two souls. By creating two parallel figural tracks in the poem, Donne literalizes the uncertainty of the preceding admission that the lovers "know not what" the difference of the two kinds of soul might be, and how such a difference might be bridged. The poem embodies the confusion attending the two souls, signified by "ourselves know not what it is," by openly displaying Donne's struggle to work through different figures to find the proper way to understand the two souls, and how they might be unified into the "subtle knot which makes us man" proposed by the Extasie. If the Extasie confidently mobilizes various figures to bind the Aristotelian and Christian souls into a constitutive knot, the Valediction: forbidding Mourning is far less certain as it cycles through figures to find how such a knot might be tied.

The Valediction: forbidding Mourning tentatively concludes by moving from the image of gold hammered into a sheet extending between separated souls, to the figure of the twin-armed...

---

14 Targoff, John Donne: Body and Soul, p. 74.
compass in which the two souls are joined at a fulcrum, even if they are separated at the ends. In shifting to the figure of the compass, Donne turns the problem of two souls from one of difference desperately requiring unification or "knotting," to one where the difference between the two arms of the compass enables the tool to work at all: without two interlocked arms, the compass could not revolve, and could not draw circles. The figure of the twin-armed compass transforms the dilemma of two different souls, initially marked by uncertainty ("ourselves know not what it is"), into a functional interdependence. Without a difference of souls, characterized by markedly different functions and locations in space, the compass could not work: "Thy soul the fixed foot, makes no show / To move, but doth, if th'other do." The souls of the two lovers are not so much "knit" together (as evinced in the Extasie), as they are mechanically joined together to perform a certain function. The specific mechanical function Donne describes in this case is inscribing the shape of a circle.

Thus by the end of the Valediction: forbidding Mourning, the relation of two souls is best figured in terms of a graphical tool, drawing "just circles." In moving from the "knot," to hammered gold, to the mechanics of the compass, Donne greatly alters the recursive logic used to describe the two souls. The two souls are not "knit" into the perplexing loops of a constitutive knot, but are more accurately figured as the recursive trace of a compass folding in upon itself, in a pattern that "makes me end, where I begun." While the initial suggestion of gold hammered into "airy thinness" attempts to bridge the two souls separated in space, the figure of the compass follows a different "oblique" logic of a drawing that folds in upon, and returns to, itself, superimposing its origin and destination. If the poem begins with "virtuous men" whispering to their souls in a muted verbal address, the poem's conclusion moves to the specific mechanics of "oblique" motion joining the two souls into a reflexive circle. The movement from the verbal "whisper" to the "oblique" inscription of the compass is emblematic of the poem's logic in general. If the Valediction is initially structured by the one-way I/Thou verbal address of the poet to his lover, expressing the desire to merge their different souls, the poem ends with the circular inscription of the compass figure. By the end of the poem, the unification of the two souls can only occur through a figure of circular inscription, and not the unidirectional verbal address conventionally associated with love poetry.

In the Valediction: of my Name in the Window, Donne moves away from the graphical nature of the drawing compass, and specifically privileges the act of writing as a way to resolve the division of two souls between two lovers. Donne renounces the integrity of his own soul, and using the inscribed name as a means to transplant his soul into his lover, in effect giving the other a sacred part of the self. Thus the Valediction: of my Name in the Window turns to the figure of

15 John Freccero's influential reading has argued that the compass image forwards a "vortical reconciliation of body and soul," in the Neoplatonic model of the spiral motion or motus obliquus. In contrast to Freccero, I argue that the compass figures the relation of two souls (and not the body and soul) in the Aristotelian, and not Platonic, tradition, and cannot be read as a "reconciliation" since the compass legs are mechanically interdependent, but not physically integrated. For this, see: Freccero, John. “Donne’s Valediction: Forbidding Mourning.” English Literary History 30 (1963).
writing, as opposed to the recursive drawing of the compass, into a mechanism to "interanimate" souls between the self and other.

My name engraved herein,
Doth contribute my firmness to this glass,
[...]
Or if too hard and deep
This learning be, for a scratched name to teach,
It, as a given death’s head keep
Lovers' mortality to preach,
Or think this ragged bony name to be
My ruinous anatomy.

Then, as all my souls be
Emparadised in you, (in whom alone
I understand, and grow and see) (23-27)

In the figure of the name engraved in glass, the nature of the written object has changed from the compass circle. In this Valediction, the engraved name comes to embody the far more dramatic stakes of the poet's "ruinous anatomy." Many critics have recently read the "ruinous anatomy" sequence as proof of Donne's obsession with anatomy and the scientific study of the body. The anatomical reading of the poem, however, overlooks the fact that the written name, and not the poet's physical body, possesses a "bony" structure, and that the anatomy being performed is one of the soul. The "ruinous anatomy" enabled by the "ragged bony name" involves the anatomization of the Aristotelian soul into its three faculties of reason, nutrition, and sensation: "I understand, grow, and see."

The Valediction's anatomy of the soul transplants the poet's three Aristotelian faculties into the lover. The poetic “ruinous anatomy” differs from a conventional anatomical dissection since it does not stop with a taxonomy of the body’s parts, and proceeds to transplant the excised faculties of the soul into the lover reading the name. Taking "all my souls" and transposing them into the reading other can be termed a "ruinous anatomy" since it destroys the integrity of the poet's selfhood. In this prosthesis of the soul, the anatomized poet thinks, sees, and grows in another person. The transferral of the Aristotelian faculties to the reading lover is absolute, and the poet retains none of his soul: "all souls" are transplanted into the other, "in whom alone" the poet can perform the living functions of his soul. The anatomized poet can be called living only

17 Donne persistently figures the anatomization of the soul into the Aristotelian faculties and its “bony” structure in his later sermons: “The soul hath bones as well as the body. And in this Anatomy, and dissection of the soul, as the bones of the soul, are the constant and strong resolutions thereof, and as the seeing of the soul is understanding, so the hearing of the soul is hearkning.” (Donne, “The Second Sermon Preached by the Author after he came to St. Dunstanes, 25 April 1624.”)
insofar as he prosthetically experiences the three faculties of his soul functioning within the lover reading his name. The anatomy of the poet's soul is "ruinous" to the extent that it completely displaces his faculties into another person, thus obliterating the boundaries between souls and between selves.

If the *Songs and Sonnets* in general are obsessed with the possibility of "interanimating" the souls of two lovers, but express great frustration at the division of each person into two souls, the *Valediction: of my Name in the Window* goes to extreme lengths to circumvent the problem. The *Valediction* suggests that the "interanimation" of two lovers can only occur through an anatomy of the soul that literally implants the poet's Aristotelian faculties of reason, sensation, and nutrition in the other. The *Valediction* attempts to resolve the problem of two souls internally dividing individuals within themselves, and separating individuals from each other, by giving the poet's own soul to his lover, thereby transforming the difference of souls into a prosthetic union.

It is apparent in the *Valediction: of my Name in the Window* that the two souls of the lovers are no longer joined at the hinge of a compass, working together in a complementary fashion to draw a circle. Surprisingly, the "ruinous anatomy" dissolving the boundaries between the two lovers, and transplanting the living faculties of the Aristotelian soul into the other, is not a violent procedure, but a rapturous union. The poem figures the transplantation of the soul's faculties as a paradisal fulfillment: "all my souls be / Emparadised in you." By figuring the lover’s prosthetic union as a paradise, Donne defines the Aristotelian soul’s anatomization and prosthesis in the specifically Christian idiom of an immortal afterlife. The fantasy of "paradise" motivating Donne’s love poetry is the ecstatic union of two separate individuals, involving the transplantation of the Aristotelian soul's faculties from one lover to the other. The rapturous experience of transplanting the poet’s organic faculties into the body of his lover is powerful enough to become a form of living paradise, mimicking the transcendence of the Christian paradise occurring after death. The "ruinous anatomy" signifies a promise of paradise, but a peculiar paradise figuring the prosthesis of the Aristotelian soul into another person as an experience analogous to the Christian soul’s salvation.

Recall that the impetus of the poet's "ruinous anatomy" and the prosthesis of his Aristotelian faculties is the writing of the "ragged bony name" upon the window. By understanding how the writing the poet's name triggers an anatomy of the soul, we are in a better position to understand what the "flow" of one soul into another by "imprinting" in the *Extasie* might signify. Based on the previous readings of the two valedictory poems, we have a clearer understanding of what such an "imprint" entails. In both the figure of the compass and the name written in glass, the mechanics of inscription become vitally important in unifying the two lovers' souls, and the two souls within each individual. In the compass, the two souls are joined at a fulcrum to draw reflexive circles. In the "ruinous anatomy," two souls can "flow" into one another by "imprinting" to the extent that the poet's inscribed name anatomizes the faculties of his Aristotelian soul and transplants them into the reader. The "interanimation" or prosthesis of the soul from one lover to another can only occur through the poet's act of inscribing words upon glass, and the reader's visual perception of the written name. Ultimately, "heaven's influence" is
not the immortal state of the Christian soul, but the manner in which the anatomized faculties of
the Aristotelian soul are "emparadised" in the other by a process of reading and writing the
name.  

"Both Sides Written Rolls": Writing the Two-Sided Soul in the Anniversaries

As love poems, the Songs and Sonnets focus upon the paradox of two souls as a way to
imagine the ecstatic union of two lovers beyond sexual consummation. In Donne's later poems,
however, the problem of two souls becomes more difficult to untangle, since there is frequently
no other person into which the soul can be transplanted. Without a self/other structure framing
the two souls in terms of the poet's relation with a lover, the friction between the Aristotelian and
Christian souls becomes a deeply-rooted crisis of identity fracturing the coherence of the poetic
subject. The increased attention Donne devotes to Christian theological doctrine in his later
poems compounds the problem, since the possibility of the Christian soul's immortality becomes
a pressing concern. The tension provoked by the problem of two souls reaches its apex in
Donne's Anniversary poems, written approximately a decade after his Songs and Sonnets.  
Three years before his ordainment into the Church of England in 1615, Donne's Anniversary poems
attempt to find a specifically literary solution to the paradox of two souls.  

In the Progress of the Soul, the presence of two souls makes it impossible for the
Christian subject to know itself, leading to a "wretched" state of ignorance and paralysis. The
poem lays out a somewhat dismaying state of affairs for the human soul: the soul knows so little
about itself as to be "oppressed with ignorance." The problematic ignorance of the soul results
from the death of Elizabeth Drury, whom the poem eulogizes, but with whom Donne was not
personally acquainted. Her passing is significant since, as the poems states hyperbolically, she
was the "electrum" that seamlessly resolved any contradictions between body and soul, and
between the two souls. Critics have long sought to find a coherent theory of the soul in the
Anniversary poems, and have traditionally identified the enigmatic assertion that Elizabeth

18 Donne articulates an analogous process of transplanting or “delivering” the writing self into the reading other in a
letter to Sir Henry Goodyer: “I make account that this writing of letters, when it is with any seriousness, is a kind of
ecstasy, and a departure and secession and suspension of the soul, which doth then communicate itself to two bodies.
And as I would every day provide for my soul’s last convoy, though I know not when I shall die, and perchance I
shall never die, so for these ecstasies in letters, I oftentimes deliver myself over in writing when I know not when
those letters shall be sent to you.” (Donne, “A letter to Sir Henry Goodyer, 9 October 1607.”)
19 Although the dating of the Songs and Sonnets has not been firmly established, it has been accepted that most of
the poems were written after 1603 and before 1610, with the Progress of the Soul written in 1612, about 3 years
before his ordainment.
20 My reading focuses on the Second Anniversary since I agree with Targoff’s statement that while “the complexities
of the First Anniversary have been thoroughly considered, the radical nature of The Second Anniversary has been
almost completely neglected.” (Targoff, John Donne: Body and Soul, p. 81.)
Drury's "body thought" as Donne's formulation of a mature psychology.\textsuperscript{21} This critical consensus has read "her body thought" as an idealized unification body and mind that Donne strives to attain. Overall, this reading corresponds to the critical movement that has attempted to define Donne's career in terms of his monism. Perhaps the most famous monist reading of "her body thought" comes from John Carey, who argues that “Donne collapses, in an instant, the age-old dualism,” and thus “achieves an integration of body and mind.”\textsuperscript{22} The problem with this monist reading of the poem is that the sequence following the statement of "her body thought" is primarily concerned with a conflict between different models of soul, and not the possibility of a monist amalgamation of body and soul.

Poor soul, in this thy flesh what dost thou know?  
Thou know’st thyself so little, as thou know’st not,  
How thou didst die, nor how thou was begot.  
Thou neither know’st how thou at first cam’st in,  
Nor how thou took’st the poison of man’s sin.  
Nor dost thou (though thou know’st, that thou art so)  
By what way thou art made immortal, know. (254-260)

The 75 lines following the statement of “her body thought” carefully describe the problems besieging the soul after Elizabeth Drury's death. The problem emerging after her death is not a dualist schism of body and soul, but rather a conflict between two warring souls. We are "oppressed with ignorance" since there are too many different types of soul existing simultaneously within us, resulting in a psychological cacophony. The poem articulates, in sequence, a contradiction between the Christian soul defined by immortality and original sin on one hand, and the organic soul defined by the Aristotelian faculties on the other. The speaker first addresses the "poor" soul who knows nothing about its existence in the terms of the Christian mysteries: its own birth or death (“how thou didst die, nor how thou was begot”), its implantation in the body prior to birth (“how thou at first cam’st in”), the infection of original sin (“how thou took’st the poison of man’s sin”), and its immortality (“what way thou art made immortal”). If the Christian soul is indeed immortal, it has no way to confirm it. The condition of the Aristotelian soul is no better, since it understands nothing about the function of its own organs.

Thou art too narrow, wretch, to comprehend

\textsuperscript{21} Targoff states that “Donne seems here at once to anticipate and to rebut Descartes’ cogito, the supreme isolation of mind as the exclusive sphere of thinking.” (Targoff, \textit{John Donne: Body and Soul}, p. 98.) Jonathan Sawday states that instances in Donne’s poetry such as the “body thought” and the \textit{Extasie}'s “subtle knot which makes us man” link the body and soul in a manner similar to Descartes’ identification of the pineal gland as the “place where the soul exercised its functions within the body.” (Sawday, p. 146.) More generally, William Empson has argued that “that only way to make the poem sensible is to accept Elizabeth Drury as the Logos” (\textit{Some Versions of the Pastoral}. London: Chattus and Windus, 1935. 84), while Barbara Lewalski has contended that Drury represents the redeemed Protestant soul (\textit{Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise}. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.) See also: Elderhorst, C. “John Donne’s First Anniversary as an Anatomical Anamorphosis.” In \textit{Explorations in the Field of Nonsense}, ed. Wim Tigges. Amsterdam, 1987; and Love, Harold. “The Argument of Donne’s First Anniversary.” \textit{Modern Philology} 64 (1966): 125-31.

\textsuperscript{22} Carey, p. 163-4.
Even thyself: yea though thou wouldst but bend
To know thy body. Have not all souls thought
For many ages, that our body is wrought
Of air, and fire, and other elements?
And now they think of new ingredients.
And one soul thinks one, and another way
Another thinks, and 'tis an even lay. (254-268)
Know'st thou but how the stone doth enter in
The bladder's cave, and never break the skin?
Know'st thou how blood, which to the heart doth flow,
Doth from one ventricle to th'other go?
And for the putrid stuff, which thou dost spit,
Know'st thou how thy lungs have attracted it?
[...]
And of those many opinions which men raise
Of nails and hairs, dost thou know which to praise? (261-278)

The lines following the ambiguities of the Christian mysteries address a soul “too narrow...to comprehend even thyself,” defined not by Christian ontology, but by its bias to the body: “thou wouldst but bend / To know thy body.” Unfortunately, the body's structure is "too narrow" to encompass both souls. The second model of the soul differs fundamentally from the Christian soul - it is defined by the elements (“our body is wrought / Of air, and fire, and other elements”), humors and spirits, and the faculties of nutrition and sense. Historians of science have long read this sequence as displaying Donne’s enthusiasm for the scientific and anatomical discoveries of the era. However, the passage does not deploy its array of scientific facts as being revelatory or useful. Precisely the opposite occurs - the “new philosophy” of the time can only introduce a jumble of contravening theories of the soul's faculties and organs, which amplify, rather than resolve, the soul's confusion.

The Aristotelian soul differs from the Christian soul to the extent that it is physically rooted in the function of the body's organs. However, the Aristotelian soul knows nothing about the workings of the organs in which its faculties are embedded. It does not "comprehend" the vegetative faculty's living processes, such as excretion ("know'st thou but how the stone doth enter in / The bladder's cave"), circulation ("know'st thou how blood, which to the heart doth flow, / Doth from one ventricle to th'other go"), and the imperceptible growth of nails and hair. Beyond the autonomic processes of the vegetative faculty, the poem argues that the faculty of sense offers no insight into human nature, since it is confounded by errors of perspective.

---

23 This specific passage has been a favorite of anatomical readings of Donne as far back as DC Allen’s “John Donne’s Knowledge of Renaissance Medicine,” and as recently as Sawday’s Engines of the Imagination in 2007. For this, see: Sawday, The Body Embazoned, p. 18; (see also: Sawday, Jonathan. Engines of the Imagination. London: Routledge, 2007. p. 213) Allen, DC pp. 331-3, and Carey, p. 247: “to a Baconian Donne’s list would constitute a programme for future research.”

24 For an explanation of early modern debates over the classification of hair and nails in the sensitive and nutritive faculties, see Allen, DC, p. 333.
When wilt thou shake off this pedantery,
Of being taught by sense, and fantasy?
Thou look'st through spectacles; small things seem great
Below; but up unto the watch-tower get,
And see all things despoiled of fallacies:
Thou shalt not peep through lattices of eyes
Nor hear through labyrinths of ears, nor learn
By circuit, or collections to discern. (291-298)

The speaker urges us to abandon the "pedantery" of the faculty of sense, which is subject to constant distortion by "spectacles" and distance. The sense organs ("lattices of eyes" and "labyrinths of ears") and the rational faculty's power of memory ("nor learn by circuit") are utterly confused, and therefore we cannot use the higher faculties of the soul to "discern" our own nature. Taken together, the Aristotelian soul's faculties of nutrition, sensation, and memory are characterized by error and ignorance. *Of The Progress of the Soul* presents two souls locked in paralysis: “one soul thinks one, and another way / Another thinks, and ‘tis an even lay.” The Christian soul knows nothing about its mystical nature, and the Aristotelian soul does not know how its faculties are embedded in the body's organs. The confusion of both souls leads to a paradoxical impasse: "tis an even lay."

The confusion of the two souls described in this sequence represents the central problem of the poem. Donne defines the human in terms of two souls confused about themselves and about their relation to each other, with little prospect of harmonious synthesis. Thus the problem identified by Donne is not one of a conventional dualism of body versus soul, but rather of two confused and contradictory souls, one defined by Christian mystery, and the other by the Aristotelian organic faculties. Without the fantasy of Elizabeth Drury’s lost “body thought,” the poet is left to reconcile two warring souls, with no hope of psychological harmony or illuminating self-knowledge.

The solution that Donne identifies is a mode of double writing, or reprinting, the soul that only Elizabeth Drury was capable of performing.

She, who in th'art of knowing heaven, was grown
Here upon earth, to such perfection,
That she hath, ever since to heaven she came,
(In a far fairer print), but read the same:
She, she, not satisfied with all this weight
(For so much knowledge, as would over-freight
Another, did but ballast her) is gone,
[…]
(Taking herself) our best, and worthiest book.
Return not, my soul, from this ecstasy,
Drury's soul was exceptional since it was skilled in the "art of knowing heaven" in a way that is impossible for normal humans. She possessed knowledge of heaven "here upon earth," to such a perfect extent that her soul "read the same" in heaven as on earth. The only difference between her modes of "knowing heaven" lies in the textual medium of the knowledge: her soul in heaven is "in a far fairer print." Elizabeth Drury's soul, therefore suffered none of the problems of ignorance and self-contradiction plaguing the two souls of normal humans. The medium encoding such perfect knowledge in her soul is printed language. Her soul is perfect in heaven and on earth insofar as it can be read identically, containing the same words, but printed in two different types. This section transforms Drury's soul from a perfect knowledge ("th'art of knowing heaven") to a malleable text printed on earth and reprinted in a new heavenly cast. Her soul is exemplary insofar as it can be reproduced in different, "fairer" prints, but the signification of her text "reads the same."

The poem itself performs the reprinting of Elizabeth Drury's soul in its repetition of "She, she." The colon after "in a far fairer print, but read the same" links lines 314-15 in a logic of versified cause and effect. The colon gestures forward to the next line's "She, she" as the textual performance of the identical reprinting articulated by the previous line. If line 314 describes the general principle of rewriting Drury's soul "in a far fairer print, but read the same," the colon turns the following line's "She, she" into the actual textual performance of such a reprinting in the frame of the poem we are reading. The reprinting of "She, she" follows the parameters of "a far fairer print, but read the same" exactly. Each repetition of "she" possesses the same meaning (Elizabeth Drury's soul), but each "she" is printed differently, insofar as the poem's versification pattern dictates that the first "She" of the line be capitalized, while the second is not. The poem therefore repeats the rewriting of Elizabeth Drury "in a far fairer print" in two consecutive moments. The heavy linguistic "weight" of the linguistic repetition would "over-freight" normal souls, but is the appropriate means of approximating how her soul is reprinted in heaven.25

Donne's transformation of Elizabeth Drury into a text printed differently before and after death becomes absolute with line 320's identification of her soul as "our best, and worthiest book." The poem no longer laments the loss of her soul qua soul, but instead mourns the loss of Elizabeth Drury's soul understood as a textual object. Our two souls have fallen into a condition of paralysis and confusion inasmuch as we can no longer read the "book" of Elizabeth Drury's soul, which has been rewritten in a "far fairer print" illegible to human readers. Donne calls the poem's extended transformation of Elizabeth Drury's soul into a printed "book" an "ecstasy" from which he does not want to return. The poem's connection between the textual

metamorphosis of the soul and the experience of "ecstasy" gestures to Donne's earlier poem, The Extasie, which famously declares that "the body is his book." However, the nature of the "ecstasy" in the Progress of the Soul has changed dramatically in the decade since Donne wrote the Extasie. If the earlier poem moves to an ecstasy of the body as book, the ecstasy in the Progress of the Soul is a condition of the soul: "return not, my soul, from this ecstasy." Donne attempts to capture the experience of ecstasy occurring in the preceding metamorphosis of Elizabeth Drury's soul into the "best, and worthiest book."

The movement from the ecstasy of the body, to the ecstasy of the soul, hinges on Donne's changing understanding of temporality. The Extasie figures the body as a book in order to capture the immediacy of the present moment lying next to a lover. The soul's ecstasy in the Progress of the Soul becomes an urgent matter of futurity, and is not concerned with the present: the ecstasy of the soul is a "meditation of what thou shalt be." However, what the ecstatic soul "shalt be" in the future is entirely unclear. The poem exhorts the soul to remain in a state of ecstasy until it understands how it shall "appear" to "earthly thoughts" after its death, going so far as to order the soul to engage in "conversation" with its own post-mortem representation. However, after the firm command to enter into "conversation" with "earthly thoughts," the following line turns the imperative into a question: "With whom wilt thou converse?" Line 325's question subverts the possibility that the poet can successfully meditate upon how "earthly thoughts" will read the soul after his own death. The soul encounters such paralyzing uncertainty in its ecstatic self-mediation and self-representation since it moves away from the figure of the soul written as a book, which made Elizabeth Drury's soul exceptionally potent. The poet's soul vainly pursues ecstatic "thoughts," leading to uncertainty and confusion as to who is "conversing" with whom. The problem of the human soul lies in its excessive thinking, and its search for a pure epistemology resolving the confusion and conflict of the Aristotelian and Christian souls. Such an epistemology of the soul, however, does not exist, and we must turn to the example of Elizabeth Drury, whose soul was perfect insofar as it was written, and rewritten, in printed language, and read as a book. Of the Progress of the Soul acknowledges that the soul must be "ballasted" with "weight," but not the ballast of the body's materiality emphasized in Donne's earlier Air and Angels and the Extasie. Instead, Elizabeth Drury's soul serves as an illuminating contrast to the confused state of our own souls since it is "ballasted" with the linguistic weight of the twice-printed text constituting her soul.

The poet's extremely long self-address to his soul, beginning on line 157 with "Think further on thy self, my soul" and ending with line 321's "Return not, my soul, from this ecstasy" lays out the fundamental problem defining the human soul. Humans are constituted by two souls mired in a state of paradoxical confusion after Elizabeth Drury's death, since each soul knows nothing about its own nature. The two souls remain confused precisely because humans seek knowledge about the soul, and mistakenly try to think through the paradox of two souls. Such an emphasis on knowledge and thought can only lead to paralysis: "one soul thinks one, and another way / another thinks, and 'tis an even lay." The poem progressively comes to the realization that

---

26 See Air and Angels, l. 10-20: “Love must not be, but take a body too...Whilst thus to ballast love".
we cannot "think" our way out of the confusion of two souls. In Elizabeth Drury's death, we have not lost an epistemological synthesis of two souls, which does not exist. Without Drury, we have rather lost a completely alternative model of understanding the soul, in terms of its textuality, its composition in printed language, and its capacity to be figured as a book.

Donne's transformation of the two-souls problem into a question of textuality structures the logic of the poem's conclusion, but with a crucial modification. The poem's ending alters Elizabeth Drury's doubled printing into the inscription of the two sides of a single sheet of text figuring her soul.

She, who left such a body, as even she
Only in heaven could learn, how it can be
Made better; for she was rather two souls,
Or like to full, on both sides written rolls,
Where eyes might read upon the outward skin,
As strong records for God, as minds within;
She, who by making full perfection grow,
Pieces a circle, and still keeps it so (501-508)

The poem's concluding sequence initially casts Elizabeth Drury in terms a traditional dualism of body and soul: with her death, the soul flies to heaven, with her body "left" behind in the material world. However, the poem concludes that the body is not the most useful approach to thinking about her life and death. Drury can be "made better" in heaven by redefining her as a composite of "two souls," transforming the paralyzing confusion of the two souls into a new figuration of the human. The poem uses the figure of the "written roll" as the figural structure of the two souls: "two souls...on both sides written rolls."27

By writing the two souls on "both sides" of a sheet of text, the poem deemphasizes the body and the traditional metaphors describing the body/soul relation.28 The conventional dualism of body and soul can be "made better" by shifting to the alternative tropology of the two souls defined in terms of their textual nature, "written" on "both sides" of the text. The poem reconceives the soul in terms of a sheet of paper existing in three dimensions, which requires the reader to rotate the "written roll" in space so as to read the reverse, hidden surface of text. The reader must "roll" the paper over in order to perceive "both sides" of the soul's written text. In writing the two souls on the obverse and reverse surfaces of the dual-sided sheet, the poem circumvents the traditional Christian metaphysics of interiority and exteriority. Neither of the "two souls" is interiorized, but are both are exteriorized written surfaces legible according to the

---

27 The only reading I have found coming close to the two-sided textual soul is in Raspa, A. “Theology and Poetry in Donne’s Conclave.” ELH (1965): “As a synthesis of this human typology, Elizabeth Drury had two ‘soules’ and was like paper written on both sides, on one her history as a created being and on the other her mystical significance as the law of God.”

28 For an account of Donne’s use of these conventions, see: Waddington, RB. “‘All in All’: Shakespeare, Milton, Donne and the Soul-in-body Topos.” English Literary Renaissance 20, no. 1 (1990).
reader's position in space relative to the two surfaces. The Christian soul's "strong records for God" are invisible to the reader not because they are nested in the body, but rather because we have failed to "roll" over the sheet of paper in space, revealing a hidden reverse surface. For Donne, a three-dimensional conception of the two-sided textual soul represents a "fuller" understanding of Elizabeth Drury's existence than the dualism of body and soul.29

It is important to emphasize that Donne's specific description of the “two souls” as a “written roll” with recto and verso sides modifies the Progress of the Soul's initial understanding of Elizabeth Drury as humanity’s “best, and worthiest book.” The concluding moves of the poem demonstrate that part of the problem in understanding the two souls lies in finding the proper textual format to figure their relation. Elizabeth Drury is therefore not a printed “book” or codex with multiple quires bound together, but rather must be figured as a “written roll” or scroll inscribed by hand, such as those used in documenting court and state records, composed of parchment or “skin” and not paper. The physical difference between the image of the book and that of the “written roll” is significant in understanding the Donne’s self-identified role in defining the two-sided soul. Rolled “records” of the court were proprietary knowledge, and were not meant to be disseminated to the eyes of the reading public. However, Donne’s self-description as the “trumpet” announcing the “proclamation” of Elizabeth Drury’s triumphant two-sided soul effectively unrolls the secret, private document of her soul’s “records” and disseminates her unfurled “written roll” to readers such as us. Donne turns the private “record” of Drury’s two-sided soul into a public “proclamation” broadcasted by the poet figured as the “trumpet, at whose voice the people came.” The arriving “people” in question are the readers of the poem itself. The poem converts Elizabeth Drury’s two-sided soul from a tightly bound private scroll, to a public “proclamation” unfolding her “two souls...on both sides written rolls” into the sheet of poetry that we read before us. The “eyes” reading Drury’s two souls are ours, and the two sided-text in question is the poem itself.

The "two souls" sequence concluding the Progress of the Soul also revises the temporality of reprinting Elizabeth Drury's soul described in earlier passages. Earlier moments of the poem accounted for two different moments of rewriting Elizabeth Drury's soul: once in the mortal world, and a second reprinting in heaven "in a far fairer print," but with identical wording: her reprinted text "read the same." Where the previous articulation of her soul's reprinting described a temporality of sequential printing, once before death, and once after, the conclusion of the poem turns the double-printing of the souls into a question of the text's spatial orientation. The two souls are therefore not duplicate texts reprinted at different times, but are written simultaneously, on the reverse faces of single sheet of text. The difference between the two souls

29 Donne’s Funeral Elegy written in honor of Elizabeth Drury two years prior to the Progress of the Soul, sets the terms for the later poem’s reconstitution of the soul as a two-sided sheet: “She hath yielded to too long an ecstasy, / He which not knowing her sad history, / Should come to read the book of destiny...Should turn the leaf to read, and read no more,/ Would think that either destiny mistook, / Or that some leaves were torn out of the book. / But ‘tis not so” (81-91). In the earlier poem, Donne argues that the “ecstasy” of Elizabeth Drury’s soul is an interrupted reading of a text: either the reader attempts to “turn the leaf to read,” but stops reading, or tears the leaves out of her book. The conclusion of the later poem completes the interrupted reading of the Funeral Elegy, by finishing the act of “turning the leaf to read” the second side of Elizabeth Drury’s soul.
is not the time of their printing, but rather their specific orientation on the three dimensional surfaces of a "rolled" text. In this revised temporality of the two souls, the poet moves away from the previous ecstasy of what the soul "shall be" in the future time of afterlife, to the contemplation of how the two souls have already been inscribed on a two-sided sheet. The poet was obsessed at earlier moments with how Elizabeth Drury's soul is printed differently on heaven and on earth to such a great extent that he failed to realize that her two souls were already printed twice: "for she was rather two souls...on both sides written rolls." By placing the act of writing in the past tense, "was," Donne argues that Elizabeth Drury was always composed of a two-sided written soul, but that such a fact was unrecognized by readers obsessed with speculation about the futurity of the soul. A scene of double printing already composes the two-sided soul, and is not performed at some future time. However, the soul's dual surfaces are difficult to perceive since one of its faces points away from the reader in space, hidden on the reverse face of the "written roll." The conclusion of the poem, therefore, exhorts the reader to abandon the useless obsession with futurity and the reprinting of the soul "in a far fairer print" in heaven. The double printing of the soul has already occurred in the past, albeit in a counterintuitive fashion, on the reverse faces of the two-sided "written roll."

If we understand our souls as already being composed of dual written surfaces, we do not need to wait for death in a future moment to resolve the problem of two souls. The inscription of the two-sided soul permits a new understanding of the two souls existing simultaneously in harmony. On the recto side of the two-sided sheet of the soul, Donne inscribes the Aristotelian soul legible and perceptible to the reading “eyes” and faculties of the Aristotelian soul. On the verso, reverse side of the dual-sided sheet, Donne describes the Christian soul composing “strong records for God” encoded in a language completely beyond the scope of the Aristotelian soul and its faculties. The Aristotelian soul is the legible surface of the text facing the reader as the "outward skin" visible to the "eyes": we can "read" the soul insofar as the eyes can visually perceive the language composing it. Donne creates an intrinsic connection between the act of reading and the Aristotelian soul, since we can read the soul-as-text only insofar as we can visually perceive its language through the faculty of sensation and its organs. While the faculty of sense can "read" the "outward skin" of the Aristotelian soul, Donne defines the Christian soul in terms of an invisible spiritual text signifying "records" written for God in a language analogous to the “mind”: “As strong records for God, as minds within.” Since the language encoding the Christian soul on the reverse side of the two-sided sheet is illegible to the faculties of the Aristotelian soul, the only way that Donne can describe them is by using figures. Donne creates a figural comparison between the Christian soul’s imperceptible text and the invisible workings of the “mind.” Upon turning the sheet of text, the reader finds that the reverse side of Elizabeth Drury’s two-sided soul is encoded in figures and analogies, and not the directly

---

30 Donne uses the figure of the skin as a written sheet in his definition of the image of God “imprinted” upon the soul: “These be the Records of velim, these be the parchmins, the endictments, and the evidences that shall condemn many of us, at the last day, our own skins; we have the book of God, the Law, written in our own hearts; we have the image of God imprinted in our own souls; wee have the character, and seal of God stamped in us...and, all this is bound up in this velim, in this parchmin, in this skin.” (Donne, “Sermon Preached at Lincolns Inne,” upon Job 19.26.)
The perceptible language of the "outward skin." The poetic resources of metaphor and analogy are so important in articulating the two-sided soul, since without them, we could not begin to think about the visually inaccessible "strong records for God" written on the far side of the "written roll."

Ultimately, the inscription of the "two souls" as the dual faces of the "written roll" amounts to a state of psychological perfection abiding by a principle of growth: "She, by making full perfection grow." The pronoun "she" that previously represented the reprinting of Elizabeth Drury's soul in heaven, now functions according to the logic of the Aristotelian soul's vegetative faculty responsible for human growth. If line 504 argues that the "written roll" should be understood in terms of its "fullness" or figural plentitude ("two souls / or like to full, on both sides written rolls"), line 507 reasserts that the writing of the two souls constitutes a "full perfection" bringing the Aristotelian and Christian souls into a state of harmony. Inscribing the dual surfaces of the "written roll" creates a soul that "grows" as the body's organs would. The two-sided soul inscribed upon the "written roll" is therefore not simply a figure for Elizabeth Drury, but becomes by the end of the passage a growing, seeing, and thinking textual entity that defines the living human. The process of writing the dual surfaces of the two soul's "written rolls" works through all three faculties of the Aristotelian soul: the senses capable of reading the "outward skin" of the text, the rational faculty as an analogy to express the hidden language of the Christian soul's "strong records for God", and the vegetative faculty's power of growth as a way to describe the "full perfection" of the two-sided soul. The conclusion of the Progress of the Soul is so rich and complex because it uses the faculties of the Aristotelian soul in several different ways: as the textual content of the "outward skin" of the two-sided "written roll," as readerly instruments enabling the sense organs to visually perceive the soul's text, and as a system of figures capable of approximating the Christian soul's "strong records for God."

The growth of the two soul's "full" perfection "pieces a circle," marking a return to the circular trace of the compass concluding the Valediction: forbidding Mourning. However, unlike in the Valediction, the "circle" being inscribed in the Progress of the Soul is not a figure of one's relation to a lover, but becomes a symbol for the poem itself figured as a circular coin.

Nor wouldst thou be content,
To take this, for my second year's true rent,
Did this coin bear any other stamp, than his
That gave thee power to do, me, to say this.
Since his will is, that to posterity,
Thou shouldst for life, and death, a pattern be,
And that the world should notice have of this,
The purpose, and th'authority is his;
Thou art the proclamation; and I am
The trumpet, at whose voice the people came. (521-528)
Throughout the poem's concluding moves, Donne repeats a circular geometry, in the "written rolls" folding the two-sided soul into a scroll, the circle "pieced" together in writing "full perfection" of the two souls, and ultimately, the circular coin which stands as an emblem for the poem itself. If the initial contrast between the "outward skin" and the "strong records for God" describes a scroll that is tightly bound upon itself, in a shape that "pieces a circle," Donne's introduction of the coin effectively flattens the circular shape of the "written roll," into the two-dimensional format of stamped currency. The circular "written roll" is the poem itself, which Donne figures as the circular coin "stamped" by the authority of Sir Robert Drury. Elizabeth Drury's father confers on Donne the "power" to turn the story of the dead girl's soul into a "pattern" for future printing and "stamping." The prominence of circular figures in the poem's final moves (in the "written roll," in her two souls "piecing a circle," and in the stamping of coins) demonstrate that the poem's title is somewhat inappropriate in describing Donne's ultimate resolution of the two-souls problem. The poem is not a forward or linear "progress" of the two souls to a state of transcendence or of Christian immortality. The "progress" of the soul ultimately achieved in the poem is a circular movement, "piecing a circle" by inscribing Elizabeth Drury's two souls onto the dual surfaces of the "written roll" and by recasting the circular text as a stamped coin. Elizabeth Drury has experienced a circular form of "progress" since her already-printed soul will be printed and stamped again.

Donne's act of "trumpeting" the "two souls...on both sides written rolls" inscribes the "proclamation" of Drury's two souls in the language of the poem itself, which he ultimately figures in the mechanics of "stamping" coins. In describing the authorship of the poem in the vocabulary of "stamping" coins, and by turning the narrative of Elizabeth Drury's two souls into a "pattern" for future printing, Donne completely changes the nature of the soul's immortality. Elizabeth Drury's soul is not immortal in accordance with the temporality of Christian eternity delineated in "laws of religion" (l. 515), but rather due to the "laws of poetry" (l. 514) that guide the writing of the poem we read before us. Elizabeth Drury's soul becomes immortal only insofar as it serves as a "pattern" for the future printing and "stamping" of circular textual "coins" such as the poem Donne has written, and that we read before us. Her soul can be called immortal to the extent that it functions as a "pattern" or template for infinite duplication and reprinting in the future, in the form of the textual "coin" that is Of the Progress of the Soul. In Of the Progress of the Soul, then, Donne does not simply describe the state of Elizabeth Drury's immortal soul, but goes so far as to claim that the text of the poem itself is the circular two-sided "written roll" upon

---

31 The reference to the "coin" is also a sly reference to the story of Donne's patronage to Sir Robert Drury: Donne wrote the Anniversaries so as to attract the patronage of Drury during a period of desperate poverty. Donne's effort was successful, and traveled with the Drurys across Europe from 1611-1612, and he was provided a house upon their return to London. See also, Carey John. “Donne and Coins.” In English Renaissance Studies Presented to Dame Helen Gardner, ed. John Carey. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

32 The poem’s concluding figure of the “coin” and “pattern” reflects a repeated theme through both Anniversary poems: “She that was best, and first original / Of all fair copies...Is but as single money, coined from her.” (Anatomy of the World, 227-234); “She, from whose influence all impressions came...Who, though she could not transubstantiate / All states to gold, yet gilded every state.” (Anatomy of the World, 215-218); “She whose rich beauty lent / Mintage to others' beauties.” (Progress of the Soul, 223-224); “She coined, in this, that her impressions gave / To all our actions all the worth they have.” (Progress of the Soul, 369-370).
which we read her two souls, rendered immortal to the extent that she is the "pattern" for the reprinting of future texts.

The conclusion of the *Progress of the Soul* redefines the two souls in terms of their textuality and their composition as a two-sided sheet. Donne gives the poet, with his unique ability to rewrite the figures defining the two-sided textuality of the soul, the power to resolve and renegotiate the complex paradox of the two souls. If Hamlet gives a sense of agency to the theatrical performer, Donne gives to the poet the agency to rewrite the two souls in terms of their textuality and their composition in figures.

"Read my leafes on both sides": Printing the Image of God in Donne's Sermons

Donne carries the framework defining the two souls as a two-sided "written roll," into the final phase of his career, as Royal Chaplain to the households of James I and Charles I, and as dean of St. Paul's Cathedral. In his sermons, Donne continues to demonstrate his obsession with the process of writing and reprinting the two souls understood as a textual object. Donne's 1623 sermon upon the Penitential Psalms, for instance, proposes a method of "stamping" and printing the poetic text figured as a coin, in precisely the same manner as the *Progress of the Soul* written a decade earlier.

And therefore it is easie to observe, that in all Metricall compositions, of which kinde the book of Psalmes is, the force of the whole piece, is for the most part left to the shutting up; the whole frame of the Poem is a beating out of a piece of gold, but the last clause is as the impression of the stamp, and that is it that makes it currant.33

Donne's reading of the Psalms late in his life returns to many of the figures used in his earliest literary efforts, including the act of "beating out a piece of gold" and the interpretation of the poetic text as a "stamped" coin. Donne's sermon serves as a commentary upon the Psalms, but also functions as a retroactive reading of his own act of writing the conclusion of the *Progress of the Soul*. Both the poem and the later sermon agree that the poetic text should be figured as a coin given value by its "stamp." However, the sermon adds the proviso that the order of reading matters crucially in the successful formation of the "metricall" coin. The "whole frame of the Poem" constitutes the hammering of the raw materials of the "piece of gold," but the "impression of the stamp" transforming the gold into currency must wait until the "last clause" ending the poem. By creating a parallel between the order of "stamping" the coin and the order of reading the poem, Donne suggests why he waited until the final moments of the *Progress of the Soul* to introduce the concept of "two souls...on both sides written rolls." The conclusion of the poem is the most important moment of the poem, which transforms the raw matter of "gold" into a coin possessing value by the "impression of the stamp" that "makes it currant."

33 Donne, “Sermon Preached upon the Penitentiall Psalms,” April, May, or June 1623.
Note also that Donne's explication of the poem's conclusion as the "impression" of a coin serves as his reading strategy for interpreting the Psalms. He contends that "all Metricall compositions," including the scriptural Psalms, must be read in this fashion. For Donne, the figure of gold beaten into a coin and given value by its "stamp," introduced in the Valediction: for bidding Mourning, and developed in the Progress of the Soul, reappears in his sermon as a strategy for reading the "Metricall" structure of the scriptural text. These moves demonstrate that Donne does not simply abandon figures from his earlier poetic career as playful witty conceits, but indeed reconfigures them late in his life as the metaphorical tools used in developing his powerful interpretations of Scripture.

Donne's sermons have been read by critics since Izaak Walton's 1640 Life of John Donne as a body of mature theological thought in contradistinction to the juvenalia of his earlier "metaphysical" poetic conceits fixated on eroticism and love. Critics have argued that Donne's ordainment into the Church of England represented a clean break from his earlier poetic career, and they have expressed dismay at the Donne's alarmingly conservative positions as a priest in contrast to the radical ideas of the poet. This account of Donne's career overlooks the pervasive continuity of a wide range of ideas and figures that obsessed Donne from his earliest lyrics to his final sermon, including the aforementioned image of the hammered gold, and the figuration of the poem as a "stamped" coin. Donne's sermons do not simply superficially refer to such figures and concepts first developed in his poetry in passing: many of the figures become the foundation of Donne's doctrinal positions. The critical assumption that Donne abandons the radical ideas and figures of his poetry in his later "mature" conservative sermons does not take the intellectual import of his poetry seriously enough, and fails to acknowledge that Donne constantly returns to earlier poetic preoccupations in his sermons.

The sermons dramatize Donne's lifelong preoccupation with the problem of two souls: seventy-nine of his one-hundred sixty sermons refer to the paradoxical relationship of the Aristotelian and Christian souls first introduced in the Songs and Sonnets. In the sermons, Donne is specifically concerned with the process of inscribing the "two souls...on both sides written rolls" described at length in the Progress of the Soul. Donne uses the poem's definition of the soul's two-sided textuality as a way of radically reconceiving the Christian subject's relation to God and Scripture. Notably, Donne expands his understanding of the "two souls...on both sides written rolls" to all humans, and not only Elizabeth Drury's case, in his Sermon preached on Easter Monday, 1622:

---

34 Carey, pp. 10-11.
35 Such dismissals of Donne's thought begin with with Samuel Johnson's famous characterization of Donne's poetry as a facile employment of “discordia concors” in which “the most heterogeneous ideas are yoked by violence together,” T.S. Eliot agrees in 1927, in arguing that Donne’s work does not demonstrate “any thinking, but only a vast jumble of incoherent erudition on which he drew for purely poetic effects.” (Eliot, T.S. “Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca,” in Selected Essays. London: Faber & Faber, 1951. 139.)
as a Circle is printed all at once, so his beginning and ending is all one...And then if God be pleas'd to make thee a Roll written on both sides, a History of Adversity, as well as of Prosperity. 36

And in his Sermon to the King on Lent, 1630:

And truly, so may I, so may every soule say, that is rectified, refreshed, restored, re-established by the seales of Gods pardon, and his mercy, so the world would take knowledge of the consequences of my sins, as well as of the sins themselves, and read my leafes on both sides, and heare the second part of my story, as well as the first. 37

In these two excerpts, directly repeating the "two souls...on both sides written rolls" of the Progress of the Soul, Donne argues that "every soule" is made by God as a "Roll written on both sides," and a "leaf" read "on both sides." In a sense, the articulation of Elizabeth Drury's two-sided written soul serves as a prototype for Donne's later attempt to define "every soule" created by God as a "Roll written on both sides." For "every soule," each side of the double-sided sheet inscribes the two stories and the two histories of one's life: one side documents the "history of adversity" and the "consequences of my sins," while the other contains a text describing a history of "Prosperity" and the "seales of God's pardon." By directly appropriating the "two souls...on both sides written rolls" of the Anniversaries, Donne turns the "Roll written on both sides" into the primary figure of "every soule's" textual nature, in its capacity to be "written" and "read" as the two-sided story of one's life.

Donne's articulation of a God that "reads" and "writes" the soul as a two-sided sheet becomes a central concern in his reconception of the "image of God" in the Christian subject. Across many sermons, Donne engages in a sustained project of revising the traditional doctrine of the "image of God" in man. Donne engages in his most systematic treatment of the concept in his 1629 sermon preached to King Charles, in which he evinces the radical position that God prints his image upon the "natural faculties" of the Aristotelian soul, and not upon the immortal substance of the Christian soul.

And there remaines onely now, the operation thereof, how this Image of God in the soule of man works. The Sphear then of this intelligence, the Gallery for this Picture, the Arch for this Statue, the Table, and frame and shrine for this Image of God, is inwardly and immediately the soule of man...But this Image is in our soule, as our soule is the wax, and this Image is the seale.

[...]
let us consider the having of this Image: in what respect, in what operation, this Image is in our soule. For, whether this Image, bee in those faculties, which we have in Nature; or in those qualifications, which we may have in Grace; or in those super-illustrations, which the

37 Donne, “Sermon to the King on Lent,” April 20, 1630.
blessed shall have in Glory; hath exercised the contemplation of many. Properly this Image is in Nature; in the natural reason, and the other faculties of the Soule of man...For it is radically, primarily, in the very soule it selfe.

[...]

For the steppes, which we consider are four; First, \textit{Esse}, Beeing; for some things have onely a beeing, and no life, as stones: Secondly, \textit{Vivere}, Living; for some things have life, and no sense, as Plants: and then, thirdly, \textit{Sentire}, Sense; for some things have sense, and no understanding. Which understanding and reason, man hath with his Beeing, and Life, and Sense; and so is in a nearer station to God, then any other creature, and a livelier Image of him, who is the root of Beeing...Now in all these respects man, the meer naturall man, hath the Image of the King of Kings. And therefore respect that Image in thy selfe, and exalt thy natural faculties.\footnote{Donne, “Sermon Preached to the King, at the Court,” upon Gen. 1.26, 1629.}

This sermon considers in great detail the "operation" of the "Image of God in the soule of man." Donne works through several metaphors describing the relation of God's image and the human soul: "The Sphear of this intelligence, the Gallery for this picture, the Arch for this Statue" all figurally approximate how the soul serves as the "table and frame" of the image of God. Ultimately, however, Donne selects the figure of the seal impressed into wax to describe how God's image is imprinted in the human soul. After cycling through several possible figures to describe the image of God, Donne's final choice of the wax seal is startling since it adopts the privileged metaphor used in Aristotle's \textit{De Anima} to characterize the hylomorphic interaction of form and matter: "The soul may therefore be defined as the first actuality of a natural body potentially possessing life, and such will be any body which possesses organs...So one need no more ask whether body and soul are one than whether the wax and the impression it receives are one" and "the wax receives the impression of the signet-ring without the iron or the gold."\footnote{Aristotle, \textit{De Anima}, 424a17-20, and 412b5-7.} By appropriating Aristotle's figure of the "impression" of a seal in wax, Donne surprisingly turns the paradigmatic metaphor of the Aristotelian organic soul into the basis of explicating the specifically Christian concept of the image of God. Donne not only cites Aristotle's organic soul, but goes so far as to mobilize Aristotle's exact metaphors to describe a vitally important Christian concept.

Donne's reading of the "image of God" continues in an unexpected direction in his assertion that God "impresses" his image in the "natural faculties" of the Aristotelian soul, and not in the "grace" of the Christian soul. Donne acknowledges that generations of thinkers have struggled to ascertain whether the image of God places the image of God in "those faculties, which we have in Nature," or in "those qualifications, which we may have in Grace," or finally in "those super-illustrations, which the blessed shall have in Glory." One might expect that as a Christian thinker preaching to the king, Donne would advocate the primacy of "Grace" or "Glory." He does not, and instead guides his audience to the faculties of the Aristotelian soul: "Properly this Image is in Nature; in the natural reason, and the other faculties of the Soule of
man." The image of God is "properly" located in the "faculties" of the "natural" Aristotelian soul, and not in the Christian soul more obviously marked by "Grace" and "Glory."

Donne specifically cites the "steppes" of the ascending faculties of the Aristotelian soul to emphasize his point. Donne's natural "steppes" directly cite Aristotle's hierarchy of the faculties in *De Anima*.[40] The first "step" of nature is bare being without life, as in the case of stones; the second is life without sense, as in the case of plants; the third is sense without understanding, found in animals, and the final "steppe" is the human soul combining "understanding and reason" with being, life, and sense. Donne's taxonomy is a direct citation of Aristotle's hierarchy of the faculties, which organizes living beings according to the ascending faculties of nutrition, sensation, and reason. Humans possess the "liveliest" image of God to the extent that we have all of Aristotle's faculties, separating us from animals, plants, and stones: we are in a "nearer station to God" inasmuch as we have the faculty of "understanding and reason" combined with "Beinge, and Life, and Sense." According to the sermon's logic, the "image of God" is impressed upon the "natural faculties" of the Aristotelian soul, and since humans possess the greatest number of faculties, we have the fullest image of God in our souls. In this additive logic composing the "image of God," humans are a "livelier image" since we have all four of the "natural faculties," while perhaps animals only have 3/4 of his image since they are defined by three faculties, without reason, and plants only have 2/4 of his image, since they lack the higher faculties of sensation and reason. Donne creates a direct correspondence between the natural faculties and the completeness of God's image in the soul: the more faculties we possess, the more compete the image of God will be. God impresses the "liveliest image" within humans only insofar as we have all of the "natural faculties," while God's image impressed in animals and plants are partial since they possess a fraction of the faculties we do.

After repeatedly emphasizing the primacy of the Aristotelian soul's "natural faculties" in the impression of the "image of God," Donne culminates his reading with the assertion that all humans, every "meer naturall man," and not exclusively the elect, possess the "Image of the King of Kings." For Donne, we enjoy the privilege of a full "image of God" to the extent we are defined by the "natural faculties" of the Aristotelian soul defining every human, and not the "grace" or "glory" of the Christian soul. Since the "image of God" is contained in the Aristotelian soul's faculties, Donne exhorts his audience to alter their strategy of worship: Christians must "respect that Image in thy selfe" by "exalting thy natural faculties." Demonstrating "respect" to the "image of God" requires that we "exalt" the Aristotelian soul's "natural faculties." In placing the "image of God" in the Aristotelian soul instead of the Christian, Donne shifts the locus of proper worship from an obsession with the Christian soul's "grace" or "glory" to the "exaltation" of the "natural faculties." In this late sermon written two years before his death, Donne

---

surprisingly instructs the king and his household that they must "exalt" the Aristotelian soul's "natural faculties," and not the immortal substance of the Christian soul.41

This 1629 sermon demonstrates that late in his life, Donne's fascination with the relation of the Aristotelian and Christian souls has not diminished, and if anything, his positions have become more extreme. In his use of Aristotle's figure of stamped wax as a way to define the image of God in the Christian subject, in his assertion that God implants his image in the "natural faculties" of the Aristotelian soul, and not in the "grace" of the Christian soul, and in his insistence to the king to direct the act of "exaltation" not toward the Christian soul, but toward the faculties of the Aristotelian soul, Donne shows that even late in his career as an ostensibly Christian thinker, he does not abandon the problem of two souls at the heart of his earlier poetry. Even as a priest, Donne continues to understand the Aristotelian soul's faculties as the most important way to define fundamental Christian concepts such as the "image of God."

Donne's model of the God's image implanted in the faculties of the Aristotelian soul becomes a dominant trope in his sermons, recurring frequently in his readings of the soul. In his 1623 sermon on All Saint's Day, Donne returns the figure of printing and reprinting so important to the articulation of the two souls problem in the case of Elizabeth Drury, as a way to describe how the reprinting of God's image represents the possibility of Christian salvation.

Both Angels and we have the Image of God imprinted in us...They have it not in the highest degree, (for so Christ onely is the Image of the invisible God) but they have it in a deep impression, so as they can neither lose it, nor deface it. We have this Image of God so as that we cannot lose it, but we may, and doe deface it; \textit{Vri potest, non exuri}; The Devil hath this Image in him, and it cannot be burnt out in hell; for it is imprinted in the very naturall faculties of the soule...which though God have a purpose, \textit{Resculpere imaginem}, to re-engrave, to refresh, to polish this Image in us.42

Donne's sermon again uses the Aristotelian figure of the soul as an impressed medium as a way to figure the difference between God's image in angels, devils, and humans. The image of God has been "imprinted" in the "natural faculties of the soule" of all three creations, but the nature of the image varies based on specific differences occurring during the engraving process. Angels have a "deep impression" that cannot be altered: "they can neither lose it, nor deface it," while even the Devil has a permanent impression that cannot be "burnt out in hell." Humans, on the other hand, possess an impression deep enough so that "we cannot lose it," but superficial to the extent that we can "deface" it by sin. Donne insists that since the image of God is imprinted in

41 In a 1627 sermon, Donne argues that the "exaltation" of the natural faculties occurs by using them to "publish" oneself as a living word: "Be thou \textit{Verbum} too, A Word, as God was, A Speaking, and a Doing Word, to his glory, and the edification of others...Let thy mouth, let thy hand, let all the Organs of thy body, all the faculties of thy soule, concurre in the performance of this duty, intimated here...That they speak, utter, declare, publish the glory of God."

42 Donne, "Sermon Preached upon All Saints Day," 1623.
the "natural faculties" of the Aristotelian soul marking us as living beings, we can never lose the image as long as we are alive and can grow, sense, and think.

By defining the taxonomy of angels, devils, and humans as a difference of how deeply the image of God is imprinted upon the natural faculties, Donne refigures the promise of Christian salvation as God's act of re-engraving his image in our soul. Humans can attain a status closer to angels not by cultivating the virtue of the Christian soul, but by allowing God to work upon the Aristotelian soul, where He will "re-engrave" his image on the natural faculties. Donne defines God's ultimate "purpose" as a labor of printing and "re-engraving" our natural faculties, and claims that if we are to be saved, the path to salvation traces an arc through the Aristotelian soul's capacity to be imprinted and re-engraved by God. The force of Donne's argument in this moment cannot be overemphasized: the promise of salvation does not lie in the Christian soul's immortality, but rather in the possibility that the faculties of the Aristotelian soul can be imprinted and re-engraved by God, restoring the original depth and quality of his image in our souls. For Donne, the possibility of Christian immortality and salvation lies in the figuration of the Aristotelian soul as a medium of repeated printing, and not in the grace or virtue of the Christian soul. In heaven, we will not have a second life, but will rather experience our second printing.

By rethinking Christian salvation as a second printing, Donne attempts to give Christian subjects a form of agency to rewrite the text of our souls that will one day be reprinted by God. The “image of god” is fixed and unchangeable in angels and devils, but the human soul is unique in that it can be modified: it can be de-formed or re-formed during our lives. By transforming the Christian soul imprinted upon the “natural faculties” of the Aristotelian soul into a palimpsestic medium of printing and reprinting, Donne imagines a mode of human agency modify the content of our souls for better or worse.

Donne does not, however, reject the concept of Christian immortality outright: as an Anglican priest, he avers that the Christian subject will be rewarded by God in an immortal paradise. However, just as in the Songs and Sonnets, Donne admits that he has no idea what the immortality of the Christian soul looks like, nor how salvation will take place. Donne constantly returns to the figure of God’s imprinting the “natural faculties” of the Aristotelian soul as the central trope to think about how the Christian soul will be saved, and how the Christian soul’s relation to the Aristotelian soul structures the human relation to God. The example of the “strong records for God” on the reverse side of Elizabeth Drury’s two-sided soul is illuminating in this instance. In the Second Anniversary, Donne argues that human “eyes” can directly read the etched upon the “outward skin” of the Aristotelian soul, but that the hidden face encoding the Christian “strong records for God” can only be accessed through an analogical comparison to the faculty of reason: “As strong records for God, as minds within.” The imperceptible language of the “strong records for God” can only be read by mortal eyes through figures. In his sermons, Donne uses the same rhetorical strategy, by turning the trope of God “imprinting” his image on the “natural faculties” of the Aristotelian soul into his primary method of explaining the image of God and Christian salvation to his audience. Without recourse to the evocative figure of printing,
Donne could only speak in garbled tongues or mystical riddles, leaving his audience in utter confusion. Donne does not so much privilege the “natural faculties” of the Aristotelian soul over the Christian soul as he identifies them as the only way to talk about the Christian mysteries. By returning to the figure of God “imprinting” the “natural faculties” throughout his sermons, Donne turns the immortality and salvation of the Christian soul into a matter of accurate figuration, a tropology, rather than an transcendental eschatology.

It is important to emphasize the specificity of Donne's diction in his figuration of Christian salvation as a reprinting of the Aristotelian soul. Donne argues that the image of God etched upon the natural faculties can be reprinted only insofar as God "re-engraves" his image. By selecting the word "engrave," Donne specifies that what will be "refreshed" and "polished" is not so much an image imprinted in ink, but rather the engraved metallic cast that serves as the template for the printed image. Donne goes into great detail in his 1627 sermon on Acts 7.60 in describing how such a process of graving a cast defines human life, culminating with the printed image created at the moment of one's death.

Wee give you a Picture too. There is not a minute left to do it; not a minutes sand; Is there a minutes patience? Bee pleased to remember that those Pictures which are deliver'd in a minute, from a print upon paper, had many dayes, weeks, Moneths time for the graving of those Pictures in the Copper; So this Picture of that dying Man, that dies in Christ, that dies the death of the Righteous, that embraces Death as a Sleepe, was graving all his life; All his publique actions were the lights, and all his private the shadowes of this Picture. And when this Picture comes to the Presse, this Man to the streights and agonies of Death, thus he lies, thus he looks, this he is. His understanding and his will is all one faculty; He understands Gods purpose upon him, and he would not have God's purpose turned any other way; hee sees God will dissolve him, and he would faine be dissolved, to be with Christ; His understanding and his will is all one faculty; His memory and fore-sight are fixt, and concentred upon one object.43

If Donne previously defined "God's purpose" as a return to "re-engrave" the image imprinted upon the natural faculties, in this passage, Donne specifically demonstrates how "God's purpose" becomes actualized at the moment of death: "He understands Gods purpose upon him, and he would not have God's purpose turned any other way." Donne initially adopts an extremely urgent tone, underlining the lack of time one has to successfully print one's image at the moment of death: "there is not a minute left to do it; not a minutes sand." However, the dying individual can be comforted by the fact that an image "deliver'd in a minute, from a print upon paper," required a long process of graving a template in a "copper" mold for months before the moment of printing. For Donne, the printing of the dying person represents the culmination of a lifetime of "graving" the copper template, in which the "publique actions" compose the lights, and the "private" moments the shadows, of his final image.44 If in the previous sermon, Donne argued

44 For a reading of the parallels between Donne’s final sermons and his final portrait, see: Anderson, JH. “Life Lived and Life Written: Donne’s Final Word or Last Character.” Huntington Library Quarterly 51 (1989).
that God will return to the image imprinted in the Aristotelian faculties so as to the "re-engrave" the soul at the end of one's life, in this passage, he asserts that human life itself is a long process of "graving" a copper cast in preparation for this final printing. In this radical move, Donne redefines human life itself in terms of the mechanics of copper engraving and printing, and argues that each moment of an individual's life coalesces into a slow process of constructing the copper mold that will be actualized at the moment of our death, "when this Picture comes to the Presse."

It is worthwhile to emphasize how extreme Donne's position is in contrast to the canonical philosophies of soul found in the writings of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas. Both Augustine and Aquinas argue that the divine substance of the soul is rational thought and the powers of cognition (memory in Augustine’s case, or the “agent intellect” in Aquinas’), marking the Christian human as different from brute animals and plants. Donne completely transforms the substance of the Christian soul into either the wax impression synonymous with the Aristotelian soul, or a textual printing by God. Donne’s enunciation of the two souls is so radical because it moves away from cognition and rational thought as the basis of Christian transcendence, to a model basing salvation on our malleable textuality and ability to be reprinted at the moment of our reunion with God.

Donne’s figuration of Christian salvation as a mode of printing is so powerful since it can unify the Aristotelian and Christian souls in a way that the canonical paradigm of spiritual transcendence cannot. The printing of the image upon one's death "dissolves" the internal divisions of the soul, transforming the higher-order cognitive powers of the understanding, will, and memory into "one faculty." The printing of the final image "dissolves" the schism between the powers of the Aristotelian soul, and unifies the cognitive powers of the soul with the Christian soul’s singleminded desire to be the object of “God’s purpose.” The figure of the final printing “concentrates” all of the Aristotelian powers of mind into “one faculty,” focused with an intense desire to “be with Christ.” At the moment of one’s final printing, the Aristotelian and Christian souls are bound in a unified desire to “be with Christ” and to be reprinted by God. The unity of the cognitive faculties with the desire of the Christian soul at the moment of death represents an enormous contrast to the divided, warring state of the two souls described in the Anniversary poems. If in life our two souls are divided, such divisions are "dissolved" at the moment of our death into "one faculty" intensely focused upon God's act of reprinting our soul.

Donne’s figure of the final printing is also more radical than the standard Christian model of salvation since it redefines the separation of soul and body at the moment of death. In Donne’s sermon, the soul does not gloriously rise to heaven, leaving the body’s shell in the grave. Donne refigures the “grave” as the process of copper template “graving” unifying the soul into “one

faculty,” and not the trough into which one inte a dead body. In Donne’s revised model of Christian death, the “grave” is not the final resting place of the corrupt body, but rather the “engraved” soul reprinted and “dissolved” into “one faculty.” For Donne, the “grave” involves the printing of the soul and not the final state of the body. In moving from the grave-as-burial to the graving-as-printing of the soul’s new image, Donne changes the temporality of Christian death. For Donne, death does not occur in an instant, but is the culmination of a lifelong process of meticulously “graving” the copper plate that will serve as the template of the soul’s image in God’s “Presse.” Although an image is “deliver’d in a minute” with the application of “print upon paper,” the template impressing the image upon the paper requires a lifetime of “graving.” The “copper” template of our souls has been “graving” and under construction for every moment of our lives, and the actual act of printing of the soul’s image occurs at the moment of our death, in God’s “Presse.” The “graving” is not the act of burying the dead body, but rather the living process of etching the copper template of the soul’s image. By modifying the temporality of the “grave,” Donne relocates the responsibility of a proper Christian death. Death does not only occur at the final moment of one’s life: our death occurs during every minute of our lives, as we slowly build the template of our final image. Just as Donne alters the state of Elizabeth Drury’s two souls from the future tense of “shall be” to the past tense of “she was two souls,” Donne’s sermon urges the audience to realize that one’s reunion with God as a second printing will not happen in the future, but has already begun in the “actions” that define our lives. By simply living, we are already dying, by constructing the pattern for our final image. For Donne, the “grave” does not describe the death of the body as much as the life history of our souls.

Donne’s specific use of the word “dissolve” to describe the unification of the soul’s powers into “one faculty” also directly reflects the precise mechanics of graving and copper etching. The “dissolving” of the soul suggests the chemical process of a copper template covered in wax, and washed in acid to “grave” the inscribed etching.46 The acid “dissolves” or bites into the copper plate to etch our final image according to the wax pattern. Donne turns Aristotle’s figure of the soul as a wax impression into the medium of our second printing: God-as-printmaster “dissolves” the wax impressing the different faculties of the Aristotelian soul with corrosive acid, revealing the “copper” template used in one’s reprinting at death. All of our lives, the copper plate of our soul’s image has been “graving” in an acid wash, and at the moment of our final printing, God removes the wax layer, “dissolving” the internal divisions of the soul into “one faculty.” Donne’s extended figure of copper “graving” and printing completely rethinks the experience of Christian death as the union (or dissolution) of two souls, and not the divorce of the corrupt body and transcendent soul. The frustrating division of the two souls in life is resolved at the moment of our final printing, where God-as-printer “dissolves” the partitions between the different powers of the Aristotelian and Christian souls into “one faculty” unified in the desire to “be with Christ.” For Donne, death is not the separation of the soul and body, but rather the union of the two souls in a final printing by God.
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In the sermons, the mechanics of "imprinting" and "graving" God's image upon the "natural faculties" give Donne a powerful array of metaphors to think about God's return to the human soul at the moment of death, and how Christian salvation might be refigured in terms of the textuality of the two souls and their ability to be printed. Donne’s extended figuration of the soul’s printing allows him to bind the two souls into a constitutive relation, in which the faculties of the Aristotelian soul serve as the substrate for God’s final printing of our image. Where Donne struggled to join the two souls throughout his life, he finds that the figure of printing allows him to “dissolve” the divisions between the two souls in death. Ultimately, the extent of Donne's fascination with how the soul "comes to Presse" in a final image can be clearly seen in his own final portrait, in which he famously poses in his own shroud. For Donne "embraces Death as a Sleepe," with closed eyes, lying in a death pose for a final "graved" image: "thus he lies, thus he looks, this he is." Donne abides by the sermon's articulation of the soul’s final printing, in his own memento mori, printed months before his death.

In Donne's sermons, we can therefore see how the writing and printing of the two-sided soul upon a sheet of text in the Anniversaries, functions as a powerful figural model frequently mobilized in his later articulation of the "image of God" printed and engraved upon the "natural faculties" of the Aristotelian soul. More generally, this chapter has argued that Donne's obsession with the problem of two souls extends throughout his career, from the early lyrics to his final sermons in the years before his death. For Donne, the problem of two souls could only be resolved by redefining them in terms of their textuality: their capacity to be written and imprinted in life, and re-engraved upon one's death. Ultimately, Donne redefines the immortality of the Christian soul and the promise of salvation, in the Anniversaries and in his sermons, as God's rewriting and reprinting the faculties of the Aristotelian soul in "a far fairer print." The initial paradox of two souls leads Donne to reconceive the immortal Christian soul in terms of the Aristotelian soul's textuality. This radical vision of Christian immortality as a reprinting informs Donne's preparation for his own death, in his late sermons and in his final portrait, where he anticipates the moment of returning to God’s “Presse.”
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