

(129) moments. McEachern makes the implausible suggestion that the figure of the cuckold, being emblematic of the “epistemic disadvantage” (139) of dramatic irony, is emblematic of all plays. Though the subsequent discussion about cuckolds, horns, Moses, and Actaeon is fascinating in itself, it feels like a digression.

The final three chapters are devoted to close readings of *Richard II*, *King Lear*, and *The Tempest*. In chapter 5, the major compositional strategy in plays like *Richard II* or *King John* is to “worry the threshold of an event in a series of false alarms” (198), so that suspense and doubt are heightened. In chapter 6 McEachern asks the question of what knowledge Lear has by virtue of being a king, in a kind of inverse dramatic irony. Chapter 7 looks at the device of gathering scenes where information is exchanged between characters, or conversely, where they are prevented from gathering in order to build informational asymmetries between characters, exacerbating dramatic irony and suspense. One wishes that in all of these close readings, however, that McEachern pursue the compositional techniques that egg on desire for recognition more aggressively.

Many are the times the reader can be grateful for McEachern’s recognition of us, as she strives to guide us through the complicated terrain of early modern belief.

Rana Choi, *University of Chicago*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.487

Phantasmatic Shakespeare: Imagination in the Age of Early Modern Science.
Suparna Roychoudhury.

Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2018. xiv + 230 pp. \$45.

Suparna Roychoudhury’s *Phantasmatic Shakespeare* begins with Theseus’s response to the bewildered lovers in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. His meandering meditation on fancy is perhaps unsurprising in a play known for its meddlesome fairies, floral aphrodisiac, and coveted changeling. Teasing out the textures and tensions of this speech, Roychoudhury argues that Theseus’s incohesive thoughts on the imagination demonstrate two things: first, that early modern theories of the imagination were elusive and evolving; second, that such theories, though inchoate, were of particular interest to Shakespeare.

This ambitious and beautifully written examination of the image-making mind offers readers a thorough account of how Shakespeare’s variegated representations participate in the shifting field of faculty psychology. Roychoudhury joins scholars such as Evelyn Tribble, Mary Thomas Crane, and Carol Thomas Neely in analyzing how early modern literature negotiates the period’s often incongruent theories of cognition. Roychoudhury is unique, however, in focusing primarily on the operations of the image-making faculty (rather than its ethical or aesthetic value) and how exactly

Shakespeare engages in “epistemological problem solving” (8). Consulting an astonishing array of texts—including medical manuals, travelogues, and sermons—Roychoudhury organizes *Phantasmatic Shakespeare* around the epistemological ambiguities Shakespeare confronts in his plays and poetry.

Proto-scientists exhibited acute concern with the epistemological underpinnings of the imagination, reexamining philosophies of the mind inherited from medieval and classical thinkers, such as Aristotle, Avicenna, and Thomas Aquinas. Dissection, while illuminating, deepened rather than resolved debates regarding, for instance, the precise location of specific functions. Roychoudhury argues that the speaker of Shakespeare’s Sonnets, an anatomist in his own right, betrays, at times, greater interest in the inner workings of his body than in the beloved. This first chapter shows that the Sonnets belong very much to a culture in which anatomical investigation was just as much about “dissecting subjectivity” as it was about delineating the human form (55).

Chapters 2 and 3 remind us that early moderns commonly associated fancy with idleness and vanity, believing it could prevent intellectual growth and lead recklessly to irreligious phantasms. As Roychoudhury suggests, Shakespeare’s *Love’s Labour’s Lost* probes the imagination’s relation to empiricism, reconceiving traditional curricula by privileging the sensory reality of the observer. The play calls for a transformation of the imagination too, suggesting that it “must become alert to things outside itself, to nature rather than preconceived notions about nature” (81). Chapter 3 argues that literary representations of fancy drew heavily on Lucretian tropes, depicting the imagination amid a cosmos abuzz with nearly imperceptible “motes, worms, and winds” (88). Such depictions “coexisted with traditional connotations of vanity, render[ing] imagination both carnal and spiritual, gross and sheer, vital and morbid” (84). Roychoudhury claims that we see this tension as Mercutio attempts to disprove the validity of dreams. That he becomes possessed by his own fantastical images demonstrates not only the imagination’s infectious power, but also the extent to which natural philosophy—the testing of hypotheses—relies on the sensual imagination.

Roychoudhury’s fourth chapter returns to the period’s medical advances, specifically new optical models that divorced the imagination from vision. *Venus and Adonis* illustrates this rupture while *King Lear* stages the shortcomings of the imagination when sight fails. Although the influence of empiricism was felt across fields, Roychoudhury explains, in chapter 5, that discourses on melancholy were still largely informed by humoral medicine, which attributed the illness to an excess of black bile and cited hallucinations as its most common manifestation. Demonological discourses, however, obscured the boundary between natural and supernatural diseases, warning readers of similar delusions. Roychoudhury argues that the Macbeths’ indeterminate melancholy and recurring hallucinations stage anxieties regarding chaos, humoral imbalance, and the influence of the supernatural.

In her final chapter, Roychoudhury again touches on the risks of imaginative thought, pointing to the figure of the chimera, a hybrid beast, that came to stand for

the imagination's grotesque potential. Roychoudhury suggests that the period's travel literature and zoological writings relied on what she terms "chimeric description," a string oftentimes of similes used to depict new living forms. In *The Tempest*, Shakespeare not only "reveals the combinative imagination at work," but also forces us, as readers and playgoers, to reenact this process, particularly as we mentally negotiate the many creaturely descriptions characters ascribe to Caliban (181).

Roychoudhury attends to the metatheatricality of several isolated moments, arguing, in her epilogue, that *Midsummer's* rude mechanicals underscore the imaginative work dramatic productions necessitate. A more sustained engagement with the image-making minds of audiences could, however, offer the field of performance studies a fruitful investigation into the phenomenological experience of playgoing during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Nevertheless, *Phantasmatic Shakespeare* is an exciting addition to scholarship on early modern cognition and embodiment and a timely contribution to the fields of cognitive literary studies, history of consciousness, and phenomenology.

Roya Biggie, *Knox College*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.488

Shaping Remembrance from Shakespeare to Milton. Patricia Phillippy.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. xiv + 270 pp. \$110.

The last decade has seen a bumper crop of scholarly work on memory studies, with a remarkably bountiful harvest of books concerning the English Renaissance and Reformation—most notably, Lina Perkins Wilder's *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre* (2010), Andrew Hiscock's *Reading Memory in Early Modern Literature* (2011), Jonathan Baldo's *Memory in Shakespeare's Histories* (2011), and Isabel Karremann's *The Drama of Memory* (2015); also, *The Memory Arts in Renaissance England: A Critical Anthology* (2016) and the essays collected in *The Routledge Handbook of Shakespeare and Memory* (2016). *Shaping Remembrance* contributes productively to the conversations promulgated by these and other related works owing to Patricia Phillippy's sustained critical approach, which deftly intertwines religion, materiality, and gender.

The impetus and rationale for this hybrid treatment of the arts of remembrance derives from the book's overarching thesis, linking these six seemingly disparate chapters and focusing on material and textual remains of living webs of connection in which the creators and creations mutually are involved. This calls for an implicit recasting of the word *monument*, as was undertaken by Bart van Es in *Spenser's Forms of History* (2002)—incidentally, not mentioned in *Shaping Remembrance*—to show how the monument was torn between two different kinds of truth, that of moral instruction and physical evidence. Phillippy, therefore, is at pains in chapter 1 to remove monuments from a limited