

## Introduction

Smith, Simon; Watson, Jackie; Kenny, Amy

*License:*

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Smith, S, Watson, J & Kenny, A 2015, Introduction. in S Smith, J Watson & A Kenny (eds), *The senses in early modern England, 1558-1660*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, pp. 1-16.

<<https://www.manchesteropenhive.com/view/9781526146465/9781526146465.xml>>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

# Introduction

*Simon Smith, Jackie Watson and Amy Kenny*

What can texts, performances and artworks tell us about the senses in early modern England? The sensory experiences of subjects living some four centuries ago are to some degree lost. We cannot hope to recreate the experiences of hearing, smelling and feeling the interior environment of a church at a service in the 1590s, or seeing, touching and tasting the River Thames on a boat journey in the 1640s. Today, we might encounter early modern culture through language, sight and touch, mediated by written texts, images, artefacts and architecture of the period. Early modern works of performative art such as theatre, music and dance are remade in new performances, generating new sensory encounters, but the sensory experiences of early modern performance are ephemeral, and long past.

Yet even while we cannot recreate early modern sensory experience, works of art from the period are often highly suggestive about the senses. Despite the ephemerality of sensation, artworks in forms as diverse as poetry, painting, music, drama, domestic objects and dance often preserve examinations of the senses, representations of sensory encounters, and even accounts of the sensory experiences that articulated everyday life for early modern subjects. This suggests a useful relationship of mutual elucidation between works of art and wider culture: not only can a clearer picture of early modern thinking about the senses clarify our understanding of particular artworks, but in turn, the ideas about sensory experience suggested in these artworks might illuminate wider early modern understandings of the senses. Our investigation aims at precisely this mutual illumination of early modern culture and works of art.

This collection's intention to explore both works of art and wider culture in early modern England is best illustrated by examining one specific artwork from several angles. Figure 1 offers an apt subject for this interrogation: a woodcut illustration depicting four figures seated in a relatively bare room, with a similarly economical landscape of rolling hills visible through a window in the background. Both smell and taste seem to be absent from this scene. Visual experience, however, is foregrounded substantially. The adult figures depicted on either side of the room look pointedly into one another's faces; the

[Image not available in this digital edition due to restrictions from the rights holder]

1 Frontispiece illustration from *Tenor of the whole psalmes in foure partes* (1563)

child to the left of his mother looks across at his smaller brother with apparent suspicion; in turn, this smaller brother looks amusedly at his father, perhaps focusing his gaze on the father's hands. Touch is similarly emphasized: two children each hold an object in one hand – a book and a hobby-horse respectively – while seemingly clasping their mother with the other; meanwhile, the father touches his right thumb with his left forefinger. There is no clear manifestation of sound, or of hearing, to be seen.

It might surprise us, then, to learn that this image is a representation of domestic, devotional singing.<sup>1</sup> It appears in an early Elizabethan edition of psalm settings published as four part-books, 'set forth for the encrease of vertue: and abolishyng of other vayne and triflyng ballades'.<sup>2</sup> When encountering the image in this material context, facing a page of musical notation, one would presumably surmise that the book depicted in the hands of the larger child is a volume of music, perhaps representing the very book in which the image is printed. Moreover, the father's pointing to his thumb offers an additional representation of psalmody: he appears to be instructing the family to sing using the mnemonic system known as the 'Guidonian hand'.<sup>3</sup> Music is thus represented here in two forms: as the mnemonic touch of thumb on forefinger enacted by the father, and as the sight of printed notation in the book from which the child

has (at least momentarily) turned his head. Yet music does not seem to appear in the form of sound. All four mouths are closed decorously, which if open might represent singing; if humming is taking place, this is not signalled to the viewer.

One immediate question relating to the senses might be why hearing is (apparently) not represented, with sight and touch instead used to indicate psalmody. Certainly, woodcut illustration is a medium that communicates most immediately through the visual (although the copies of this book held by the British Library are now remarkably pungent). Its mode of depiction is static, and very much representational, although we might perhaps think of this image as a composite representation, in which activities that take place variously during a session of domestic psalm singing are all depicted simultaneously. In short – and unsurprisingly – the illustration gives an extremely clear account of what domestic psalm singing might look like in the early modern period. What is far more challenging to communicate visually is what domestic psalm singing might sound like. Indeed, even if the figures had open mouths, we would need all the available contextual information in order to read this as a depiction of musical performance. Hearing is an experience in sound and in time, neither of which are particularly easy to represent pictorially. Significantly, then, by thinking about the (lack of) representation of hearing in this image, we arrive swiftly at a wider question about the senses and artistic expression: how does one represent an aural sensory experience in a visual medium, a visual experience in a linguistic medium, or a gustatory experience in a performative medium? This collection engages centrally with the challenges that various artistic media pose for the representation, exploration and consideration of the senses, challenges faced not only by early modern writers and artists, but also by scholars and historians today.

Turning from the practicalities of representation to the represented scene, we might next ask what a sensory approach can suggest about the particular context portrayed. Notably, the woodcut illustration appears to place clear emphasis on a particular set of sensory experiences that articulate the domestic intimacy of a family gathered around a psalm book or books. Through the senses of touch and sight, domestic psalm singing is represented in the image as private familial interaction, and these sensory exchanges are perhaps even more significant to the participants than musical performance itself. The family members communicate with one another in this collective household activity through physical contact, and through evocative visual interaction. There is a striking contrast between the barren representation of domestic space, and the vivacious evocation of emotion in the characters' carefully drawn gazes, in the interaction of their glances, and in their attendant facial expressions. For this early modern family imagined in ink and paper, psalmody is most importantly the *exchange* of sensory experiences, in looks, touches and (unrepresented) musical sounds. This line of enquiry points towards the richness of

sensory experience enacted by a particular cultural practice, a richness that could easily be overlooked when the musical component of psalmody draws attention inevitably towards sound and hearing. According to this woodcut illustration, perhaps more important than the music itself is the suggestion that the psalm singing facilitates a particular set of sensory interactions that reinforce domestic harmony, familial bonds and devotional sentiment.

We might even consider the role of this paratextual image in shaping the sensory experiences of real early modern subjects who purchased the part-books. Each volume has a title page and an imprint of the woodcut illustration, but no further prefatory material: no dedication to a patron; no address to a reader; no praise poems; no errata. Instead, the picture supplies the frame for the musical notation that follows, suggesting to purchasers how they might themselves use the volumes.<sup>4</sup> According to the image, the books do not just supply notation to be transformed into sound; those who purchase them can themselves also engage in the visual and tactile encounters represented in the image, with the attendant familial unity and pleasure that the scene suggests (only cynical viewers would find their eyes drawn to the landscape beyond the window, seeking amusements other than domestic psalm singing). The paratextual image does not just give an account of sensory experience in the particular context of psalmody, then; it offers this context of sensory encounter as a model or aspiration to early modern subjects who themselves intend to sing psalms domestically. The paratextual role of this image therefore suggests an important mutual relationship between artwork and wider early modern culture: not only does the image represent sensory encounters that might occur in domestic contexts, but in its role as a paratext, it encourages subjects to pursue similar sensations of their own. Not only could this text represent the sensory encounters encoded in an early modern cultural practice, it could also generate new sense experiences that follow its example. Here, artwork and wider culture are mutually constructive – even mutually constructing – in their configuration of sensory experience.

Throughout, this study seeks to illuminate both early modern works of art and the wider cultural moments in which they were produced and circulated. In so doing, our contributors consider a broad range of early modern texts, performances and other art forms including poetry, painting, music, drama, domestic objects and dance. The volume is divided into three sections, each focusing on a different question about the senses. The first section asks how individual senses appear in particular artworks, considering each of the five senses in turn. Why, for instance, is sound often portrayed as a problematic and invasive sensory stimulus in early modern drama? Can stage representations of visual self-fashioning help us excavate an early modern distrust of knowledge obtained through sight? In each case, questions about a single sense help elucidate early modern thinking about sensory experience more gener-

ally, these questions also generating fruitful readings of the particular artworks under consideration.

The second section asks how the senses were understood in particular early modern contexts explored in works of art, including contexts of night, of sexual pleasure, and of love melancholy. These investigations yield clear suggestions about early modern sensory configurations, as well as emphasizing the contingency of sensory experience. Once again, attention to the senses provides a distinctive route through the texts being interrogated, offering mutual illumination of cultural context and work of art.

The final section asks what sensory experiences might have been enacted when early modern subjects actually engaged with works of art, considering practical encounters with playhouse performance, painting and printed drama. The perspectives on sensory experience that emerge from the three sections together point towards a mutually elucidating relationship between the understandings of the senses suggested by early modern works of art, and sensory experiences in wider early modern culture.

This collection owes much to the wider critical field of sensory scholarship, responding to the extensive call for a historicized account of the senses in both literary and cultural studies in recent years. Scholars including Constance Classen, Alain Corbin, David Howes and Bruce R. Smith have argued in seminal works that sensory encounters are culturally specific, dependent upon the understandings of the senses current in a particular time and place.<sup>5</sup> It follows, therefore, that the sensory configurations of a particular cultural and historical moment must inform our later engagements with the art, life and wider culture of that moment. Making this case in relation to several diverse contexts, Constance Classen's pioneering work, *Worlds of Sense: Exploring the Senses in History and across Cultures*, has been seminal for scholarship within cultural studies, literary studies and other related disciplines. Beginning from the premise that the senses do not operate in fixed and universal ways, Classen argues that sensory experience itself is culturally contingent, exploring how different cultures configure the significance of the senses through contrasting formulations. Thus, while in contemporary Western culture sight is often considered the dominant sense and smell is perceived as marginal, Classen traces radically different attitudes to the relative importance of these two senses in the pre-modern West, reconstructing various significances of smell in late medieval and early modern culture that are now lost. As she notes, Shakespeare 'proclaims that "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet", not that it would *look* as fine'.<sup>6</sup>

Developing a similar line of enquiry with specific reference to early modern England, Holly Dugan's article on 'Shakespeare and the Senses' is a particularly influential recent contribution to the field in its interrogation of the shifting nature of bodily experience. Dugan traces divergent views of the senses from

different cultural and historical perspectives, noting how some cultures even count six, seven or nine unique senses. Thus, both experience and understanding of the sensorium are culturally specific and deeply embodied, requiring scholars to take account of these shifting understandings when exploring historically distanced cultural contexts. Dugan asks, moreover, whether the body has adapted over time, or whether the shifts are merely in the theories and frameworks used to comprehend sensory experience. Dugan also asserts the significance of each individual's unique embodiment of sensory experience, arguing that 'individual bodies sense specific phenomena' divergently. In order to study the senses in context, then, we must also interrogate the 'shifting interface between individual cognition and shared material environments', remaining cautious about flattening individual sensory encounters into undifferentiated models of collective experience.<sup>7</sup>

In the same article, Dugan locates a separate, salient concern for sensory studies when she observes that cultural historians of the senses must engage with perceptions, experiences and bodily descriptions that are by nature ephemeral. If sensory experience cannot be preserved materially, how can scholars today interrogate early modern senses most productively? Here, Dugan acknowledges the challenges of researching ephemeral sensory encounters from a position of cultural and historical distance. Alain Corbin likewise addresses this concern when questioning the evidentiary value of written sensory configurations. He argues that while textual representations of the senses are often the most suggestive evidence available, we must remain aware of the limits of such discourse, taking care not to confuse what is articulated in language with what was actually experienced. He cautions other scholars not to fall into the 'trap which consists, for the historian, of confusing the reality of the employment of the senses and the picture of this employment decreed by observers'.<sup>8</sup>

A similarly significant issue is the relative level of scholarly attention that each sense is afforded. Since antiquity, writers have sought to organize the senses into hierarchies – of overall significance, of practical utility, or of epistemological value. Following Aristotle, sight and hearing generally prevail, whilst smell and taste are particularly prone to marginalization. These priorities are often broadly replicated in critical attention to the various senses: scholars have returned repeatedly to the visual above all, while the olfactory and gustatory are all too often overlooked. This is a particular concern for a study concerned with the senses in early modern England, a cultural context in which hierarchies of the senses were regularly challenged and destabilized as well as articulated; in which despite widespread emphasis on sight, the extreme 'ocularcentrism' of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries was not in place, and – as Classen reminds us in the passage quoted above – Shakespeare's rose could smell sweet rather than look fine. A study of early modern culture such as this volume

must balance attention to the various senses, just as that culture explored and challenged the full sensorium.

One particularly effective means of countering this critical imbalance has been to offer studies focused explicitly on the senses less explored. The 'Sensory Formations' series edited by David Howes has been particularly significant in offering (among other volumes) 'readers' for each of the five traditional senses, including substantial volumes dedicated specifically to smell and to taste.<sup>9</sup> Likewise, Holly Dugan takes smell as a central topic of sensory interrogation as she investigates *The Ephemeral History of Perfume: Scent and Sense in Early Modern England*, using textual and material evidence to offer a complex and more equivocal picture of the early modern sensorium.<sup>10</sup>

An alternative means of challenging scholarly preoccupation with sight and sound has been to assert the importance of collective thinking about sensory experience, emphasizing the co-functionality of the senses in practice. David Howes's *Sensual Relations: Engaging the Senses in Culture and Social Theory* asserts that, as well as giving separate consideration to the five senses, scholars must consider their interrelations. As Howes observes, scholars have at times given the impression that each sense 'constituted a completely independent domain of experience, without exploring how the senses interact with each other in different combinations and hierarchies'.<sup>11</sup> Likewise, Michael Bull and Les Back's *The Auditory Culture Reader* takes a particular interest in sensory interrelationships, reminding us that 'it is difficult to separate out our senses' in practice.<sup>12</sup> Dealing as Bull and Back are with one of the senses more commonly explored, their explicit aim is to avoid 'supplant[ing] one "primary sense" with another', hoping instead that their volume can contribute to a scholarly 'democracy of the senses'.<sup>13</sup> The pertinence of these concerns to early modern studies is productively articulated by Alice Sanger and Siv Tove Kulbrandstad Walker in their recent edited collection concerned with early modern visual art. A survey of responses to artworks from 1300 to 1700, the volume interrogates the relationships between artwork and the consumer through Classical and Renaissance traditions of sensory thought, with a focus overwhelmingly upon visual art forms and exclusively outside England. The collection engages closely with questions of sensory hierarchy, exploring how the primacy of the visual interacts with viewers' other sensual experiences of art: 'in what ways, this volume asks, were the operations of visual culture inflected with meaning because of the value attached to hearing, smell, taste and touch?'<sup>14</sup> Sight was extremely important in early modern sensory configurations, but as Sanger and Walker acknowledge, so too were the other senses, requiring a critical approach to this period that is alert to a full range of senses.

Another question of perennial interest to scholars is that of the relationship between language and the senses. In Classen's seminal study introduced above, she explores the cultural contingency of sensory experience by demonstrating



how language both reflects the sensual priorities of a given culture, and contributes to the continuing cultural replication of those priorities:

The Ongee of the Andaman Islands in the South Pacific, for example, live in a world ordered by smell. [...] Therefore, when an Ongee wishes to refer to ‘me’, he or she points to his or her nose, the organ of smell. Likewise, when greeting a friend, an Ongee will ask ‘How is your nose?’<sup>15</sup>

Studies of early modern culture have sustained Classen’s line of enquiry with notable success; most recently, Katharine A. Craik and Tanya Pollard’s *Shakespearean Sensations: Experiencing Literature in Early Modern England* directly addresses the issue of language and the senses by discussing how the vocabulary used to express and describe the sensorium and its perception of associated somatic reaction has shifted over time. As the editors point out, several of the period’s phrases suggestive of literal reaction (‘hot-headed’ or ‘cold-blooded’, for example) have survived into the modern period as merely figurative; they remind us that ‘[u]nderstanding the period’s psychophysiology requires recognizing that the boundaries between metaphorical and literal language were radically unstable’.<sup>16</sup> The contributors to their volume focus on written texts, and mainly on examples from Shakespeare, to explore textual depictions of the senses and their effects on an audience, examining the difference between ‘affect’ and ‘emotion’. The volume explores early modern perceptions of changes in bodily state and in consciousness when reading a poem or going to the theatre, changes regarded as the results of the action of the five senses. The contributors root this understanding of the workings of the senses in its Classical background.

Particularly significant for scholars concerned with language and the senses is the recent translation of Michel Serres’s *The Five Senses: A Philosophy of Mingled Bodies (I)*. First published in French in 1985, this seminal study explores the relationship between the body’s senses and words, using sensory experience to challenge theoretical positions predicated on the primacy of language. Serres sets up bodily experience through the senses as fundamentally alternative to – even opposed to – language, a kind of knowing that is qualitatively and meaningfully different from language itself. As Steven Connor notes in his introduction to the English translation, ‘Serres stakes on the senses the possibility of a return to the world, which means an escape from “the abominable verb to be”, and the associated trap of linguistic identity’.<sup>17</sup> The new availability of this canonical text in translation is significant for Anglophone cultural and literary studies.

David Howes’s influential edited collection, *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader*, appeared some 20 years after the original composition in French of Serres’s seminal work. Howes can thus articulate the changed scholarly relationship since 1985 with both language and the body, resonating

powerfully with Serres's aspirations in *The Five Senses*. As Howes explains, after 'the linguistic turn [in the second half of the twentieth century], [i]t has taken an ideological revolution to turn the tables and recover a full-bodied understanding of culture and experience'.<sup>18</sup> The volume is explicitly indebted to Serres as a harbinger of recent critical interest in the body, Howes acknowledging the significance of *The Five Senses* in his introduction and Steven Connor contributing a chapter concerned specifically with Serres's work.<sup>19</sup> With chapters from influential sensory scholars including Constance Classen, Alain Corbin, Carla Mazzi, Jim Drobnick, and Howes himself, the collection also makes a significant contribution to the strand of scholarship outlined above that both asserts and explores the cultural and historical contingency of sensory experience.

One distinctive feature of scholarship concerned with early modern sensory encounters is a consideration of the significance of Classical intellectual tradition to early modern understandings of the senses. As noted above, recent edited collections concerned both with visual art and with literary texts have offered detailed explorations of this significance.<sup>20</sup> Another study engaged with this topic is Lowell Gallagher and Shankar Raman's edited collection, *Knowing Shakespeare: Senses, Embodiment and Cognition*.<sup>21</sup> Focused on the Shakespearean text, this collection gives attention to the subject of the senses alongside both embodiment and cognition. Its central focus is on cognition in Shakespeare's canonical plays, examining the role of sensory experience and of the body in the acquisition of knowledge. The collection offers a broad-ranging account of Shakespeare's use of, and even participation in, contemporary intellectual debates about epistemology and the senses.

Our volume takes its cue from previous scholarship in its attempts to interrogate the literary, artistic and cultural output of early modern England. Perhaps most significantly, in focusing on a specific time and place we follow Classen's view that understandings of the senses, and sensory experience itself, are culturally and historically contingent; the collection thus explores the culturally specific role of the senses in textual and aesthetic encounters in England, often in London, between 1558 and 1660. A dual focus, though, on the early modern works of art under consideration, and the cultural moments of their production, allows us to explore further the critically important issue of ephemerality: how can sensory experience be represented in works of art, particularly if the artistic medium used does not communicate via the sense(s) in question? Contributors to this volume ask interpretative questions about how far the sensory encounters of early modern subjects themselves can be interrogated through such representations.

Equally, as in previous key studies of the senses, those writing here are concerned with the tension between sensory experience and linguistic description of that experience. Accepting that early modern sensory vocabulary in turn

constructed ideas of sensory affect in the period, and that, moreover, there is a tension between language itself and the sensory experiences it aims to convey, several chapters evaluate how contemporary language reflected writers' engagement with the senses.

The substantial debt that we owe to previous work in this area is demonstrated both in chapters where our contributors develop existing scholarship, and in those where they take alternative directions, in both cases responding to the key concerns and insights of previous scholars. Perhaps most importantly, both the coverage and the methodologies of our volume intend to offer a 'democracy of the senses', rather than a sensory hierarchy, reflecting the early modern period's multiple and often entangled explorations of all five senses. By presenting chapters in our first section that each explore the representation of a single sense in artistic works, we aim for a balance between the five key senses. This balance is taken forward in the ensuing discussions of senses in context, and of the nature of early modern sensory engagements with works of art. The opening chapters raise key issues of the representation of senses such as taste and smell that can only be preserved indirectly, even as these contributors trace early modern representations of such sensory encounters as deeply powerful and affective.

Many of the essays in this volume draw upon previous scholarly attempts to trace theoretical backgrounds for early modern thinking about the senses and their actions on the individual. Contributors explore that relationship carefully, with several chapters demonstrating the contemporary importance of the ideas of classical writers such as Aristotle and Plato, Cicero and Lucretius. However, this volume does not take the epistemological value or status of the senses as a central topic of enquiry; neither does it intervene in the burgeoning field of scholarship that explores how Shakespeare (in particular) reflects or participates in intellectual debate around the senses and cognition. We choose instead to consider *how* sensory experience itself is represented in different media, and what this tells us about early modern culture.

A further departure from previous collections in this area lies in the range of artistic media covered in this volume. Having deliberately reduced geographical and historical parameters, we take care to examine a breadth of artistic forms, with research focusing on sensation in dramatic performance and in poetry matched by complementary work on the impact of musical performance, printed drama, theoretical writings, domestic objects, visual art and dance. As a result, although literary examples are still most frequent, we broaden the range of conclusions we can draw about early modern sensual engagement by drawing on cultural experiences, such as dance, which generate a number of simultaneous sensations. Further, the collection's dramatic and poetic material ranges deliberately wide, not least in order to avoid the tendency in some recent literary scholarship to lionize Shakespearean material.

The opening section of the collection, 'Tracing a Sense', follows Joachim-Ernst Berendt's call for 'a democracy of the senses' in preference to the various sensory hierarchies that have often shaped theory and criticism.<sup>22</sup> In doing so, we echo the early modern period's questioning and problematizing of received hierarchies of the senses, and its concomitant interest in the full gamut of sensory experience. The section offers one essay on each of the five senses, beginning and ending with two senses – taste and smell – that are often overlooked in studies of early modern culture. Beginning with an essay on taste by Lucy Munro, the volume's first example of the representation of an individual sense is one in which the perception of that sense – here in a variety of dramatic contexts – must be through a peculiar combination of imagination and second-hand sensation. In considering the personification of taste in the dramatic presentation of the glutton or epicure, and the role of the taster, the chapter begins the volume's project of characterizing sensual reception. By exploring the range of substances that are 'tasted' on stage, and their social and emblematic associations, Munro evaluates the stage's sensory language and the dramaturgical uses of taste through the work of a wide variety of playwrights, as well as assessing the place of taste in different dramatic genres.

The volume's movement away from scholarly hierarchizing continues in Jackie Watson's chapter on sight. Rather than showing vision as the chief and most valued of the senses, she instead explores the limitations early modern writers recognized in seeing, and the potential for deception which was consequent upon a reliance on appearance. With a particular focus on the representation of sight and appearance in stage portrayals of the courtier and those ambitious for courtly preferment, Watson argues that the playhouse itself challenged its audiences' reliance on the evidence of their own eyes, teaching early modern playgoers *how* to see and how to interpret the validity of the visual. Sharing Watson's interest in the sensory representation of court life, Darren Royston's essay on the importance of touch in poetic and dramatic depictions of dance addresses the moral value attached to fleshly contact. Royston explores the moral ambiguity of dance in early modern England through evidence presented by oppositional pamphleteers, courtly dance manuals and visual representations. In his examination of the poetic narrative of Sir John Davies's *Orchestra* and in dramatic examples from Shakespeare, he shows how dance relates to historically established rituals from the art of courtly love and proceeds to explore the complexity of touch in this context, even as the practical necessity of tactile contact was often elided in textual accounts of cosmic dance.

Eleanor Decamp's chapter on hearing opens in an unusual cultural domain, that of early modern barber shops. From an evocation of ear picking, she explores early modern perceptions of the vulnerability of the ear, proceeding to consider how barbering itself is represented acoustically, using Jonson's *Epicœne* as a key text in the assessment of the dramatic representation of the profes-

sion. Questioning how sound, especially for the anti-theatricalist, was perceived as frivolous, Decamp follows the three contributors before her in examining contemporary concerns surrounding a particular sense.

The final chapter in this section, as Munro's on taste, explores the difficulties of representing ephemeral early modern sensual experience. Taking twenty-first-century relationships with perfume and smell as an illuminating analogue, Holly Dugan's essay examines how early modern visual media sought to represent the qualities of particular scents in abstract ways. Through her examination of pomanders, Dugan considers the conjunction of aesthetic detail and utilitarian value in such objects as she examines how a synaesthetic approach to the history of olfaction might contribute to sensory history.

The second section explores early modern artistic accounts of the senses collectively, in three particular contexts. Natalie Eschenbaum's essay investigates Robert Herrick's accounts in *Hesperides* (1648) of how the senses function during sexual pleasure and contact. Eschenbaum argues that Herrick's fluid depictions of sensation respond (in a small way) to the tradition of poetic sensoria and (in a substantial way) to the early modern debate about how and why the five (or six) senses worked as they did. For Eschenbaum, this debate explains why Herrick configures sensation as a full body, materialist and Epicurean experience. Her attention to Herrick's problematizing of received sensory configurations continues the volume's attempts to move away from scholarly hierarchizing, even as it demonstrates the purchase of our approach on early modern culture.

The section continues to explore sensory experiences in context as Susan Wiseman interrogates textual accounts of the senses at night in writings from the English Renaissance. Focusing on poetry by Donne and Chapman, this essay questions how far textual accounts of night and the senses might be connected to larger, culturally and socially significant shifts in encounters – sensory, social and intellectual – with night, light and shadow in early modern England. In the final essay in this section, Griffin explores Mary Wroth's accounts of the senses in the context of early modern love melancholy, this being the topic of a rich and often anxious discourse in the period. Griffin explores how the sensory debates that elsewhere motivate Herrick's writing alternatively inspire Wroth's creative, and sometimes conflicting, conceptions of melancholic love. The essay argues that the melancholic subject's senses – sight in particular – were repeatedly described as unreliable, and therefore he or she was considered to be susceptible to illusion. Griffin explores how Mary Wroth responded to contemporary theoretical conceptions of the senses by suggesting that melancholic love can both trouble and heighten the senses. Following the example of her uncle Philip Sidney, Mary Wroth both represented the ways in which melancholy was believed to affect the senses, and exploited the connection between melancholy and creativity, locating her writing in contemporary debates surrounding the 'disease'.

The essays in this section offer a picture of early modern thought in which sensory encounters are unstable, suggesting ways in which the senses are influenced by the contexts in which they are experienced: at night, in states of sexual excitement, or even when melancholic. Where earlier chapters focused on representations of the five senses in turn, these essays argue for the collective volatility of the sensorium. Those writing in this section suggest that attention to specific contexts for sensory experience is vital to our understanding of early modern engagements with the sensorium in literature, art, theatre and culture.

If the second section looks outward most notably – from works of art to wider early modern culture – then in contrast, the third and final section directs attention most directly towards works of art themselves. Here, Simon Smith, Faye Tudor and Hannah August consider the significance of the senses for early modern subjects attending a play, regarding a painting, and reading a printed volume. In examining the sensory processes that might be enacted when encountering texts, artworks and performances in early modern England, this section shifts focus from how artistic producers might have thought about the senses to the sensory experiences early modern subjects may have faced as they encountered works of art.

In the first chapter, Smith considers playhouse musical performance, taking the example of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*. Beginning with the observation that early modern sources often present musical experience as a fundamentally multi-sensory phenomenon, he argues that early modern culture placed particular significance on visual engagement with musical performance. Playhouses were in fact unusual in their habitual placement of musicians out of the audience's sight, with precise and distinct responses anticipated when unseen music sounded. Smith argues that in *Antony and Cleopatra*, certain responses are invited – through hidden music – at moments of particular dramatic significance, making the sensory experience of this music integral to the dramaturgy of Shakespeare's play in early modern performance. This interrogation of sensory experience contributes to wider critical debates about the nature of the playhouse as a cultural space, and indeed about the place of music in dramatic performance. It also seeks to complicate the notion of musical experience as a solely aural phenomenon in early modern culture; rather, subjects encountering the particular early modern performance medium of playhouse musical performance did so through a range of sensory engagements, involving sight in particular as well as hearing.

Tudor's chapter is also concerned with looking, but in the rather more familiar context of painting. This chapter explores the visual experience of the viewer and the viewed, as these experiences were manifested when early modern subjects encountered a painted work of art. The concerns of painters themselves with the act of looking are central to this investigation; taking the self-reflexive gaze into a mirror as a rubric through which to examine self-

portraits by female artists such as Sofonisba Anguissola, Tudor argues for a distinctively early modern configuration of viewing, tracing the significance of this configuration for encounters with a painting through a wide range of texts, including writings by Edmund Spenser and James Shirley. These specific understandings of visual engagement with paintings yield significant suggestions about the sensory configurations of early aesthetic encounters.

August concludes our volume with a return to early modern drama; however, where other contributions focus on playhouse performance, this chapter considers the widespread early modern consumption of comedy in print. Drawing evidence from dramatic paratexts, manuscript commonplace books and other early modern non-dramatic writings, this chapter interrogates the sensory quality of the pleasure that printed comedies may have provided early modern readers. It argues that the sense of sight, when deployed by imaginative readers, could provide a dual pleasure that was conceived as both aesthetic and erotic, and that comedies that ‘tickled the senses’ in performance were just as capable of doing so in print. Recalling earlier chapters by Munro and Dugan, August pursues early modern accounts of sensory experience that marshal both immediate sensory stimuli and an imagination of the senses towards a distinctive mode of sensory encounter with printed drama.

This section offers a view of early modern encounters with artworks that above all emphasizes the importance of the senses in articulating these encounters. The chapters make a common assertion, too, that those involved with the production and consumption of artworks were themselves often fascinated by the sensory experiences that their work would facilitate for audiences and consumers; indeed, each contribution argues for early modern attempts to comprehend the complicated sensory encounters encoded in aesthetic experiences. Moreover, ideas explored in earlier sections – about the importance of particular contexts for sensory encounters, and the challenges of negotiating and representing particular sensory experiences – reappear in these discussions. Here, they take on slightly different contours, now yielding alternative insights through attention not to artistic production, but rather to consumption.

We began with a problem for sensory studies, in the form of ‘lost’ early modern sensory encounters: a church service in the 1590s; a boat trip on the Thames in the 1640s. We end, however, with an assertion of what is possible: despite the ephemerality of sensation itself, we can nonetheless make significant propositions about early modern culture by considering the senses through works of art. The questions pursued in this collection yield a range of suggestions about the place and nature of the senses in early modern art, life and thought. By asking how individual senses appear in works of art, how particular contexts for sensory experience are described and represented, and how artworks might themselves have generated particular sensory encounters, we hope to add new contours to the critical picture of the senses in early modern England.

## Notes

- 1 David Lindley considers this image within a larger discussion of psalm singing in *Shakespeare and Music* (London: Thomson, 2006), pp. 65–68. An earlier consideration of the image appears in Lelan Ryken, *Worldly Saints: the Puritans as they really were* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986), p. 72.
- 2 *The Whole Psalmes in Foure Partes* (1563), A1r.
- 3 This memory technique, named for Guido of Arezzo, uses the joints of the hand as an aid in teaching solmization. Numerous images depicting the ‘Guidonian hand’ survive from the early modern period. See Susan Forscher Weiss, ‘The Singing Hand’, in *Writing on Hands: Memory and Knowledge in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Claire Richter Sherman (Carlisle, PA: Trout Gallery & Folger Shakespeare Library, 2000), pp. 35–45 (p. 37); Lindley, p. 67.
- 4 It is relatively unusual to find an image framing musical notation in place of an address to the reader or a dedication. Thomas Coryate’s playful venture into travel writing, *Coryats Crudities* (1611), includes a song that praises his achievements through favourable and extended comparison to ‘a Porcupen’ (E6v), thus framing a written text with a musical paratext. Whilst sharing our 1563 psalter’s interest in non-linguistic textual framing, the song to Coryate perhaps operates on a level of irony not found in volumes of devotional music published with the stated aim of ‘abolishyng [...] other wayne and triflyng ballades’ (A1r).
- 5 See Constance Classen, *Worlds of Sense: Exploring the Senses in History and Across Cultures* (London: Routledge, 1993); Alain Corbin, *Time, Desire and Horror: Towards a History of the Senses*, trans. by Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995); David Howes, *Sensual Relations: Engaging the Senses in Culture and Social Theory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); ‘Sensory Formations’ series (Oxford: Berg, 2003–09).
- 6 Classen, p. 25.
- 7 Holly Dugan, ‘Shakespeare and the Senses’, *Literature Compass*, 6 (2009), 726–40 (p. 727).
- 8 Corbin, p. 187.
- 9 *The Smell Culture Reader*, ed. by Jim Drobnick, Sensory Formations (Oxford: Berg, 2006); *The Taste Culture Reader: Experiencing Food and Drink*, ed. by Carolyn Korsmeyer, Sensory Formations (Oxford: Berg, 2005).
- 10 Holly Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume: Scent and Sense in Early Modern England* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011).
- 11 Howes, p. xi.
- 12 *The Auditory Culture Reader*, ed. by Michael Bull and Les Back (Oxford: Berg, 2003), p. 3.
- 13 Bull and Back, p. 2. Bull and Back adopt this extremely helpful concept of ‘a democracy of the senses’ from Joachim-Ernst Berendt’s *The Third Ear: On Listening to the World*, trans. by Tim Nevill (Shaftesbury: Element, 1988), p. 32.
- 14 *Sense and the Senses in Early Modern Art and Cultural Practice*, ed. by Alice Sanger and Siv Tove Kulbrandstad Walker (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 2.
- 15 Classen, p. 1.



- 16 *Shakespearean Sensations: Experiencing Literature in Early Modern England*, ed. by Katharine A. Craik and Tanya Pollard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 7.
- 17 Steven Connor, 'Introduction', in Michel Serres, *The Five Senses: A Philosophy of Mingled Bodies (I)*, trans. by Margaret Sankey and Peter Cowley (London: Continuum, 2008), pp. 1–16 (p. 9).
- 18 *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader*, ed. by David Howes, Sensory Formations (Oxford: Berg, 2005), pp. 1–17 (p. 1).
- 19 Howes (ed.), p. 1; Steven Connor, 'Michel Serres' Five Senses', in *Empire of the Senses*, ed. by Howes, pp. 318–34.
- 20 *Art and Cultural Practice*, ed. by Sanger and Walker, pp. 6–10; *Shakespearean Sensations*, ed. by Craik and Pollard, pp. 9–11.
- 21 *Knowing Shakespeare: Senses, Embodiment and Cognition*, ed. by Lowell Gallagher and Shankar Raman (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010).
- 22 Berendt, p. 32.