Ars Memoriae, Philosophy and Culture: Frances Yates and After

JOHN MICHAEL KROIS

I.

Frances Yates began her last book, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age,* by emphasizing that, like all her writings, it was a purely historical study. I ask to be forgiven for here ignoring Dame Yates' injunction about how to read her work. Many of Yates' writings are well-known to historians of philosophy,[1] but I want to speak about some of her work from a systematic philosophical point of view. Granted, Yates did not intend to write philosophy, but much of her work and particularly her studies of the art of memory raise questions of theoretical importance. Yates drew attention to philosophical traditions from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that philosophers and even historians of philosophy have largely ignored. In some cases, as in the case of the aforementioned book on Elizabethan Occult philosophy, Yates dealt with traditions whose remoteness she could not eliminate, even while she made them more understandable. Cornelius Agrippa's philosophy depends, for example, upon the ancient doctrine of the four elements and their "correspondences" in the world, according to which Elizabethan authors linked groups of heavenly bodies to days of the week, months, flowers, numbers, stones, seasons, virtues, and metals.[2] We feel the same kind of incredibility when we read about the Renaissance memory treatises that Yates examines in her book *The Art of Memory*. What sets these works apart from other "occult" sciences is that they are concerned with a

matter of enduring significance: memory in a cultural sense. This is why her book has been influential among literary and cultural theorists interested in social memory.[3]

It has not been influential among philosophers. The leading movements of twentieth-century philosophy—linguistic analysis and phenomenology—were both extremely ahistorical in their orientation, so much so that even the history of *philosophy* was long considered an inappropriate matter of study for philosophers. This anti-historical attitude can be found from the very beginning of philosophy. The tension in Plato between narrative form and the geometrical spirit is found throughout the entire history of philosophy. Philosophers traditionally have looked for unchanging, ever-present foundations to help them see beyond the contingencies of history. Platonic "recollection" was not historical memory. For a Platonist the historical world of change and instability gives us the spectacle of injustice, the "advantage of the stronger."[4] Joyce distilled the Platonist sentiment towards change in *Ulysses* when he called history a "Nightmare from which you will never awake."[5]

When Renaissance philosophers began to regard human activity differently, granting "dignity" to the changing, inconstant nature of man,[6] this intellectual change in perspective was a reflection of wider cultural developments.[7] Copernican astronomy and Galileo's mathematical physics were part of this. So too navigators and explorers not only changed the map of the world, they called the book and "authorities" into question. Anthony Grafton cites the following log passage from an early navigator's account of reaching the equator: "What could I do then but laugh at Aristotle's *Meteorology* and his philosophy? For in that place and that season, where everything, by his rules, should have been scorched by the heat, I and my companions were cold."[8]

The medium of the text and reliance upon authorities no longer seemed to be the sources of knowledge. Frances Yates called attention to the far-reaching implications of Isaac Causabon's dating in 1614 of the *Corpus Hermeticum*. Caussabon demonstrated that these texts, supposedly written by Hermes Trismegistus, an Egyptian who lived long before Plato and even Moses, actually could not have been written before the second century. Earlier datings resulted in anachronisms in references to events and persons and conflicted with the late Greek vocabularly of these Hermetic writings. For the Florentine

Platonists Hermes had been an ancient Egyptian, but a century later he was recognized as a fiction, the invention of Christian Neoplatonists. Peter Burke argued that the "Renaissance Sense of the Past" was not "historical" in our sense of the word. There was no sense of textual criticism, anachronism, awareness of evidence, or interest in causation.[9] Caussabon's seventeenth-century discovery was not immediately effective and the effects of such historical criticism were generally slow in spreading. This was due in part, no doubt, to the fact that textual criticism was a dangerous practice.

Vico demonstrated a hundred years after Caussabon that the Homeric epics had no single author, but he avoided any comparable consideration of biblical texts, something which had to wait until nineteenth-century German higher criticism of the Bible. Yates showed that the memory systems, Bruno's in particular, relied upon the Hermetic teachings. But while textual criticism threatened the ancient authority of the doctrines employed in these memory systems, a far greater threat to the art of memory ought to have resulted from the technical advances made in the early Modern era for the preservation of memory. Book printing, however, did not end the art of memory, instead it was the instrument for its greatest flourishing—he printed memory systems of Bruno, Lull, Dee, Fludd, and others, which Dame Yates examined.

According to Dame Yates' history, the memory tradition persisted in philosophy until Leibniz, whose *characteristica universalis*, with its proposed use of artificial symbols for general notions, was a free-floating art of memory with no "places." Yates says: "it may be that here [with Leibniz] ends the influence of the Art of Memory as a factor in basic European developments."[10] She added, however, that possibly, the story could be continued further. I want to show two things: (1) that there was a continuation of the memory tradition in philosophy, and (2) the problems discussed in *The Art of Memory* are still with us and continue to emerge even in contemporary philosophy.

II.

The Renaissance art of memory was not concerned with historical recollection. Its chief feature, Yates says, was its elevation of the imagination to the position of "man's highest power, by means of which he can grasp the intelligible world beyond appearance through

laying hold of significant images."[11] This art of memory combined a Platonic conception of philosophy as the search for an intelligible order beyond appearances with the un-Platonic conviction that such knowledge was best attained by finding the right visual imagery. Yates said: "Whoever wishes to probe the origins and growth of methodological thinking should study the history of the Art of Memory . . ." because it was an important stage in the search for method.[12] But it was not just a stage on the way to better methods, it was a way of thinking in itself, employing imagination instead of arguments.

This art originated in rhetoric, not in logic. Originally, it was a means for fixing historical events in an image, as in the case of its legendary inventor, Simonides of Ceos, for whom the spatial order of the guests at a banquet was the key to identifying their bodies after the roof collapsed on them. The use of memory images in rhetoric, such as the technique of mentally placing the topics a speaker wants to recall in the rooms of an imaginary house, was soberly recommended by Quintilian as the best way to organize a speech. This kind of technique, Yates notes, could have been expected to wane with the rise of printed book.[13] This rhetorical art of memory was "a kind of inner writing,"[14] an arrangement that enabled later recall but was less reliable than a written record.

Instead of waning, the art of memory received "a new and strange lease on life"[15] in the Renaissance memory programs of Camillo, Lull, Bruno, Fludd, and others. The aim of these memory systems was not rhetorical but purported to be philosophical. Yates called it quasi-religious, but perhaps the best way to describe these systems would be to call them what they were: *Weltanschauungen* in a literal sense. They offered an overview of the order of the world and the security which such an overview provides, putting everything in its place. In Yates' history of this art, Peter Ramus is characterized as the antipode, for he dispensed with the use of emotionally striking and stimulating images,[16] central to this art, in favor of the use of logical dichotomies, structured so as to proceed from the general to the particular. The use of such divisions into opposites lent itself to the printed book, wherein tabular forms could be easily reproduced. This simplified form of scholastic logic[17] was easy to keep in mind and exercised what Yates called a kind of "inner iconoclasm"[18] because it introduced a memorable form of order without resorting to images. Yates nonetheless refers to Ramism as an art of memory

because it still conceived of knowledge in terms of the hierarchical "chain of being" that permitted the "descent" from the general to the particular. Ramus shared with the Aristotelian Scholastics an uncritical belief that philosophy was able to immediately grasp reality in talking about it. For Ramus, the organization of language was the organization of everything. The real revolution in method came later when the observation of experiment entered into philosophy and mathematics augmented language as a way to describe things.

The art of memory survived this revolution because it was fundamentally different from scholasticism. Its basis was imagination and not the logic of genera and species. The world in its entirety was to be recalled in totality by the practitioner of the art of memory. The memory system of Bruno, so carefully reconstructed in Yates' *The Art of Memory*, was neither historical memory, scholasticism, nor empirical science. The art of memory purported to depict the essential order of the world in vivid images whose meanings exceeded what the eye beheld. The art of memory made a showpiece of philosophy but it required prior knowledge of philosophy to be understood, unlike the image of a landscape. But it could be argued that without ever seeing a landscape we would not recognize the image of one. The emblematic character of the memory treatises required the ability to think emblematically. This capacity is still important in literature. Authors and readers invest scenes and events with "symbolic meaning" that far exceeds what is depicted. This kind of emblematic thought did not originate with Renaissance memory nor did it end with that tradition. Where did it end? How long did this art persist? Yates ends her overview with Leibniz, but it can be shown to live on in Hegel and far beyond.[19]

Hegel called his *Phänomenologie des Geistes* a "*Galerie von Bildern*," a "gallery of images" whose purpose, he said, was *Erinnerung* or recollection.[20] There are, of course, important differences between the images in Hegel's phenomenology and the kinds of images found in the works of Camillo, Lull, or Bruno. Like Ramus, Hegel used no visible pictures. We find Hegel even emphasizing this difference (without explicit reference to the memory tradition) when he writes the word "*Erinnerung*" with a hyphen as: *Er-Innerung*. The spatial image is internalized in Hegel's phenomenology. This internalization process is lost in the English translation of *Er-Innerung* as "re-collection." Hegel's images are not visible to the eye. The

Phänomenologie des Geistes contains no pictures, but it does not just develop logical dichotomies nor move via the chain of being from the general to the particular. Hegel's book uses linguistic images or metaphors. Its "argument" is marked out by its images: the Inverted World, the Master and Slave, the Unhappy Consciousness, the intellectual Animal Kingdom, the Beautiful Soul, etc. These images are brought together in and by an imaginative narrative, which uses negation as a way to separate and link the scenes.

In *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* Hegel gave an astonishing (eight-page) explication of the art of memory, beginning with *Ad Herennium* and going over into Bruno with reference to Lull.[21] He discounts the memory technique in *Ad Herennium*, even calling it a "bad art" ("*eine schlechte Kunst*"),[22] its difficulty being that it possessed no way to make any connections, "*die heillostesten Kombinationen*," and permitted every kind of arbitrary association. Lull's Art is treated with ironic distain while Bruno is treated with the greatest respect. Hegel says: "Bruno gave Lull's Art a deeper inner meaning."[23] This deeper meaning, Hegel explains, came from Bruno's elevation of the art of memory to an art of the imagination (*Einbildungskraft*).[24] Bruno in fact received more extensive treatment in Hegel's *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* than almost any other thinker and perhaps the most sympathetic interpretation as well. Hegel ends his assessment of Bruno's philosophy with untypical words, calling it "a great beginning." It attempted, Hegel says, to conceive of both the unity of the world and the process of its development at the same time.[25] That was Hegel's project as well and in the *Phänomenologie des Geistes* we find Hegel as the next great figure in the history of the art of memory, a virtual follower of Bruno.

Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes* is a modern work: its subject matter is the knowing process and not the depiction of the world itself. Unlike the earlier philosophical forms of memory, based upon the hierarchical world view of Scholasticism, Hegel had to come to grips with the problem of historicity. Hegel's "places" in the *Phenomenology* are dynamic, like acts in a play. They are typical phenomena, which occur historically, such as "the struggle of the Enlightenment with superstition." Hegel spoke of this side of his book as the attempt to deal with phenomena "in the form of contingency."[26] Yet the *Phenomenology* is not a historical work. Hegel calls it a "*Wissenschaft*," meaning "a conceptually grasped organization," of these phenomena.

The work combined the matter of contingent historical events in an organized form. Hegel referred to this combination of contingent matter and conceptual form as "recollection" (*Erinnerung*). "Recollection" is *conceptually grasped history*, "*die begriffene Geschichte*."[27]

Of course, by "conceptually grasped" Hegel means something different from what the term "conceptual" ordinarily calls to mind. He means dialectically grasped, so that we see how one phenomenon leads "ideally" to the next. The series of images we meet with in the *Phänomenologie des Geistes* is not contingent. Like the older art of memory, it claimed to show us absolute truths. But the older art of memory was cosmological, it did not thematize historical processes. After reading Hegel's phenomenology, the reader looks back upon the tableau of this ideal history and sees its order. He recognizes how the history of consciousness developed and "has" to develop. The reader who finishes Hegel's *Phenomenology* is like the visitor leaving the theater. He witnessed the spectacle of the history of consciousness coming to self-knowledge. The *Phenomenology* is a kind of play or *Schauspiel*, rather than a static theater building like Camillo's. But its imaginative character is clearly rooted in the tradition Yates investigated. Yates says of Bruno: "He seeks to reach, not a Trinity, but a One. And this One he thinks of as, not above, but *within* the world."[28] With clarifying distinctions, this could also be said of Hegel (he was not a pantheist). Regardless of how all this relates to Hegel's logic and system, the point remains that Hegel's *Phänomenologie* must be included in the memory tradition that Frances Yates traced down to Leibniz.

Depending upon one's philosophical commitments, this might not be regarded as a recommendation. The *Phänomenologie des Geistes* is a book of the imagination. Hegel's method does not need to check with empirical reality before he proceeds to the next phase. Everything appears to follow, but we are offered only a *Gallerie von Bildern*, not an account of actual happenings. Hegel's phenomenology, like the memory systems explicated in Yates' works, served a quasi-religious purpose: to attain a vision of what Hegel called absolute Mind or Spirit. Today, philosophers—like most scientists—are no longer ready to conceive of reality as Hegel did in terms of such *das Ganze* or a "One." Pluralism and openness are the ruling conceptions, even for a philosophical theist like William James. Hegel's philosophical enemy was the notion of chance. The real was the

Vernüftige. Even Hegel's critics, like Nietzsche—who rejected Hegel's system and for whom such unified wholeness was an illusion—still shared his assumptions about the philosophical "unacceptability" and unliveableness of a philosophy of change. Nietzschean forgetfulness was the opposite of an art of memory, but it was addressed to the same problem: overcoming the appearance of boundless change.

Such metaphysical worries are mitigated for most people by the distress of real changes in their social and cultural world. The philosophy of culture gives us a new way to consider the art of memory. Hegel's *Phänomenologie* has been read as an attempt to systematize knowledge as cultural history and in that way inspired later philosophers to rewrite it from the point of view of the philosophy of culture. Santayana's *The Life of Reason* was such an attempt, as was Collingwood's *Speculum Mentis or the Map of Knowledge* (1924) with its five "provinces" of art, religion, science, history, and philosophy,[29] or Ernst Cassirer's *Phänomenologie der Erkenntnis* (which consciously paraphrases Hegel's title). These writers all attempted to reinterpret Hegel's "recollection" in terms of the philosophy of culture.[30] They were conscious of their divergence from Hegel: they were not retelling the history of absolute mind, but recollecting the history of culture in systematic form. In each case more was involved than a reaction to Hegelianism, but I leave this aside. This kind of systematic philosophical recollection of the history of culture (which is not limited to these examples) appeared to have disappeared with the spread of analytic philosophy and Husserlean phenomenology.

III.

In 1981 the philosophical memory tradition found a new expression in Alaisdair MacIntyre's book *After Virtue*.[31] This book was a philosophical narrative on virtue, not a history of ethics, about which MacIntyre had also written. The overt point of the book was to show how philosophical ethics needed to consider the cultural or narrative identity of the person in his community and not just the problem of individual choice. Its premise was: cultural tradition is the basis of virtue. The book reintroduced into philosophy the topic of cultural memory at a time when the established methods of philosophy were totally ahistorical: Husserlian intuition, linguistic analysis, and logical argument. Historical reality was of no genuine interest to "serious"

postwar philosophers, especially in the English-speaking world. For analytic philosophers, existentialists, and Rawlsian liberals the chief topic in ethics was the problem of individual decision. MacIntyre reintroduced the concept of community into philosophical ethics with his narration of different conceptions of morality as they appeared in history. The book offered emotionally striking and stimulating images of virtue organized in a narrative form, using historical types and occasionally even characters from literature to show the phenomenon in question. The book did not aim to provide a historically correct reconstruction of the past, but to give a "philosophical history" of virtue in Heroic, Athenian, Medieval, and Modern forms, culminating in the administrator, with whom the tradition of virtue ends because his actions are not based upon the historical recollection of a common task. MacIntyre's "narrative" method presented the reader with a series of images of different phases in a history in order to show the true state of morality derived perhaps from his reception of Hegel, but it obviously harks back to the art of memory.

After Virtue also exposes difficulties connected with this art. MacIntyre's image of the Enlightenment, when viewed documentarily, is historically false. In his book everything acquires its meaning from its place in the narrative. Hence, a thinker like Kant assumes a wholly negative identity because his philosophy is regarded only as the expression of a non-social conception of ethics based upon the notion of individual rights rather than virtue. MacIntyre's narrative leaves little room for historical differentiations. The result is a historically inaccurate story of the unbroken decline of virtue. The Enlightenment virtues of tolerance and fraternité, as cosmopolitan ideals, have no place in it.

The key feature and problem with the art of memory is its use of real phenomena. When memory is organized by means of images it is limited by this concreteness. Usually, philosophers employ formal arguments and only illustrate them if pressed to do so, by giving "examples." Yates stressed the vastly different character of the older memory systems' use of striking and emotionally stimulating images for profound realities as compared to Lull's use of letters as abbreviations for these realities.[32] She claims that the object of memory in Lullism became Lull's art itself: the method by means of which the names or attributes of God could be seen to also apply on different levels of the hierarchy of being to God's creation.[33] In none

of its phases, neither in Camillo, nor Lull nor Hegel nor MacIntyre, is the philosophical art of memory concerned with specific historical events as empirical facts, but as illustrations of ideas. In the philosophical art of memory, images are purported to offer a kind of absolute or general knowledge, but in reality the same facts can always been taken to illustrate different things.

Is a critical art of memory therefore impossible? Must philosophy keep a rein on the imagination by avoiding it?

IV.

The memory tradition in philosophy did not stem directly from either Plato or Aristotle. Plato's notion of recollection derived from his belief in a kind of knowledge that did not stem from sense impressions but from a knowledge of unchanging forms possessed by the soul prior to experience.[34] Aristotle distinguished recollection from memory, something he attributed to animals as well as human beings, by emphasizing the *inferential* nature of recollection. For Aristotle we recollect by means of "a sort of investigation"[35] of the past. He stressed this temporal relationship to the past and the concrete subject matter of recollection. In other words, the Aristotelian notion of recollection was historical in orientation. Yates calls attention to the conflation in the Middle Ages of Aristotle's views with the artificial memory training in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and its stress upon the use of striking images. The art of memory had no roots in Greek philosophy; neither Plato nor Aristotle saw images as the key to recollection.

Images have rarely been the focus of philosophical study, except in the sphere of art, which itself has remained at the periphery of philosophical concerns. But images are essential to culture, as is memory. Culture depends upon social memory, the heroes and great deeds that provide the background and continuity for life. Hence, the philosophy of culture cannot avoid the study of images as a vehicle of memory. The contemporary interest in the topic of "cultural identity" has given Yates' research on the art of memory greater currency than she could have anticipated. One of the underlying concerns in all of her writings was the study of attempts to achieve cultural stability in times of historical upheaval: the theme of enlightened reform. The surprising thing is where she finds these attempts: among what to us appear to be esoteric movements of thought. The Rosicrucian

movement, she argued, should be regarded as an example of Enlightenment because the idea of a group of persons in possession of an all-healing medicine, at work on the improvement of the world, provided an image of the necessity to reform society, particularly education and religion.[36]

Yates claimed that the art of memory was not just the preoccupation of scholars in the Renaissance, but circulated throughout European culture. In her Shakespeare studies she sought to show how the ideas of Robert Fludd and the Hermetic tradition found their way into Shakespeare's plays and even into the design of his theater building. I cannot comment on the acceptability of her readings to Shakespeare specialists or of her linking of the Globe Theater building with Fludd's memory theater. I only want to call attention to the nature of her view. Her attempt to see Hermetic influence in Shakespeare and his theater, such that it becomes, as she says, "cosmic in its ground plan, religious in its meaning,"[37] can be best contrasted with George Santayana's view in his essay on "The Absence of Religion in Shakespeare" (1900). There he wrote: "In Shakespeare's time and country, to be religious already began to mean to be Puritanical; and in the divorce between the fullness of life on the one hand and the depth and unity of faith on the other, there could be no doubt to which side a man of imaginative instincts would attach himself. A world of passion and beauty without a meaning must seem to him more interesting and worthy than a world of empty principle and dogma, meagre, fanatical, and false."[38]

Santayana, who himself personally had more than his share of the Puritans to endure, upheld an aestheticism like Walter Pater's. I do not want to criticize Santayana for failing to overcome his historical situation as a scholar but only want to contrast his understanding with the vastly richer reading of Shakespeare that we find in Yates, where far more is at stake than passion and beauty without meaning. In Yates' words "Shakespeare's narration of the crimes of Monarchs or of the agony and death of lovers, gains its poignancy from the imagery, which so often suggests universal possibilities forever betrayed."[39] The key word in this quotation is "imagery." These "universal possibilities" of history were expressed in Shakespeare's time in symbolisms we have forgotten. That was Yates' key to Shakespeare. In *Astrea* Yates says: "In the Elizabethan imperial theme, universal concepts are never far below the surface in the interpretation of history."[40] Yates' rediscovery of the memory tradition is only one example of her approach to the history of

culture: finding symbolisms that gave meaning to history. The present-day trend in cultural studies to reduce history to the study of forms of power repeats the late nineteenth-century trend to treat culture as "a world of passion and beauty without a meaning." Yates demonstrated that historical research could show that the surfaces of culture offer more meaning than could be dreamt of in these methodologies.

The Renaissance art of memory was a marginal, esoteric thought form, but its very obstruseness makes it a clearly observable phenomenon, whereas everyday forms of cultural memory are easily overlooked. The friezes adorning public architecture worldwide employ portrait busts and other symbols, often set in niches with more than a superficial similarity to a memory theater. Even the highly verbal discipline of philosophy continues to utilize processions of thought in stages as a means to create systematization. A thinker like Heidegger, whose "*Geviert*" divides the world up into Heaven and Earth, Mortals and Gods (*Himmel und Erde*, *Sterbliche und Götter*) and calls his thought "*Andenken*" (remembrance), appears in a new light after a study of Yates' *The Art of Memory*. But Heidegger's later writings bring us back to the question: Is a critical art of memory impossible? Is it possible to "just say how things are" and call this philosophy? Can philosophy only keep a rein on the imagination by avoiding it? What is the relationship between imagination and criticism? What methods permit us to study such phenomena? The art of memory offers a place to start answering these questions.

NOTES

1. See, e.g., Brian P. Copenhaaver and Charles B. Schmitt, *Renaissance Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 430. See also *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt and Quintin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 929.

2. See Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethean Age* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979), chaps. 5 and 6. The four elements of earth, air, fire, and water correspond to Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, and the Moon and to the four temperaments: melancholy, sanguinity, choleric, and phlegmatic. John Ferne applies this thinking in correspondences or "sympathies" in his *Blazon of Gentrie* (London: 1586, ed. 1624) to days of the week, months, flowers, numbers, stones, seasons, virtues, and metals.

3. See, e.g., the essay collection, *Mnemoysyne: Formen und Funktionen der kulturellen Erinnerung,* ed. Aleida Assmann and Dietrich Harth (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1991).

4. This is Thrasymachus' definition of justice in Plato's *Republic* 338 C.

5. James Joyce, *Ulysses* (New York: Random House, 1961), 137 (1st American ed., 134).

6. This is Ernst Cassirer's assessment. See esp. Cassirer, "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3 (1942): 331–32. See also his "Some Remarks on the Question of the Originality of the Renaissance," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 4 (1943): 49–56.

7. Consider the change of perspective from the timeless to the dramatic with the rise of Italian opera in contrast to medieval liturgical music. Jacopo Peri's *Dafne*, perhaps the first opera, dates from 1598.

8. Anthony Grafton with April Shelford and Nancy Siraisi, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 1.

9. See Peter Burke, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (London: Edward Arnold, 1969). The ruins in stone, the Bible, and the law were all regarded in an a-historical manner.

10. Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 389.

11. Ibid., 230.

12. Ibid., 241.

13. Ibid., 127.

14. Ibid., 6.

15. Ibid., 128.

16. Ibid., 234.

17. According to William and Martha Kneale, *The Development of Logic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), Ramus did little to really reform logic except to insist upon simplicity and order (302f.).

18. Yates, *The Art of Memory*, 235.

19. The first exploration of the memory tradition in Hegel's *Phenomenology* is Donald Phillip Verene, *Hegel's Recollection: A Study of the Images in the Phenomenology of Spirit* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1985). The following examination follows Verene's view but differs in emphasis; my interest is limited to the method of the *ars memoria*.

20. Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, ed. J. Hoffmeister (Hamburg: Meiner, 1952), 563.

21. Hegel, *Vorlesung Uber die Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. 20 of *Werke* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1971), 31–39. His discussion of Lull is

full of irony; see *Vorlesung*, vol. 19 of *Werke*, 585–87. The Rhetoric dedicated "Ad Herennium," purported to have been written by Cicero, was the chief source for the classical "Art of Memory."

22. Hegel, *Vorlesung*, III, 32.

23. Ibid., 33: "Bruno hat der Kunst [Lulls] eine tiefere innere Bedeutung gegeben."

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid., 39: "Es ist ein großer Anfang, die Einheit zu denken; und das andere ist dieser Versuch, das Universum in seiner Entwicklung, im System seiner Bestimmungen aufzufassen und zu zeigen, wie das Äußerliche ein Zeichen ist von Ideen.—Dies sind die beiden Seiten, die von Bruno aufzufassen waren."

26. Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, 564: "in der Form der Zufälligkeit erscheinenden Daseins."

27. Ibid.

28. Yates, *The Art of Memory*, 230. My emphasis.

29. R. G. Collingwood, *Speculum Mentis or the Map of Knowledge* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924). See chap. 2 on the provinces.

30. Collingwood, *Speculum Mentis,* and Cassirer, *Phänomenologie der Erkenntnis* (Berlin: Bruno Cassirer, 1929). Santayana's *The Life of Reason* is another example: *The Life of Reason; or, The Phases of Human Progress*, 5 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905–1906).

31. Alaisdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981).

32. Yates, *The Art of Memory*, 184f.

33. Ibid., 177–79.

34. Plato, *Meno, Phaedrus.*

35. Aristotle, *De memoria et reminiscentia*, 453a10.

36. Frances A. Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (1972, London and New York: Ark, 1986), 233.

37. Frances A. Yates, *Theater of the World* (1969, London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), 188.

38. George Santayana, *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*, ed. William G. Holzberger and Hermann J. Saatkamp, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1990), 99.

39. Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (1975, London: Pimlico, 1993), 87.

40. Ibid.