

ALLEGORY & ENCHANTMENT

An Early Modern Poetics

Jason Crawford

Allegory and Enchantment

An Early Modern Poetics

JASON CRAWFORD





Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP, United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Jason Crawford 2017

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2017

Impression: 3

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press 198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016942385

ISBN 978-0-19-878804-1

Printed in Great Britain by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

ALLEGORY AND ENCHANTMENT

for Chelsy

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook

Acknowledgments

My first encounter with the texts that occupy this book took place in my childhood, when my mother read *The Pilgrim's Progress* aloud to me and my sister. I remember well how thrilling, how charged with danger and wonder and dark truth, Christian's quest seemed to us then, unfolding in my mother's voice. The byways of writing the critical story I have to tell here have, at times, taken me far from those early, enchanted moments. But the abiding power of those moments in my imagination has reminded me often that the most significant debts of this book are deeper than any footnote can tell, and that my parents are, as they ever have been, the first and best of my teachers.

I owe special debts of thanks to Nicholas Watson, James Simpson, and Gordon Teskey. These three were wise and generous guides as I wrote my doctoral dissertation in Harvard's Department of English, and they each taught me much then about what scholarship can mean and be. But they have surprised me even so, in the years since, with the steadfastness of their encouragement and support. As I have toiled at this book, each of them has read, commented, contributed, questioned, warned, conversed, and cheered, with untiring patience. Each has shared with me many gifts from his own learning and writing. In plenty of ways each of them will take issue with the pages that follow. Even at these points, each has helped to make the book stronger, and each has done a great deal to sustain my joy in writing it.

Along the way I have enjoyed the companionship of many colleagues at Harvard University, at Union University, and in the Lilly Fellows Program in Humanities and the Arts. I have been grateful in particular for Scott Huelin and John Netland, who made themselves my friends on my arrival at Union and who encouraged me to keep writing in the midst of much else; for Mike Owens, who convinced me to give this book a try and who helped me through some key phases of its making; for Joshua King, who was there in the beginning, a fellow pilgrim in many endeavors; for Steve Halla, who has been so very free with the gifts of his woodcut artistry and of his good company; for Ryan Wilkinson and David Hoogerheide, who have enriched this work with years of conversation about matters great and strange; and for Kathy Sutherland, Joe Creech, Sandra Visser, Gwen Urdang-Brown, Melinda Posey, Chad Schrock, and, not least, my colleagues in the Department of English and the Honors

Community here at Union. Brenda Machosky has, at various conferences on various coasts and continents, been a perceptive and hospitable interlocutor, and Vladimir Brljak offered me a warm welcome, in my last weeks of writing, at a colloquium on allegory hosted by the Warburg Institute. In the final stages of my work, I have been heartened and helped by my commissioning editors at Oxford University Press, Jacqueline Norton and Eleanor Collins; by the attentiveness of the press's editorial and production staff; and by the reports of the press's anonymous readers, who took the time to know my work well and whose astute readings have prompted me to revise at a number of points.

I wrote portions of the book with the help of a Lilly Postdoctoral Fellowship, a Pew Research Grant from Union University, and a Lindsay Young Visiting Faculty Fellowship at the University of Tennessee's Marco Institute. I have been much helped by the skill and graciousness of the librarians at Harvard's Widener and Houghton Libraries, at Oxford's Bodleian Library, in the Special Collections of the University of Tennessee's Hodges Library, and at Union University's Logos Library, where the everforbearing Stephen Mount must be glad my work is done. Portions of the book have appeared in journals: part of Chapter 2 as "Langland's Allegorical Modernity," *English Studies* 95:6 (fall 2014); part of Chapter 3 as "*The Bowge of Courte* and the Afterlives of Allegory," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 41:2 (spring 2011); and part of Chapter 5 as "Bunyan's Secular Allegory," *Religion & Literature* 44:1 (fall 2012). I am grateful to those journals for permission to publish my work here.

There is no way of acknowledging adequately my greatest debts of gratitude. In Boston, Jackson, Knoxville, and Atlanta, and especially in Charlotte (where the cup of good cheer is never dry) and in Baton Rouge (where kindness never knows limits), my friends and family have loved me to all excess and beyond all deserving. I cannot do justice to the depth or breadth of what they have contributed to this book: certainly not in the case of my two smallest helpers, who daily renew my capacity to tell stories and love words; and least of all in the case of the one to whom this book is dedicated. She has endured more, hoped more, believed more, and been more than the small offering of this book can possibly answer or attest. Caritas numquam excidit.

Contents

Introduction: A Poetics of Enchantment	1
1. Genealogies of Allegory	45
2. Incarnations of the Word: Piers Plowman	82
3. Suspicion and Solitude: The Bowge of Courte	110
4. Violence and Apocalypse: The Faerie Queene	138
5. Selfhood and Secularity: The Pilgrim's Progress	175
Bibliography	203
Index	221

Introduction

A Poetics of Enchantment

What is enchantment? For the past century, historians and theorists of many persuasions have used the term to say something about modernity. Especially in the long shadow of Max Weber's critical accounts, we have come to conceive of modern culture as a set of interlinked projects: empirical science, capitalist industry, constitutional government, colonial violence, interiorized religion, instrumental rationality. And we have come to understand these projects as exercises in what Weber calls the "disenchantment of the world." "The fate of our times," as Weber says in a 1918 lecture,

is characterized by rationalization and intellectualization and, above all, by the "disenchantment of the world" [*Entzauberung der Welt*]. Precisely the ultimate and most sublime values have retreated from public life either into the transcendental realm of mystic life or into the brotherliness of direct and personal human relations.¹

The projects of modernity, as Weber understands them, commit themselves to the enforcement of an absence, to an abandonment of the sacramental rites, magical practices, and immanent spiritual presences of an idolatrous past.² Weber here imagines the old values and presences in retreat, but "disenchantment" is also a transitive act, and many more recent commentators have described modernity as a campaign of

² In naming sacrament and magic as the linked practices modernity has repudiated, I reiterate the terms of Weber's analysis in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), pp. 104–5, 117.

¹ I quote from the English version of Weber's lecture, "Science as a Vocation," in Max Weber, *Essays in Sociology*, trans. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 155; and from the German text, "Wissenschaft als Beruf," in Max Weber, *Schriften: 1894–1922* (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 2002), p. 510. The German phrase appears also on p. 488. My description here of modernity's "projects" is indebted to Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003), p. 13.

renunciation, as what we have variously called "the elimination of magic from the world," "the impoverishment of the reign of the invisible," "the departure from religion," "the destruction of the old enchanted cosmos," the "general rejection of magic," "the abandonment of that theoretical ideal [of 'ontotheological synthesis'], defined more than two millennia ago," "the surrender of our previous meaningful, humanly suffused, humanly responsive, if often also menacing or capricious world." To understand modernity as disenchantment is to conceive of modernity in just these negative terms: elimination, impoverishment, departure, destruction, rejection, abandonment, surrender. Modernity, in our narratives, is the end of something, a withering of the obsolescent past in the light of a utopian or dystopian future. Its identity depends upon the old magic from which it is, for better or worse, persistently trying to awaken.

And enchantment is that old magic, the spell modernity has broken. In a kind of back-formation on Weber's language of disenchantment, some recent narratives of modernity use "enchantment" to name a set of premodern, and usually medieval, cultural forms. When we talk about enchantment, we often talk about the medieval church, with its vast sacramental economies and its theology of bodily presence; about medieval political life, with its magical conceptions of authority and social bond; or about the medieval natural order, with its occult affinities and its daemonic agents. If disenchantment entails "the impoverishment of the reign of the invisible," enchantment, as many of our narratives imagine it, indicates the immanent operations of the invisible, whether the invisible agent takes the form of the God whom Akeel Bilgrami has described as "present in nature itself and therefore providing an *inner* source of

⁴ See, for instance, Charles Taylor's synopsis of premodern enchantment in *A Secular Age*, e.g., pp. 25–43; Akeel Bilgrami's account of early modern alternatives to disenchantment, "What is Enchantment." in *Varieties of Secularism in a Secular Age*, ed. Michael Warner, Jonathan VanAntwerpen, and Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), pp. 145–65; and David Morgan's comments on the uneasy persistence of enchantment in modernity, "Enchantment, Disenchantment, Re-Enchantment," in *Re-Enchantment*, ed. David Morgan and James Elkins (New York and London: Routledge, 2010).

2009), pp. 9-18.

³ I quote, respectively, from Weber, *The Protestant Ethic*, p. 105; Marcel Gauchet, *The Disenchantment of the World: A Political History of Religion*, trans. Oscar Burge (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 3; *The Disenchantment of the World*, p. 5 (and this metaphor of departure permeates his book); Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), p. 63; Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), p. 787; Louis Dupré, *Passage to Modernity: An Essay in the Hermeneutics of Nature and Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), p. 3; and Ernest Gellner, who here summarizes the Weberian thesis in a parodic spirit, "The Rubber Cage: Disenchantment with Disenchantment," in *Culture, Identity, and Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 153.

⁴ See, for instance, Charles Taylor's synopsis of premodern enchantment in *A Secular*

dynamism" or of the "host of demons, threatening from all sides" that Charles Taylor takes as the defining mark of an enchanted cosmos.⁵ The language of enchantment therefore tends to indicate forms of commerce or of approach, channels by which the material world and the immaterial divine come into contact with one another.

But as a term of critical discourse, "enchantment" also indicates something else. A critical account of enchantment can be possible, after all, only to the subject who has come out from under the spell and who therefore stands at the distance necessary to give enchantment a name. "Enchantment," as the name of an unnatural suspension out of ordinary life, has a kind of retrospection built into it. Just as the terms "medieval" and "premodern" define the thing they name as inherently previous, a period that precedes and strangely presupposes the real birth or rebirth of civilization, "enchantment," too, precedes and presupposes the disenchantment that makes its spells apparent. The term signifies a condition of otherness, a secondary state. In our narratives of modernity, it suggests the fragility and anteriority of the dream from which the premodern world eventually will awaken. Even when our critical accounts mean to eulogize or rehabilitate enchantment, they tend to find enchantment already, and perhaps necessarily, dissipated at odds, certainly, with modernity, and with modernity's core projects of repudiation and departure. Enchantment is premodern, and the premodern is enchanted. It seems hard, within the terms of the Weberian narrative, to imagine a modern enchantment, or an enchanted modernity.

Early modern writers would in many ways recognize this narrative of medieval enchantment and modern disenchantment. These writers are themselves, after all, engaged in the repudiation of an old magic. In England, writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have their own narratives and metaphors of disenchantment, and they invent a variety of renunciatory postures, imagining themselves as debunkers, skeptics, bearers of news, inquisitors and counter-inquisitors, plain-speaking prophets against every sort of conspiracy and error. For the main body of these English writers, the metaphor of disenchantment undergirds a violent renunciation of the Roman church, which John Bale in the 1540s calls the "proud church of hypocrites, the rose coloured whore, the paramoure of Antichrist, and the sinfull sinagoge of Sathan." In their efforts to expose this rose-colored whore, English writers take their

⁵ Bilgrami, "What is Enchantment," p. 148; and Taylor, *A Secular Age*, p. 32.
⁶ I quote from the 1548 edition of *The Image of Bothe Churches* (London, 1548), "A Preface unto the Christen Reader," fol. A2v. Here, as in all my quotations from early modern editions, I modernize type but retain spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.

marching orders from the biblical apocalypse, with its declaration about Babylon the Great: "for thy marchaunts were the grett men of the erth. And with thyne inchantment were deceaved all nacions" (Rev. 18:23).7 Bale in his commentary on this biblical passage lays bare the "preuye legardimain," the "iuglinge castes," the "lyes in hipocrisye," the "errours in supersticion," the "craftes, & inchauntmentes," and the "subtyle charmers" of the great Satanic impostor.8 His mission is to break the charms of this impostor, and the terms of his commentary could serve as a kind of lexicon for many of the anti-Roman titles that come off English presses over the next century: A Countercharme against the Romish Enchantments, that Labour to Bewitch the People (1630); The Spreading Evills, and Pernicious Inchantments of Papisme, and Other Errors (1641); The Iesuites Banner. Displaying their Original and Successe: their Vow and Othe: their Hypocrisie and Superstition (1581); A Discouerie of the Most Secret and Subtile Practises of the Iesuites (1610); The Vnmasking of all Popish Monks, Friers, and Iesuits... Together with Some Briefe Observations of their Treasons, Murders, Fornications, Impostures, Blasphemies, and Sundry Other Abominable Impieties (1628); The Hatefull Hypocrisie, and Rebellion of the Romishe Prelacie (1570); Roman Forgeries or A True Account of False Records Discovering the Impostures and Counterfeit Antiquities of the Church of Rome (1673).9

The skeptical zeal of these titles serves a vigorous campaign of discovery and disbelief. Protestant prophets in England direct their efforts against an ecclesiastical history that seems increasingly alien and against forms of sacramental practice and word-magic that seem nothing more than idolatrous superstition. ¹⁰ These prophets perceive the times to be perilous and evil, and they labor to cultivate in their dissenting communities a finely

I quote from William Tyndale's 1526 New Testament, reproduced as The New Testament: A Facsimile of the 1526 Edition (London: The British Library, 2008).
 The Image of Bothe Churches, commentary on Rev. 18:20–4, paragraph 17.

⁹ I quote from the title pages of, respectively, Anthony Cade, A Iustification of the Church of England (London, 1630); Anon., A Discouerie of the Most Secret and Subtile Practises of the Iesuites (London, 1610); Lewis Evans, The Hatefull Hypocrisie, and Rebellion of the Romishe Prelacie (London, 1570); Alexander Grosse, A Fiery Pillar of Heavenly Truth (London, 1641); Meredith Hanmer, The Iesuites Banner (London, 1581); Lewis Owen, The Vnmasking of all Popish Monks, Friers, and Iesuits (London, 1628); and Thomas Traherne, Roman Forgeries (London, 1673); all in facsimile at Early English Books Online. For the durable URLs associated with individual titles at Early English Books Online, see my Bibliography. In my citation of early modern English titles, I regularize capitalization and type.

The term "word-magic" I take from James Baumlin, whose *Theologies of Language in English Renaissance Literature: Reading Shakespeare, Donne, and Milton* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012) is useful on the early modern disenchantment of sacramental and incarnational language. See, e.g., pp. xxxii–xl.

tuned apparatus of doubt. Lewis Owen, author of The Vnmasking of all Popish Monks, Friers, and Iesuits and various other attacks against the Jesuits, begins his treatise with Paul's reminder that Satan can appear as an angel of light and John's exhortation "not to beleeue euery spirit." He teaches his readers that these apostles "labour to stirre up the godly to a more continual and earnest watchfullnesse and warinesse, when they tell of the state of the latter dayes wherein wee liue," and he insists that, in these perilous days, faithful individuals and communities can survive only by practicing a hermeneutics of suspicion, a resistance to the heresies of Jesuitical impostors. 11 Samuel Harsnett begins his A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures (1603) by addressing "the Seduced Catholiques" themselves, warning these spiritual prisoners of their captivity to a "forraine Idol Gull, composed of palpable fiction, and diabolicall fascination, whose enchaunted chalice of heathenish drugs, & Lamian superstition, hath the power of Circes, and Medeas cup, to metamorphose men into asses, bayards, & swine." Harsnett sets out to expose the tricky methods of the Jesuit exorcist Father Edmunds, and he too exhorts his readers to be wary and watchful, quick to inquire and disbelieve. If, he says to them, my Declaration can unmask the Jesuit swindlers, then "what can you, or any ingenious spirits do lesse, then bewaile your seduced misaffection unto us, and to account them as the grand Impostors, and enchaunters of vour soules?" If Owen's burden is to inoculate, Harsnett's is to rescue, but their missions in the end are more or less the same: to train their readers in the disciplines of a disenchanted skepticism, to leave them disabused and wide awake.12

At the outset of his *The Discouerie of Witchcraft* (1584), Reginald Scot, the great enemy of the witch-hunting Inquisition, suggests that this posture of skepticism is a mark of his generation's modernity. "Robin goodfellowe ceaseth now to be much feared, and poperie is sufficientlie discouered," he says, as if he need only remind English subjects that they have, at this late date of 1584, become well inured to the enchantments of older times. How is it then, he asks, that "witches charms, and coniurors cousenages are yet thought effectuall," so that "our cold prophets and inchanters make vs fooles still"? He urges his disenchanted readers to "defie the diuell, renounce all his works, and not so much as once thinke or dreame vpon this supernaturall power of witches; neither let vs

¹¹ In his "To the Gentle Reader," *The Vnmasking of all Popish Monks, Friers, and Iesuits*, Fol. A2v.

¹² A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures (London, 1603), "To the Seduced Catholiques of England," fol. A2v.
13 The Discouerie of Witchcraft (London, 1584), "To the Readers," fol. B2v; in facsimile

¹³ The Discouerie of Witchcraft (London, 1584), "To the Readers," fol. B2v; in facsimile at Early English Books Online.

prosecute them with such despight, whome our fancie condemneth, and our reason acquiteth."14 In doing so, he suggests, like Owen and Harsnett, that to pursue disenchantment is to resist both unreasoning "fancie" and the great enchanter, the devil. His inquiry into the investigative methods and paranoiac superstitions of the witch-hunters exposes these selfappointed enemies of Satanic enchantment as themselves agents of that enchantment, charmers whose spells must be broken. The clarion call of his long treatise is persistently against the "credulitie" of those who fall prey to the "abhominable and divelish inuentions" of the witchmongers, and he sets out to cultivate a stance of incredulity, a critique that inquires into the inquisitors and examines the examiners. 15

A writer like Scot offers, in other words, a counter-paranoia, an Inquisition of his own. The contest he orchestrates between doubt and doubt, accusation and accusation, is in many ways exemplary of an inquisitorial age. Many writers in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England are, like Shakespeare's Iago, "nothing if not critical," complexly anxious about deception, probation, and proof. Inasmuch as they make themselves the debunkers of a corrupt tradition—crusaders against superstitions, sacraments, rituals, festivals, liturgies, abbeys, icons, and relics—these early modern dissenters are what James Simpson has described as "revolutionary," engaged in a militant breaking away from history, oriented in their efforts toward the "aggressive physical and ideological demolition of the 'old' order." 16 It is in this revolutionary orientation, this commitment to radical violence, that the English reformers are modern. Some recent observers have argued that the term "modernity," at its base, indicates not a stable condition or a discrete historical period but rather a revolutionary temporal relationship, an assertion of difference from-or, as Paul de Man calls it, a "ruthless forgetting" of-an inaccessible or undesirable past.¹⁷ This militant orientation toward the past takes the form, in the

The Discouerie of Witchcraft, "To the Readers," fol. B5r.
 The Discouerie of Witchcraft, book 1, chapter 9, p. 18.
 Reform and Cultural Revolution: 1350–1547, Oxford English Literary History, vol. 2

⁽Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 1.

¹⁷ Talal Asad observes that, though modernity is not what he calls a "verifiable object," the idea of modernity as a verifiable object, as a discrete ideal or enemy, directs the way individuals and states behave and is therefore itself "part of practical and political reality." It is possible, then, to think of modernity as a shared fiction or goal, as "a *project*—or rather, a series of interlinked projects-that certain people in power seek to achieve." Formations of the Secular, pp. 12-13. Italics are his. De Man is perceptive on the temporal structures of this project when he reads "modernity" as an antonym of "history" and so exposes "the radical impulse that stands behind all genuine modernity when it is not merely a descriptive synonym for the contemporaneous or for a passing fashion." "Literary History and Literary Modernity," in *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), pp. 142–65; qtd. at p. 147.

English revolutions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of what some scholars have described as an experience of "historical solitude" and "historical loss." 18 History in this period becomes prominently visible becomes history—exactly because English subjects perceive themselves to be the citizens of a new age, an eschatological age after history. These modern citizens regard the past with new intentness, and they articulate their distance from the past with a complex mingling of nostalgic longing and revolutionary dissent. 19 John Skelton, who will figure centrally in my account here, is at the turn of the sixteenth century already caught between longing and renunciation in his hopeful invocation of the "poetes olde" whose example he aspires to follow, and in his melancholy knowledge that he is cut off from these poets, a man born into evil days. The poets of the past are lost to Skelton's narrator because the history to which he belongs has left them behind. He suffers the double exile that characterizes many early modern writers: an exile both from a receding past and from an inauthentic present.²⁰

The "modernity" of these English writers is intimately bound with metaphors of disenchantment for just this reason: disenchantment, too, has a revolutionary temporality at its core. Narratives of disenchantment are narratives of repudiation, of the process by which authentic knowledge, rational or empirical or spiritual, strips the old idols of their

¹⁸ To speak of "historical solitude" is to invoke Thomas Greene's account of the Renaissance humanists, with their discovery of the past as past, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982), e. g., pp. 8–11. The experience of early modern "historical loss" has been explored by Andrew Escobedo, who sensitively reads the contradictory stances of English reformers toward what they experience as a painfully ambiguous national history, *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004).

¹⁹ Some historians have observed that early modern antiquarian scholars and early modern cultural revolutionaries are often the same people. James Simpson, to whose account I am indebted here, notes that the "project of historical recuperation" drives the sixteenth-century antiquarian John Leland to a mental breakdown exactly because, as Simpson claims, such an early modern project necessarily produces a "divided consciousness": "the entire past becomes visible as 'history' precisely because Leland is committed to the construction of a wholly new age." *Reform and Cultural Revolution*, pp. 7–17; qtd. at p. 17.

The Bouge of Courte 9. Quotations from Skelton's poetry come from The Complete English Poems, ed. John Scattergood (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), and are cited by line number. "Double exile" I take from Thomas Greene, who writes about Petrarch's "double exile" from both an irrecoverable past and an inadequate present. Petrarch was, as Greene says, "neither Roman nor modern, so that he became in his own eyes a living anachronism." The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry, p. 8. See also de Man, who observes in a different way that modernity's radical impulse leads to paradox, because modernity must discover itself as "a generative power that is itself historical." Modernity, says de Man, "invests its trust in the power of the present moment as an origin, but discovers that, in severing itself from the past, it has at the same time severed itself from the present." "Literary History and Literary Modernity," pp. 150, 149.

deceptive power. When reformers such as Bale, Scot, and Harsnett frame their attacks as campaigns of disenchantment, they ask their readers to adopt the stance of modern subjects, practitioners of suspicion in the present wicked age. These modern subjects must be self-protective, committed to authenticity, wary examiners of themselves and others. And they bear, in the narratives of Bale and many others, the features of what some accounts of modernity have called the "sovereign" or "buffered" self, the aggressively autonomous subject whose distance from both the inauthentic past and the inauthentic present gives her power to resist the encroachments of idolatry and error.²¹ She is buffered, this subject, because her commitment to an ethics of repudiation demands elaborate mechanisms of defense. In early modern England, the writers from whom I have quoted are hardly alone in offering their books as necessary medicine for an assailed and vulnerable people. Countless title pages and prefatory epistles echo the promise of these writers to protect against enchantment: "it forewarnes and so forearmes thee," as John Hull promises of his anti-Roman treatise The Vnmasking of the Politique Athiest (1602), "against these popish charmes that now flye about the land, least unwittingly thou be inchanted with them."22

In the context of these projects of renunciation and self-protection, the metaphor of disenchantment becomes central to a wide variety of early modern discourses. Especially in the chaotic decades following the accession of Charles I, entrants into the crowded fray of English spell-breaking direct their efforts not just against the Roman church and its corrupt history but against Quakers (Quakers are Inchanters and Dangerous Seducers, 1655), against Anabaptists (Anabaptismes Mysterie of Iniquity Vnmasked, 1623), against Anglican ministers (The City-Ministers Unmasked, or The Hypocrisie and Iniquity of Fifty Nine of the most Eminent of the Clergy, in and about the City of London, 1649), against lawyers (The Lawyers Bane, 1647), against witches (A Confirmation and Discovery of Witch-Craft, 1648), against archbishops (The Grand Impostor Vnmasked, or, A Detection of the Notorious Hypocrisie, and Desperate Impiety of the Late Archbishop, so styled, of Canterbury, 1644), and against a whole cornucopia of Jews, Socinians, Arminians, skeptics, schismatics, impostors, and seducers.²³ And because the possibility of enchantment everywhere threatens

²¹ On the "sovereign self," see Dupré, *Passage to Modernity*, pp. 93–144, and Asad, *Formations of the Secular*, e.g., pp. 16, 52, 67–99. Charles Taylor's extended meditation on what he calls the "buffered self" snakes through his *A Secular Age*, e.g., pp. 29–41.

²² This in his "To the Reader," *The Vnmasking of the Politique Athiest* (London, 1602), fol. A4v; in facsimile at *Early English Books Online*.

²³ I quote here from the title pages of the following volumes: Anon., Quakers are Inchanters and Dangerous Seducers (London, 1655); I. P., Anabaptismes Mysterie of Iniquity

the purity and authenticity of the self-protective subject, this subject turns her inquisitorial zeal, most of all, against herself. Early modern England abounds in treatises on discerning true prayer from counterfeit prayer, true religious emotions and experiences from counterfeit ones. Many of these treatises direct themselves against hypocrisy, with its potential to seduce the subject into inauthenticity. They bear titles like The Portraiture of Hypocrisie (1589), The Hypocrite Discovered and Cyred (1643), The Christians Looking-Glasse (1615), and The Estates of the Hypocrite and Syncere Christian (1613), and in their warnings against inauthenticity they cultivate an anxious awareness that hypocrisy destroys not only social bonds but also the bonds by which the self knows itself.²⁴ They understand well that the grand impostor can come home—"the heart of man being a Sea of subtilty, and a Mine of deceipt, giuen to deceiue and beguile it selfe," as The Christians Looking-Glasse says—and they regard the vulnerable subject as her own first potential victim.²⁵ The manuals against hypocrisy work, therefore, as manuals against self-enchantment, critical guides to self-examination and self-regard. In their schemes of reflexive attention, these texts help to make explicit the degree to which disenchantment is an orientation of the self toward itself. For the writers who will ground my discussions here, as for so many early modern writers, disenchantment entails an apprehension of the self as in danger of enchantment and therefore as in need of careful disciplines and controls. The cultivation of inquisitorial discipline serves to keep the subject free and to keep her under control, to safeguard and police her authentic, autonomous being. In this regard, the early modern human subject is like the broader early modern realms of church and society, and like the cultural projects of Max Weber's critical narrative: she defines herself as modern by learning the arts of critical suspicion and renunciatory dissent.

Our vocabulary for talking about modern disenchantment seems, then, to issue in certain ways from the very fiction it has set out to anatomize and explain. Weber's accounts have an early modern genealogy, a kinship with the narratives of disenchantment that direct so many cultural

²⁵ The Christians Looking-Glasse, p. 69.

Vnmasked (London, 1623); Anon., The City-Ministers Unmasked (London, 1649); Benjamin Nicholson, The Lawyers Bane (London, 1647); John Sterne, A Confirmation and Discovery of Witch-Craft (London, 1648); and Henry Burton, The Grand Impostor Vnmasked (London, 1644); all in facsimile at Early English Books Online.

²⁴ See John Bate, *The Portraiture of Hypocrisie* (London, 1589); Samuel Torshell, *The Hypocrite Discovered and Cvred* (London, 1643); Thomas Tuke, *The Christians Looking-Glasse* (London, 1615); and Thomas Cooper, *The Estates of the Hypocrite and Syncere Christian... Very Necessarie, for the Tryall of our Estates in Grace* (London, 1613); all in facsimile at *Early English Books Online*.