

# Supernatural Environments in Shakespeare's England

*Spaces of Demonism, Divinity, and Drama*



KRISTEN POOLE

CAMBRIDGE

SUPERNATURAL  
ENVIRONMENTS IN  
SHAKESPEARE'S ENGLAND

*Spaces of Demonism, Divinity, and Drama*

KRISTEN POOLE

*University of Delaware*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,  
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)  
Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781107008359](http://www.cambridge.org/9781107008359)

© Kristen Poole 2011

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2011

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

Poole, Kristen.

Supernatural environments in Shakespeare's England : spaces of demonism,  
divinity, and drama / Kristen Poole.

p. cm.

ISBN 978-1-107-00835-9 (Hardback)

1. English drama—Early modern and Elizabethan, 1500-1600—History and criticism.
2. Supernatural in literature. 3. Space in literature. 4. Supernatural—History—16th century.
5. Supernatural—History—17th century. 6. Religion and literature—England—History—16th century.
7. Religion and literature—England—History—17th century. I. Title.

PR658.S82P66 2011

822/.30937—dc22

2010045992

ISBN 978-1-107-00835-9 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or  
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to  
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such  
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

## *Acknowledgments*

This book took over a decade to write, and thus my debts are legion. At many points the project was nudged, questioned, or sent reeling by the comments of others. Some of these people I know, and I have benefited from a chat over tea at the Folger, a hallway exchange at a conference, or a quick conversation with a colleague. Some of these people I don't know, and help came in the form of a comment at a conference panel, an email inquiry, or a random conversation on the train. It would take another chapter for me to detail these formative encounters here, so I should simply like to say thanks to all of those who have contributed, wittingly or not, to this book.

My interactions in the classroom have helped me to solidify my thinking on many of the topics in these pages, and I am thankful for my students through the years. The conversations that took place in a graduate seminar I taught on "Renaissance Space-time" at the University of Delaware, and a seminar I taught on the senses at the Folger Shakespeare Institute, were especially valuable. Two graduate students in particular, Joshua Calhoun and Hannah Eagleson, deserve a special hand; I'm sure I have learned as much from them as they have from me. Over the years I have benefited from the research assistance of Joshua Calhoun, Daniel Mason, Kelly Nutter, and Amy Sopko. I am grateful to the University of Delaware for General University Research Grants that enabled me to have this help.

The project was launched with two short-term fellowships, one at the Folger Shakespeare Library and one at the Huntington Library. I am grateful to the staff of both institutions, especially to those at the Folger who have generously offered assistance over the years.

Chapter 1 was previously published as "The Devil's in the Archive: *Doctor Faustus* and Ovidian Physics," *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 35 (2006), 191–219. A very different iteration of Chapter 4 appeared as "Physics Divined: The Science of Calvin, Hooker, and Macbeth," *South Central*

*Quarterly*, 26 (2009), 127–52. And a much truncated version of Chapter 3 stands as “When Hell Freezes Over: Mount Hecla and *Hamlet’s* Infernal Geography,” *Shakespeare Studies*, 39 (2011), 152–87. For all of these, I benefited from the comments of the various editors – Mary Floyd-Wilson, Garrett Sullivan, and Carla Mazzio – and from some wonderful anonymous reader’s reports. I am grateful to those journals for permission to include parts of those articles in this book.

While the contents of another small article (“Psychologizing Physics,” *Shakespeare Studies*, 33 [2005], 95–100) do not directly appear in this book, writing that piece helped me to formulate and focus on my key ideas. The editor who asked me to write that submission was the late Cynthia Marshall, whose warm intellectual generosity, as manifest in an email correspondence that was longer than the article itself, continues to amaze and inspire me.

At Cambridge University Press, Reader A provided a detailed and crucial report that enabled me to better see my argument and to restructure the whole manuscript. Likewise, I profited from the final comments of Reader B (as in Bruce Smith, who graciously unmasked himself). Sarah Stanton was patient and supportive through a long process of revision. Rebecca Taylor smoothly ushered the manuscript into production. Andrew Dawes copy-edited the book with a keen eye and good humor, and Meg Davies (once again) swiftly produced an expert and artful index.

I am blessed with a most extraordinary writing group. This book simply would not exist without them. Through sharing drafts, camaraderie, and pretentious cheeses, the group provides me with a rich, sustaining, and fun intellectual life. The group has morphed as people have moved into and out of the Philadelphia area, and so through the years I have received invaluable feedback and support from Scott Black, Claire Busse, Edmund Campos, Alice Dailey, Jane Hedley, Matt Kozusko, Zachary Lesser, Laura McGrane, Nicole Miller, Scott Newman, Eric Song, Garrett Sullivan, Jamie Taylor, Evelyn Tribble, and Julian Yates. Most especially, Nora Johnson, Katherine Rowe, and Lauren Shohet have graciously read additional drafts and provided additional encouragement.

My neighbors and friends have preserved my sanity during the insane process of simultaneously writing a book and raising children. Michael Hanowitz and Tom Maciag, Shannon Coulter and Matthias and Lillian Ohr, Drury and Ellen Pifer (who doubles as a colleague), Steve Helmling (also a colleague), and, by long distance, Jennifer Carrell have sustained me with wine and laughter.

I tend to write with the aid of a computer and a cat. Thus at the risk of once again incurring the gentle (?) ridicule of my friends, I hereby acknowledge the feline contributions of both the old guard, Floh and my sorely missed companion Cleo, and the new guard, Katie and Pig.

My beloved daughters, Corinna and Juliana, have been growing up alongside this book. While they have often made it difficult for me to think about theology and physics (or, for that matter, to think at all), they dazzle with a spark of the divine and a sense of the real. Every day I am joyful just to see them, and I try to borrow from their unbounded energy, creativity, and enthusiasm for life.

When writing a book that in many ways is about early modern modes of mapping, it is convenient to be married to a cartographic historian, even if he is an Americanist. I met Martin Brückner in my first week of graduate school, and we soon began talking about our mutual interest in the conceptualization of space. The conversation has continued for the last two decades. In the BC era (i.e. Before Children), we even managed to co-author an article, "The Plot Thickens: Surveying Manuals, Drama, and the Materiality of Narrative Form in Early Modern England," *English Literary History*, 69 (2002), 617–48. This book (Chapter 5 in particular) is peppered with references to that piece. What I thought was a mere cul-de-sac of my intellectual life turned out to be the main road of the journey. I am happy, immensely grateful, and honored to have Martin traveling beside me.

## *Note on the text*

For sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources, I have retained original spelling (with the exception of modernizing the long s), although I have standardized capitalization in book titles. The place of publication is London unless indicated otherwise. In my extended discussions of *Othello*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *The Tempest* I have used Arden editions. Throughout the book, unless a different edition is specified, references to other Shakespearean plays are from Stephen Greenblatt *et al.* (eds.), *The Norton Shakespeare*, based on the Oxford Edition (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Co., 1997).

## Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	page ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
<i>Note on the text</i>	xv
Prologue: Setting – and unsettling – the stage	1
Introduction: The space of the supernatural	6
1 The devil's in the archive: Ovidian physics and <i>Doctor Faustus</i>	25
2 Scene at the deathbed: <i>Ars moriendi</i> , <i>Othello</i> , and envisioning the supernatural	58
3 When hell freezes over: The fabulous Mount Hecla and <i>Hamlet's</i> infernal geography	95
4 Metamorphic cosmologies: The world according to Calvin, Hooker, and Macbeth	136
5 Divine geometry in a geodetic age: Surveying, God, and <i>The Tempest</i>	168
Epilogue: Re-enchanting geography	219
<i>Notes to the text</i>	224
<i>Index</i>	278



## Figures

- |    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 1  | Anon., <i>The Dyenge Creature</i> . London, 1506. Title page.<br>By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.  | 67  |
| 2  | Anon., <i>Ars moriendi</i> . London, 1506. Sig. Ar <sup>v</sup> . Reproduced<br>by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University<br>Library. Classmark Sel.5.8.   | 68  |
| 3  | Anon., <i>The Doctrynnall of Dethe</i> . London, 1532. Title page.<br>© The British Library Board. Shelfmark C.25.k.21.  | 69  |
| 4  | Gerard Mercator, <i>Atlas novus, sive, descriptio geographica<br/>totius orbis terrarum</i> . Amsterdam, 1638. Vol. I, Fol. C2–3.<br>University of Delaware Library, Newark, Delaware.   | 110 |
| 5  | Detail from Gerard Mercator, <i>Atlas novus, sive, descriptio<br/>geographica totius orbis terrarum</i> . Amsterdam, 1638. Vol. I,<br>Fol. C2–3. University of Delaware Library, Newark, Delaware.   | 112 |
| 6  | Detail from Gerard Mercator, <i>Atlas novus, sive, descriptio<br/>geographica totius orbis terrarum</i> . Amsterdam, 1638. Vol. I,<br>Fol. D2–3. University of Delaware Library, Newark, Delaware.   | 114 |
| 7  | Thomas Hood, <i>The Vse of the Two Mathematicall Instruments,<br/>the Crosse Staffe, (Differing from that in Common Vse with<br/>the Mariners) and the Iacobs Staffe</i> . London, 1596. Title page.<br>By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library. | 175 |
| 8  | Image demonstrating the use of the Jacob's staff, also known<br>as the cross staff. Source unknown.  | 178 |
| 9  | George Wither, <i>A Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Modern</i> .<br>London, 1635, p. 143. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare<br>Library.  | 179 |
| 10 | Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas, <i>Du Bartas His Deuine<br/>Weekes &amp; Works</i> . London, 1611. Engraved title page.<br>By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.  | 182 |

- |    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 11 | Aaron Rathborne, <i>The Surveyor in Foure Books</i> . London, 1616. Engraved title page. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.                           | 183 |
| 12 | Leonard Digges, <i>A Geometrical Practical Treatize Named Pantometria</i> . London, 1591, pp. 30–1. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.                | 190 |
| 13 | Francis Quarles, <i>Emblemes</i> . London, 1635, p. 288. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.   | 204 |
| 14 | Leonard Digges, <i>A Geometrical Practical Treatize Named Pantometria</i> . London, 1591, pp. 18–19. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.               | 205 |
| 15 | Christopher Marlowe, <i>Tragicall Historie of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus</i> . London, 1631. Title page. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library. | 217 |

## *Prologue: Setting – and unsettling – the stage*

GUILDENSTERN: The scientific approach to the examination of phenomena is a defence against the pure emotion of fear.

Tom Stoppard, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*<sup>1</sup>

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern have come to visit. In a moment that is as raw for the emotions expressed as for the witness of false friendship, Hamlet attempts to describe his melancholy:

... indeed, it goes so heavily with my disposition that this goodly frame the earth seems to me a sterile promontory, this most excellent canopy the air, look you, this brave o’erhanging firmament, this majestical roof fretted with golden fire, why it appeareth nothing to me but a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours.  
(*Hamlet* 2.2.263–9<sup>2</sup>)

The scene is familiar. It is not quite as iconic as the moment when Hamlet gazes into the hollowed eyes of Yorick’s skull, but the sentiment is the same. That which is great and wondrous becomes, for the tortured prince, base and decayed. Man, the paragon of animals, is also the “quintessence of dust” (2.2.274). The majestic seems foul. It is a paradox that is encapsulated in the play’s insistent use of the word “rank” – that which is noble; that which rots.<sup>3</sup>

As he tries to convey the source of his torment to his erstwhile friends, Hamlet finds this juxtaposition of beauty and putrefaction in the very space he occupies; heaven seems to him indistinguishable from the vapors that rise from hell. He uses the theater as a visual aid: “[L]ook you,” he says, the imperative seemingly addressed to the audience as well as to his immediate companions, “this brave o’erhanging firmament, this majestical roof fretted with golden fire.” The gesture is towards the actual heavens, the contemporary name given to the canopy which covered the thrust Elizabethan stage. It is a rare Shakespearean instance of architectural self-consciousness (a dynamic almost, but not quite exactly, metatheatrical), akin to the famous reference to the “wooden O” in the

prologue to *King Henry V*.<sup>4</sup> It is a moment in which the Globe seems to gloat. And yet, it appears “nothing . . . but a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours.” Heaven intermingles with hell; materiality is indistinguishable from the mist; the reality of solid architecture is compromised by the specter of a mysterious void. At this moment, the wooden O – the Globe itself – presents its own inherent paradox. Not only Hamlet’s punning language, but the very setting in which he stands, becomes a site of interpretive and cognitive instability.

“Quintessence of dust”: just as heaven merges with hell, so too this verbal oxymoron suggests a profound spatial disturbance. Audiences today are likely to understand “quintessence” as “[t]he most typical example of a category or class; the most perfect embodiment of a certain type of person or thing” (*Oxford English Dictionary* [www.oed.com.proxy.nss.udel.edu], def. 3.b), and take Hamlet’s line to mean “man is the ultimate form of dirt.” His original audience, however, probably would have comprehended “quintessence” as the “fifth essence existing in addition to the four elements, supposed to be the substance of which the celestial bodies were composed” (*OED*, def. 1.a), a definition popularized through alchemy. Man (to use Hamlet’s word choice) is thus a mixture of the celestial and the terrestrial. The oxymoron here does not simply present the condition of humanity as an ontological paradox, but crashes a familiar Aristotelian cosmology. The spatial confusion that began on the stage spreads outwards to those in the Globe, encompassing the groundlings with their feet firmly planted in the dust.

We are perhaps attuned to the inflections of medieval philosophy and Christian humanism in Hamlet’s speech.<sup>5</sup> It is more surprising to discover the resonance of cartography. As John Gillies has strikingly shown, this speech has strong verbal affinities with the text of Mercator’s *Atlas*.<sup>6</sup> Then again, perhaps this should not be surprising, given the geographic context of Shakespeare’s theater. To name a theater “The Globe” – or, more accurately, to re-name “The Theatre” the “Globe,” as happened once the timbers of the original building were dismantled, floated across the river, and reassembled – is an act which deliberately locates the edifice within the sixteenth-century impulse to map.<sup>7</sup> This was the age of the great cartographers, of Ortelius and his *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1570; translated into English in 1606) and of Mercator and his *Atlas* (1595; translated into English 1636). These are the foundational texts of modern cartography, although they contain still-vibrant residues of an older spatial consciousness. As Gillies states: “What has been called ‘the Shakespearean moment’ . . . was also the moment of the new geography’s most

monumental statements. By the same token, it also represented the last flowering of the old ‘cosmography’, because both Ortelius and Mercator conceived of geography in cosmographic terms.”<sup>8</sup> The Mercatorial overtones of Hamlet’s speech thus knit together the implications of his theatrical, global, and cosmic settings, and bring together residual and emergent spatial epistemologies.<sup>9</sup>

The cartographic and cosmographic significance of Hamlet’s speech probably would not have been lost on his audience. Many of those gathered inside the Globe would have been aware of the maps that increasingly defined their space – not only the magnificent world atlases, but, closer to home, the English decorative county atlases commissioned by Queen Elizabeth and even the practical property maps increasingly necessary for calculating taxes. These are the maps which have provided such fertile ground for recent scholarship, as critics have unpacked their ideological function in the emergence of nationalism and “New World” exploration.

Hamlet’s audience would also have been keenly aware of another of the Globe’s geographies. This is a geography that is often lost on modern scholars, even though Hamlet points to it.<sup>10</sup> It is the geography of the supernatural and the afterlife, the geography of heaven and hell. Theater historians are, of course, aware that heaven and hell are part of the architectural structure of the Globe. William J. Lawrence discusses the theatrical use of the heavens – presumably painted with signs of the zodiac – as the place from which deities descend to the stage in a number of early modern plays.<sup>11</sup> The convergence of stage architecture and a cartographic sensibility is beautifully illustrated in a quote Lawrence takes from Heywood’s *An Apology for Actors* (1612) describing the Roman theater: “The covering of the stage, which we call the heavens (where upon any occasion the gods descended) was geometrically supported by giant-like [A]tlas,” the mythological figure whose name, in the wake of Mercator, became synonymous with a collection of maps.<sup>12</sup> Andrew Gurr directs our theatrical vision from above to below, writing that “[t]he painted heavens covering the stage in the amphitheatres provided an automatic visual signal for one stage locality, of course. The trap provided another, its position under the stage surface offering a hell for Marlowe’s Barabbas and Faustus to sink into, for devils to spring from, and for the ghost of Hamlet’s father to descend into before he speaks from his purgatorial grave under the earth of the stage floor.”<sup>13</sup>

For scholars of the period, however, this architectural geography of the theater has remained largely a detail of performance studies, germane only

to the comings and goings of characters on stage. The ramifications (ideological, theological, and theatrical) for an audience watching *Hamlet* – and many other early modern plays concerned with the supernatural – performed in a space mapping an eschatological cosmology have not been studied in depth (“eschatology” here referring to matters of the afterlife<sup>14</sup>). And yet, this might well have been the map that most concerned Shakespeare’s audience. Surely emergent nationalism and curiosity about the New World affected the political and imaginative lives of Londoners in 1600, but that “undiscovered country” (3.1.78) of death and the afterlife was arguably a more immediate and pressing concern.

The wooden fixity of the Globe gives an illusion of geographical and eschatological certitude. But in fact during this period both natural and supernatural geographies were in a process of rapid transformation. The terrestrial globe itself was in the process of becoming unmoored. In 1600, very probably the date of the composition of *Hamlet*, Johannes Kepler signed a contract making him a junior partner of Tycho Brahe.<sup>15</sup> These mathematical geniuses, like others, were struggling to accommodate Copernicus’s “discovery” of a heliocentric solar system with what they knew of the cosmos, of God, and of mathematics and the new instruments that gave them measurements of historically unprecedented accuracy. The new information sent heads and planets spinning. The changing cosmic landscape, and even the increasing precision used in surveying the fields beyond London’s bounds, would profoundly transform not only terrestrial and planetary order, but eschatological geography as well. When earth was the center of the cosmos, heaven was up above the ether and hell and purgatory were below the ground. When the cosmos was rearranged, and mapping became a scientific undertaking, this spatial-theological organization was undermined as well. The present book is a study of such eschatological destabilization – of how a shifting supernatural geography was produced, experienced, and portrayed.

Hamlet’s propensity for paradox, then, becomes a means of registering his own eschatological disorientation. Like lilies that fester – the paradoxical symbolic merger of bodily resurrection and corporeal decay – for Hamlet heaven and hell coexist in an impossible relationship. He clearly sees and describes the heavens, and yet they are clouded by foul vapors. His visual perception is in keeping with his muddled and contradictory attitudes towards the afterlife, his questions and doubts about heaven, hell, and purgatory. Indeed, Hamlet frets about fire for most of the play. He is caught between the medieval belief in purgatory and the Reformation denial of this space’s existence.

The theater allows for the spatial representation and performance of this theological dilemma.<sup>16</sup> On stage, an actor stands below the heavens and above hell – the visual map is simple. But Hamlet's words disrupt the picture: what we see is not what he sees; what we thought was self-evident is not; what we thought we believed becomes clouded. This is not only a crisis of faith, or a contest of Catholic and Protestant theologies: it is, in very real ways, a crisis of cosmic geography.

## *Introduction: The space of the supernatural*

By all means, they seem to say ... [l]et us not mix up heaven and earth, the global stage and the local scene, the human and the nonhuman. "But these imbroglios do the mixing," you'll say, "they weave our world together!" "Act as if they didn't exist," the analysts reply.

Bruno Latour<sup>1</sup>

### MIXING UP HEAVEN AND EARTH

The turn of the seventeenth century was marked by a sense of cosmic disorientation. Transformations in religious belief brought about by the Protestant Reformation and transformations in modes of conceptualizing space brought about by the popularization of geometry profoundly affected understandings of the relationship between chthonic and supernatural geographies. As a centuries-old structure of cosmic and divine order pressed up against new cartographies and new theologies, the realities of earth, heaven, and hell warped. The confluence of multiple, often contradictory, spatial and theological epistemologies resulted in unsteady beliefs about the universe. This book sets out to explore some of the expressions of this destabilization. Specifically, it examines how the coexistence of often incompatible spatial understandings affected beliefs about, and the experience of, the supernatural.

In Western thought, conceptions about the nature of the supernatural have long been connected to ideas about the structure of space. Saint Augustine's *Confessions*, for instance, begins with a moment of spatial and spiritual vertigo. The text is addressed to God through an insistent and intimate second-person pronoun, but before Augustine can settle into a comfortable use of "you" he must find his divine audience. In his attempt to locate God in space, Augustine seems bewildered, perhaps even frantic:



Where *to* can I, already in you, call you to come? And where *from* would you be coming? Where *to* could I retire, outside heaven and earth, for God to come there to me, my God who has said, “I fill heaven and earth”? Since, then, you fill heaven and earth, do they contain you? Or do you fill them, with a surplus of you left over, beyond their containing? Then where, once heaven and earth are filled, does the overflow of you go? Do you, who contain all things, need no container because what you fill is filled by your containing *it*? Any receptacle containing you cannot confine you – were it broken, you would not spill out of it.<sup>2</sup>

Augustine’s opening gambit acknowledges a desire to comprehend the world through containment – through shape and dimensions. A clear sense of a cosmic container would seem to ensure a clear sense of emplacement of the self, and thus would define that self’s relationship to the divine. Such a sense of clarity, however, is revealed as contrary to God’s nature. Augustine must move away from a quest to understand God’s spatiality to a radical acceptance of his numinous existence: “Then what are you, God – what, I inquire, but simply God the Lord?” (p. 4). Once he is able to rest in this realization, Augustine can turn to a more inward and for the most part a calmer meditation.

The idea of a spatial God is, naturally, very old. In Acts 17:28, we read that “in [God] we live, and move, and have our being.”<sup>3</sup> This notion – that the divine is spatial, and that humanity inhabits this god-space – itself reaches back to Plato. In the *Timaeus*, Plato established an ontological coherence of the universe through his claims that the demiurge had created a spherical cosmos in his own likeness. In explaining “the construction of the world,” Plato describes how the creator decided “[a] suitable shape for a living being that was to contain within itself all living beings would be a figure that contains all possible figures within itself. Therefore he turned it into a rounded spherical shape, with the extremes equidistant in all directions from the centre, a figure that has the greatest degree of completeness and uniformity, as he judged uniformity to be incalculably superior to its opposite.”<sup>4</sup> Geometry was thus both a sign and a function of divine perfection. This idea was to persist for millennia (and arguably still does, as recent rhapsodic claims of string theory’s “elegance” carry neo-Platonic overtones<sup>5</sup>). When Augustine breaks the “receptacle” of God, when he refutes the notion of God and space as container, he thus also breaks away from a Platonic tradition of geometricizing space.

While the relationship of God and space is a topic with an ancient pedigree, the sixteenth century – a century in which both Augustine and Plato assumed intellectual pride of place – brought a new urgency to the conversation. The period is one of both religious and spatial upheavals.