The Diabolical Adventures of Don Quixote and the Possession of Shakespeare's Protagonists: Religious Climates and Models of Madness in Late Renaissance Spain and England

Hilaire Kallendorf

University Undergraduate Research Fellow, 1994-95

Texas A&M University

Departments of English and
Modern & Classical Languages

APPROVED
Advisors

Honors Program

The Diabolical Adventures of Don Quixote and the Possession of Shakespeare's Protagonists: Religious Climates and Models of Madness in Late Renaissance Spain and England

Introduction

Part One: Models of Madness (Historicity of Texts)

I. Classifications of Appropriations

II. Intertextuality
- A. The Devil, the Enchanter: The Madness Pursuing Don Quixote
- B. Plays of Shakespeare and Demonology Treatises

Part Two: Religious Climates (Textuality of History)

I. Actual Exorcisms, Case Studies, Cultural Ambience
- A. Spain
- B. England

II. Political Implications
- A. The Inquisition and Cervantes
- B. British Tavern-Talk

Conclusions: The Role of Literature in History

I. Renaissance Self-Fashioning: Politicians and Church Officials

II. Renaissance Art-Fashioning: Writers and Literary Motives

Introduction†

> . . . . The spirit that I have seen
> May be a dev'l, and the dev'l hath power
> T' assume a pleasing shape, yea, and perhaps,
> Out of my weakness and my melancholy,
> As he is very potent with such spirits,
> Abuses me to damn me. . . .
>
> (*Hamlet* 2.2.598-603)

Madness and irrationality appear as recurrent motifs in Renaissance literature, not only in England but also on the Continent. Shakespeare incorporates the terminology and imagery of the Elizabethan exorcist to paint a convincing portrait of a young prince suffering from attacks of madness. Don Quixote, Cervantes' mad protagonist, speaks to Sancho about the power of demons:

> porque te hago saber que los diablos saben mucho . . . Y la razón es que como ellos, dondequiera que están, traen el infierno consigo, y no pueden recebir género de alivio alguno de sus tormentos. . . . (I, 558)

Just as Don Quixote is the victim of attacks of diabolical mania over which he has no control, so too Hamlet suffers from a spiritual madness which Shakespeare could only describe adequately through the terminology of an exorcist of his time. For both of these works, the audience's or reader's culturally-conditioned response

† I would like to express my thanks to the National Endowment for the Humanities for providing me, through a Younger Scholar grant, with the opportunity to conduct research for this project in the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center rare books collection.

would have been to associate the protagonist's state of mind with demonic possession.[1] The public may have considered possession to be a supernatural *or* a theatrical phenomenon, but in either case, as Stephen Greenblatt observes, they would have recognized "the types of cries appropriate to the occasion, the expected violent contortions, the 'decorum' . . . of the trance state" (Shakespearean Negotiations 111).[2]

I have investigated how two writers, Cervantes and Shakespeare -- exact contemporaries who became, for many, the greatest authors in their respective national literatures -- appropriated the language of Spanish Golden Age exorcists and Elizabethan writers on demonology to depict varying states of

---

[1] Possession (not obsession) is the appropriate term here:

> "Both were considered states of mind in which the victim could not be held responsible for what he said or did. In obsession, the devil was presumed to 'besiege' or 'sit without' the body of the afflicted [Latin: ob-sedere]. In possession the devil beset the person inside the body. Bishop Montague, after Shakespeare one of the first to use the words, in 1642 contrasted the power of Satan 'to move [and] actuate' [obsession] and 'to possess and really inhabit' his victim [possession]. Because a virtuous person was supposed immune to possession, the early saints suffered only obsession." (Robbins 392)

The two maladies were similar, however, in that

> "[p]ossession and obsession were methods of assault adopted against the will of the afflicted person, and hardly to be avoided by him without the supernatural intervention of the Church. . . . the refinement of the theologians had little or no effect upon the world outside their controversies. To the ordinary mind, if a man's eyes goggled, body swelled, and mouth foamed, and it was admitted that these were the work of a devil, the question whether the evil-doer were actually housed within the sufferer, or only hovered in his immediate neighborhood, seemed a question of such minor importance as to be hardly worth discussing . . . and the theory of possession, having the advantage in time over that of obssession, was hard to dislodge." (Spalding 82, 62-63)

[2] Demonic possession is recognized in relation to madness in many instances and examples of the literature and mythology of the Middle Ages, as Michel Foucault demonstrates in his book Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.

madness in their crazed protagonists. The terminology surrounding these characters suggests that the authors found the model of demonic possession useful in creating credible indicators of irrationality. These indicators would have been recognizable to audiences and readers familiar with exorcism as it was conceptualized within the religious climates of late Renaissance Spain and England.

Much of the investigation of Shakespeare's use of contemporary texts on demonology has been limited to *King Lear* and its association with Samuel Harsnett's A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures (1603). It is common knowledge that Shakespeare was reading Harsnett's book as he was writing this play and that he borrowed the names of Edgar's demons, several attributes of hell, colorful adjectives, and a language of madness from this treatise. Although a few scholars have begun to trace similar connections between isolated plays and works on demonology by contemporaries of Shakespeare (such as The Discovery of Witchcraft [1584] by Reginald Scot and Daemonologie [1597] by King James I), no one has explored the overall pattern of his appropriation of exorcist terminology to construct models of madness or persecution. Shakespeare's references to exorcist motifs which are not traceable to other contemporary treatises on demonology may have arisen from his knowledge of the common Elizabethan heritage of medieval demonlore. Such general references to demonology would nonetheless have contributed to Shakespeare's construction of models of madness and persecution using the terminology of Elizabethan exorcists.

Similar appropriations, even less studied, occur in Spanish literature of the same epoch. For example, one of the devices utilized by Cervantes in portraying the madness of Don Quixote is an illusory "enchanter" who pursues him. I have traced significant occurrences of "diablo," the Spanish word for "devil," in the *Quijote* to identify the mysterious enchanter with a demon or "devil." The descriptive language identifying this enchanter with a demonic possessor in the style of exorcists in late Renaissance Spain corre-sponds to the linguistic structures Shakespeare builds to trigger the resurgence of images of madness and persecution in the minds of his audience.

The distinction between these authors' tragic vs. comic purposes must be clearly drawn -- i.e., their different motives for appropriation according to what effect they sought to produce. Shakespeare appropriated the language of Elizabethan writers on demonology and exorcism to depict varying states of madness in his tragic protagonists (for example, King Lear, Othello and Hamlet) and persecution in his comic protagonists (for instance, Malvolio, Kate and Antipholus). Cervantes, I believe, wrote with both of these purposes: to express persecution, thus enhancing the comedy, and to express madness, thus subverting the comedy with tragedy. An illustration of both purposes operating simultaneously would be Don Quixote's imitation of the antics or "penitence" of Beltenebros in

the Sierra Morena; this performance obviously only highlights his underlying diabolical madness.[3]

Kenneth Muir's summation of Shakespeare's borrowing techniques is applicable to Cervantes as well:

> we may suppose that, like Coleridge, he created much of his poetry from forgotten reading. . . . It must therefore be borne in mind that apparently close parallels may be deceptive, and that even when Shakespeare is known to have read the work in question, his actual source may be different. . . [A] single line in one of his plays may combine echoes of more than one source. . . . Shakespeare thus combined a variety of different sources in the texture of his verse, and the process, in most cases, was apparently unconscious. Just as J. Livingston Lowes was able to demonstrate that 'The Ancient Mariner' and 'Kubla Khan' were a complex tissue of words and phrases borrowed from Coleridge's multifarious, and probably forgotten, reading, so it would be possible, if we had a complete knowledge of Shakespeare's reading, to show that words, phrases, and images coalesced in his poetry. (The Sources 7,10-11)

In the case of Cervantes, then, there may or may not have been a "programme of reading he carried out for the specific purpose of writing" (Muir The Sources 217). But to attempt to descend into "that dark undercellerage" (Schleiner 48) of the writing process which precedes any final product, let us examine what cultural baggage may have been kept in storage in the cellars of each of these authors.

---

[3] Foucault relates the wisdom of a wise fool like Don Quixote to the power of the devil: "the wisdom of fools . . . is a forbidden wisdom, it presages . . . the reign of Satan . . . false happiness . . . [and] diabolical triumph" (22).

Henry Anders, who described King James I's "quixotic fight against the black art" (114), was accurate in more ways than he was aware of. Both Cervantes and Shakespeare played upon the preconceptions which existed in the minds of their audiences and readers. In order to find an entrance into an understanding of these preconceptions, I have benefited from the methods of the New Historicist critics.[4] One component of what New Historicists call "social formation" is religion, in both the official and the popular venues. But why have I chosen to focus on this aspect instead of others, such as medical diagnoses? It is known that Shakespeare was familiar with Bethlehem Hospital, called Bedlam, which had been a priory until the dissolution by the Henrican reformation of 1536.[5] It was then converted by the citizens of London into an insane asylum. But treatments in this so-called asylum were far from scientific; the ordinary method of dealing with lunatics is described here: "[b]onds and confinement in a darkened room were

---

[4] "The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies," an essay by Jean E. Howard, describes the "new kind of activity . . . gaining prominence in Renaissance studies: a sustained attempt to read literary texts of the English Renaissance in relationship to other aspects of the social formation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries" (3). The so-called New Historicism is really nothing new. Scholars like Spalding should certainly be considered precursors of New Historicism, as this passage written in 1880 demonstrates: "The student must endeavour to divest himself, as far as possible, of all ideas that are the result of a development subsequent to the time in which his author lived, and to place himself in harmony with the life and thoughts of the people of that age: sit down with them in their homes, and learn the sources of their loves, their hates, their fears, and see wherein domestic happiness, or lack of it, made them strong or weak; follow dealings with their fellows -- the honesty or baseness of them, and trace the cause; look into their very hearts, if it may be, as they kneel at the devotion they feel or simulate, and become acquainted with the springs of their dearest aspirations and most secret prayers" (Spalding 7).

[5] One of several Shakespearean references to the place occurs in *2 Henry VI* (5. 1. 131), and often Shakespeare uses "bedlam" as a synonym for madness.

the specifics, and the monotony of this treatment was relieved by occasional visits from the sage who had charge of the case, to mumble a prayer or mutter an exorcism. Another popular . . . cure was by flagellation" (Spalding 76). An inventory of its equipment included manacles, irons, chains, locks and keys, stocks, and other restraining devices (Kail 44). He could also have obtained medical information from professionals such as John Hall and Thomas Lodge.[6]

My justification for not studying medicine as a more significant aspect of the social formation for these two writers is as follows. As for the sources from which these authors appropriated the terminology and imagery of madness and persecution, it is always difficult to establish specific origins of explicit borrowings. Cervantes is said to have been acquainted with Huarte de San Juan's Examen de ingenios (1575). In *Hamlet*, Shakespeare did echo ideas and phrases from Timothy Bright's A Treatise of Melancholie (printed in two editions in 1586). But we must remember that it was widely believed among Bright's colleagues that there were legitimately "evil illnesses like hysteria or madness caused by demoniac possession or the influence of witchcraft" (Hoeniger 201). Reginald Scot, whom we know Shakespeare read, stated unequivocally that "it is indifferent, or all one, to saie; He is possessed with a diuell; or, He is lunatike or phrentike: which disease in these daies is said to proceed of

---

[6] "Two physicians with whom Shakespeare was acquainted and from whom he might have learned clinical and other medical data were John Hall and Thomas Lodge" (Hoeniger 51).

melancholie" ("A Discourse" 513).[7] In reference to specific disorders, it must be remembered that "still in Shakespeare's time, epileptic and other suffocating fits were commonly confused and the symptoms often attributed to possession by devilish spirits, from which the unfortunate victims needed to be exorcised, after appropriate repentance" (Hoeniger 199). And physical disease was not the only cause for speculations on the supernatural. Even romantic love could be targeted as a possible manifestation of demon possession. D. P. Walker, in "Demonic Possession Used as Propaganda in the Later 16th Century," identifies the Shakespearean idiom of love-sickness as yet another form of possession: the jilted partner exhibits symptoms of lassitude, withdrawal, or physical illness, and her condition is attributed to possession by the object of her affections (311). The medical doctors' tendency "to attribute a disease, the symptoms of which they could not comprehend, to a power outside their control by ordinary methods, was a safe method of screening a reputation which might otherwise have suffered" (Spalding 63).

And when both Spanish and English physicians stepped aside, relinquishing their authority in the face of diabolical adversaries, priests, preachers, and schoolmasters were waiting in the wings to engage in a profitable employment. They bartered their credit with the lower class (who deferred to their superior wisdom) in exchange for opportunities of financial gain, self-aggrandizement, and

---

[7] The idea that physical diseases could be caused by demonic possession was also propagated by Andrew Boorde in The Breuiary of Helthe (1547), reprinted five times by 1598.

fanatical propaganda. Some were sincere, it must be granted, but others were proven frauds. The Church found it necessary to forbid (in the 72nd Canon) the casting out of spirits without a special license for that purpose. But many exorcisms had already drawn large crowds before the Church took official action, and

> as the Reformers only combatted the doctrine of possession upon strictly theological grounds, and did not go on to suggest any substitute for the time-honoured practice of exorcism as a means for getting rid of the admittely obnoxious result of diabolic interference, it is not altogether suprising that the method of treatment did not immediately change. (Spalding 63-64)

In most instances, the commoners simply assumed that afflictions with the set of symptoms typical for these cases were caused by supernatural powers; they did not bother to ask for a medical opinion first. The 1602 Glover case is the earliest record of medical experts being called into court to examine a case of possession. This relatively late appeal to scientific knowledge on the part of the authorities shows how intertwined the secular and sacred concepts had become.

But there is another reason for not looking at medical treatises instead of ecclesiastical ones, aside from the fact that often medical doctors, even if they were called upon, resorted to the supernatural to explain illnesses they could not cure. I have concluded that Shakespeare and Cervantes were simply not as interested in reading what little medical knowledge was available as they were in reading the pamphlets and manuals (also

transformed into propaganda) about exorcism which circulated widely at the time. I have found many more instances of appropriations from these sources than I have of any attempts on the parts of the authors to diagnose their literary creations. The latter would almost seem to operate at cross-purposes to their artistic enterprise. Perhaps appropriation of exorcist language was the favored method to portray madness because the only medical explanations for madness were based on the classics and were thus less accessible to the audience. Reliance on folk religion was a more direct route to obtain readers' sympathy for these characters.

The most compelling evidence that Shakespeare and Cervantes preferred religious metaphors over medical ones is that in the few cases when they did use specific medical phraseology, the results were often badly imprecise or even totally inaccurate. For instance, one medical term King Lear uses in reference to himself is *hysterica passio*, a condition called the "suffocation of the mother" by the Elizabethans and Jacobeans. But Shakespeare utilizes this term in a way which is wildly inappropriate, for the "mother" only occurred in women, according to most doctors of the time. A modern physician has commented on this embarrassing detraction from the tragic emphasis of the play: "Lear's lines present a real problem, since hysteria or 'the mother,' as the Elizabethans usually called it, continued to be regarded, as it had been since ancient times, as an illness affecting women alone. . . . [I]t must have been a '*lapsus*' on Shakespeare's part" (Hoeniger 320-21). He goes on to call the usage an "absurd incongruity" and "Shakespeare's medical blunder" (323, 322). The explanation for such a ludicrous mistake is that it has

now been established that the bard appropriated the phrase not from Edward Jorden's treatise on the illness, but from Samuel Harsnett's exorcist-bashing Declaration, published in the same year. Harsnett misuses the phrase; therefore, so does Shakespeare.

A final argument for these authors' preference for religious over "scientific" source material would be the obvious dramatic appeal of the sensational details of the exorcism cases. Shakespeare's contemporaries write in detail on what the ceremony was like. Reginald Scot describes it thus:

> The right order of exorcisme in rebaptisme of a person possessed or bewitched, requireth that exsufflation and abrenunciation be doone toward the west. Item, there must be erection of hands, confession, profession, oration, benediction, imposition of hands, denudation and unction, with holie oile after baptisme, communion, and induition of the surplis. . . . (Scot 440)

In less complicated language, the basic ingredients of an exorcism were as follows:

> The patient, seated in a 'holy chair,' specially sanctified for the occasion, was compelled to drink about a pint of a compound of pack and salad oil; after which refreshment a pan of burning brimstone was held under his nose, until his face was blackened by smoke. All this while the officiating priest kept up his invocation of the fiends . . . under such circumstances, it is extremely doubtful whether the most determined character would not be prepared to see somewhat unusual phenomena for the sake of a short respite. Another remarkable method of exorcism was a process termed 'firing out' the fiend. [Spalding's note: This expression occurs in 'Sonnet cxliv', and evidently with the meaning here explained; only the bad angel is supposed to fire out the good one.] The holy flame of piety resident in the priest was so

> terrible to the evil spirit, that the mere contact of the holy hand with that of the body of the afflicted person in which he was resident was enough to make him shrink away into some more distant portion; so, by a judicious application of the hand, the exorcist could drive the devil into some limb, from which escape into the body was impossible, and the evil spirit, driven to the extremity,was obliged to depart, defeated and disgraced. This influence could be exerted, however, without actual corporal contact.
>
> (Spalding 80; taken from Harsnett and others)

Sometimes the corporal contact did take on the inevitable sexual dimension: "other . . . methods of exorcism . . . were adopted, especially when the operation was conducted for the purpose of bringing into prominence some great religious truth. The more evangelical of the operators adopted the plan of lying on top of their patients, 'after the manner of Elias and Pawle'" (Spalding 78).[8]

Obviously the references to "priests" allude to the Catholic exorcists, but Reginald Scot assures us in his usual bigoted way that "[t]he papists you see, have their certeine generall rules and lawes . . . and even so likewise have the other conjurors . . . . [E]ven so doo common conjurors . . . even in the same papisticall forme" (447). The "forme" mentioned here was actually a ritual or formula which had to be spoken in precisely the right way: "I conjure thee *Peter* or *Barbara* being sicke . . . that everie fantasie and wickednesse of diabolicall deceipt doo avoid and depart from thee, and that everie uncleane spirit be conjured. . . . And this order must alwaies be followed . . ." (Scot 441).

---

[8] He quotes The Tryall of Maister Darrell of 1599, p. 2.

Unlike in England, where most of these rites were performed surreptitiously, in Spain they were codified, common occurrences. Like in England, some were conducted by charlatan exorcists, who claimed powers to exorcise everything from storms to plagues of locusts. The greatest Spanish theologian of the age wrote that all these exorcists were reproved as superstitious, diabolical, deceitful exploiters of the illiterate faithful (Ciruelo 265). These fraudulent exorcisms resembled the legitimate ones, except that their purpose was to draw a large audience. Legitimate exorcisms, referred to as holy and genuine, were modeled after examples from the Gospels. The role of exorcist was restricted to priests and minor orders -- in other words, no laymen. The four official minor orders were doorkeeper, reader, exorcist, and acolyte. But deacons and all those with minor orders of any kind could perform exorcisms with the full sanction of the Church, with the proviso that only priests were allowed to perform public exorcisms. Ecclesiastical authorities also sought to decrease the number of demagogues by warning that no priest had more power over demons than any other priest.

The most significant ecclesiastical handbook of Cervantes' age, devoted exclusively to exorcisms and written by Benito Remigio Noydens, was Practica de exorcistas y ministros de la Iglesia. En que con mucha erudicion, y singular claridad, se trata de la instruccion de los Exorcismos para lançar, y ahuyentar los demonios, y curar espiritualmente todo genero de maleficio, y hechizos (1660). This was an authoritative treatise, as is proven by the fact that it was reprinted nine times in 43 years. The "Censura, y Aprobacion" gives to the manual the ethos of absolute authority: "aprobado por

personas graves, y doctas de nuestra Sagrada Religion." The treatise consists of five parts:

I. la instrucción, y varios documentos para el Exorcista
   i. [primer documento] De los requisitos del Exorcista, y debida preparacion para el Exorcismo
   ii. [segundo documento] De las señales, y efectos de que se conoce, que alguno sea posseìdo del demonio
II. la practica, y modo de exorcizar a los Energumenos, con sus conjuros, y oracions eficacissimas
III. la practica, y modo de exorcizar a los duendes, brujos, y demonios, que infestan las casas, y curar espiritualmente todo genero de maleficio, y hechizos
IV. los Exorcismos en tiempo de tempestades, y trabajo de langosta &c.
V. [oraciones y ritos escritos en latín].

Most literary portrayals of (or allusions to) exorcism are not so elaborate as the ones dictated by this manual. But they are detailed enough to be easily identified. In Part One of this study, "Models of Madness (Historicity of Texts)," I will show how works by Cervantes and Shakespeare contain fragments of cultural dialogues specific to the historical period in which they were

produced. These literary works must be placed in their historical contexts before they can be fully understood. After explaining the precedent for my work (this previous study only covers one play and one treatise), I will demonstrate the intertextuality among Spanish exorcist manuals and *Don Quijote*, as well as English demonology treatises and the plays of Shakespeare. The occurrence of exorcism in literature is not limited to villains or other "bad" characters. According to Renaissance popular belief, any person, however blameless, was liable to be struck down into the throes of possession at any moment.

In Part Two, "Religious Climates (Textuality of History)," I will attempt to re-create the cultural ambience in which these authors lived and wrote. Much of this ambience was textual in the sense that there was a symbiotic print culture -- of pamphleteers and treatise writers feeding off each other -- which became an arena where opposing sides fought to control the way future generations would interpret the events of this time period. There are no published records of the exorcisms conducted in Spain, for the very good reason that there were so many of them, and they were nothing out of the ordinary.[9] In this section I will explain that while the exorcisms were both so spectacular and so common that these authors could not have escaped hearing about them, the political restrictions placed upon them by the Inquisition and English censors would have discouraged them from joining in the controversy by taking sides with the participants. The participants did take sides,

[9] As part of a doctoral dissertation I will conduct archival research in Spain to uncover cases of possession recorded in the Inquisition documents.

as I illustrate in the first conclusion section on Renaissance self-fashioning and the ecclesiastical officials (along with the exorcists) who engaged in it. They took sides to the extent that the documents they left behind -- treatises and pamphlets, many of them the equivalents of our tabloids -- fit rather nicely into the Girardian model for persecution texts. But Cervantes and Shakespeare, far from choosing to expend their artistic energy on such politicized, ephemeral documents, did not write persecution texts, as some scholars have tried to argue, claiming to explore "the network of assumptions, beliefs, and preferences on which Shakespeare played as on a keyboard" (Schleiner 48). Even if their patrons were biased or partisan, as far as these writers are concerned, "one can always find a good dramatic reason for the inclusion of material that critics have ascribed to the demands of patronage" (Muir 217). I will propose that they were not "out to get" anybody, that there is no veiled alignment with one political or religious group or another which is waiting to be uncovered after centuries of ignorance.

As the reader will notice from my use of the New Historicist terms "Historicity of Texts" and "Textuality of History" in the titles for the two parts of this study, I started out on this project using a New Historicist methodology. But soon I discovered that the assumptions buried inside it led me to conclusions I could not accept. The subversion/marginality motif (or actually, standard of reference) of which the New Historicists are so fond requires a willingness to see a text as a transparent cultural artifact. The boundaries of genre become blurred to the extent that a tabloid is

viewed in much the same way as a literary masterpiece. I want to show how these authors appropriated fragments of cultural dialogues to aid them in their *literary* techniques; in my conclusion, I will clarify that I believe their purposes were literary, not political.[10]

[10] To reflect this distinction, I have underlined the titles of texts written for non-literary purposes and italicized the titles of novels and plays.

Part One: Models of Madness (Historicity of Texts)

I. Classifications of Appropriations

Much of the study which has been done on Shakespeare's use of contemporary texts on demonology has been limited to *King Lear* and its association with Samuel Harsnett's A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures. It has been known since 1733, when Lewis Theobald published the fact in an edition of Shakespeare, that the dramatist appropriated material from the Declaration (1603) when he was writing *King Lear* in late 1604-1605. It is now thought that Theobald may merely have summarized the connection between the two texts which had previously been discovered by Francis Hutchinson. Building on this foundation, Kenneth Muir recognized that Shakespeare borrowed the names of Edgar's demons, several attributes of hell, colorful adjectives, and a language of madness from Harsnett's treatise.

Various associations have been suggested to explain why Shakespeare would have been interested in reading a treatise on exorcism. Although scholars agree that intelligent spectators in his audience would have noticed and comprehended Shakespeare's allusions to Harsnett, recent studies refute the traditional assumption that Shakespeare read the treatise with the intention of pleasing King James I by writing a timely satire on the fraudulent exorcisms. In one study, F. W. Brownlow offers background on the basis for Shakespeare's interest in Harsnett as well as interpretations of his attitude toward the Declaration. In this assessment, Brownlow does not concur with Stephen Greenblatt's

view (in Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England) that Shakespeare took only a secular interest in the Declaration. Brownlow's criticism of this book is a valid one: in it, Greenblatt does not demonstrate enough sensitivity to the significance of exorcism for the Jesuit priests as part of their Catholic rituals. In addition, Peter Milward notes that Shakespeare's family included some Catholics, and if this information is accurate, such a background might have influenced Shakespeare's approach to the persecution of the Jesuit exorcists. John L. Murphy theorizes in Darkness and Devils: Exorcism and *King Lear* that the hunted Edgar represents the hunted Jesuit exorcists.

His personal relationships would also have dictated that he peruse this document. It savagely attacked persons he probably knew: the exorcist Robert Dibdale, the son of a Stratford family intimate with the Hathaways; Thomas Cottam, a man feared by the demons of the exorcisms who was the brother of Stratford's (and probably Shakespeare's) schoolmaster from 1579 to 1582; and Edward Arden, who was probably Shakespeare's second cousin. But aside from provoking a disturbed personal response in Shakespeare, the lively, scandalous content of the Declaration would have interested him by merit of its current political import: the treatise included two priestly accounts and five witnesses' statements concerning the Denham possessions of 1585-1586 and a series of exorcisms conducted in and around London by Catholic missionary priests led by William Weston, S.J. The exorcists' rituals encompassed the chanting of prayers in English and Latin and the use of such properties as relics, vestments, oils, water, galbanum, salt,

rue, and sack. Each successful exorcism resulted in a dispossession which was referred to by believers in these practices as a miracle. The most subjective component of Harsnett's treatise, in addition to the examinations and confessions, was his own analysis of the events and personages under scrutiny. He concluded that the exorcisms were frauds and that the Jesuit priests were the real devils.

Complications in assessing Shakespeare's borrowings from Harsnett arise because of corruptions within the historical record of the Declaration itself. For example, the evidence was tampered with in the confession of Friswood Williams, a demoniac who was a government informer. In spite of his ecclesiastical position as Domestic Chaplain to Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London, Samuel Harsnett may not have written an altogether honest report in his vituperative zeal to denounce practices he undoubtedly viewed as absurd and sacrilegious. In later years, as he became successively the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge (1606) and the Archbishop of York (1629), Harsnett may have become ashamed of his book. Evidence for retrospective embarrassment was his failure to retain even a single copy of the Declaration in his own library at Colchester. Shakespeare could not possibly have been aware of the factual corruptions and therefore could not have corrected his reading accordingly. But it is noteworthy that (in the opinion of F. W. Brownlow, who wrote a biography of Samuel Harsnett) Shakespeare did not read the Declaration during the time when he was writing his great tragedy; he had read it before he began to write, and its insidious imaginative power had had time to take root in his mind.

But even if Shakespeare were reading and simultaneously appropriating from a corrupt text, his appropriations can nevertheless be traced and analyzed. What sorts of material did he cull from Harsnett's diatribe, and where did he see fit to include Harsnettian echoes in his own writing? Do Harsnettian words, phrases, and ideas appear in Shakespeare in similar or dissimilar contexts?

The over eighty parallels which Kenneth Muir has traced between *King Lear* and A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures demonstrate that Harsnett's treatise profoundly affected Shakespeare in the process of composing his tragedy.[1] Incidentally, no one has classified, in an organized way, the different kinds of appropriations Muir and Brownlow claim that Shakespeare made. An effort to do so will result in a list of general categories of appropriation which I will transfer and apply to other Shakespearean tragedies connected with other treatises on demonology and exorcism.

The most obvious appropriation occurs whenever a character describes his or her own madness in terms of demonic possession. The prime example is Lear's detached commentary on his own mental degeneration. His cry of "[d]arkness and devils!" (1.4.252)[2] echoes a passage from Harsnett: "[r]esort unto the Oracles of the devil . . .

---

[1] I must emphasize that all the parallels I will reproduce here are the result of work by Muir and Brownlow; some of them may even seem tenuous, by the strictest of standards. But they have been published by reputable presses and, so far, have not encountered any major objections from other Shakespeare scholars.

[2] All Shakespeare quotations are taken from The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. Evans.

and . . . conjure up from hel the Prince and power of darknes" (333). He further describes and addresses his own madness:

> O how this mother swells up toward my heart!
> *Hysterica passio*, down, thou climbing sorrow,
> Thy element's below. (2.4.56-58)

Lear's introspective lament also finds its source in Harsnett: "Ma: *Maynie* had a spice of the *Hysterica passio*, as seems, from his youth; he himselfe termes it the Moother" (223). F. W. Brownlow comments on the peculiar effectiveness achieved by Shakespeare's appropriation of exorcist terminology to construct a model of madness for King Lear by observing that each phrase borrowed by a protagonist from the exorcists "figuratively names and diagnoses an experience of present mental agony and proposes a relationship between psychic disintegration and a principle of evil located 'below,' both in human nature and the cosmos" (120).

When the protagonists are not describing their own madness in demonic terms, they may exemplify attributes or symptoms of madness which Shakespeare derived from the experiences of the demoniacs examined in Harsnett's Declaration. The most immediate specific source for Edgar's entire performance of simulated possession as Poor Tom was Harsnett's account of the experience of the first demoniac, Nicholas Marwood. Lear's physical motions designated by internal stage directions were designed to typify the symptoms of possession; his trembling (3.2.51) is a symptom described vividly by Harsnett: "[i]nstantly began the possessed to tremble, to have horrour, and rage thorough out his whole body"

(255). His fear of whipping (3.2.53) connotes the exorcists' practice of whipping the demoniacs with a priest's stole (273). His beckoning of Edgar to come forth from the hovel parallels the exorcists' beckoning of demons to come forth from inhabited persons. Edgar's contortions to brush off his beggar's lice may mimic the vigorous air-grabbing of a demoniac trying to catch demons. But A. L. Soens has offered a new interpretation of Edgar's lines and probable gestures as a portrayal of a fencing match with a demon, similar to the "fencing matches" which Harsnett mockingly describes the exorcists as having with demons. Here as elsewhere, Harsnett provided Shakespeare with a source for painful verbs -- "beaten" (283), "scourged" (289), "stung" (292), "flayed" (274), "tortured" (244), "scalded" (256), and "pierced" (287) -- denoting actions which his characters could engage in to demonstrate madness.

Another commonly-cited appropriation in *King Lear* is the series of devils' names that Shakespeare borrowed from the examination of Sara Williams in A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures. This particular series of names occurs nowhere else in contemporary literature -- only in the two works of Harsnett and Shakespeare. Here are the transformations of the names which occurred when Shakespeare appropriated them:

Declaration:	*King Lear*:
Fliberdigibet	Flibbertigibbet
Hoberdidance	Hopdance, Hobbididance
Frateretto	Morris-dancers
Haberdicut	Obidicut

(Trayford's devil)	Smolkin	Smolkin
(Mainy's devil)	Modu	Modo
(Sara's devil)	Maho	Mahu
	Killico	Pillicock
	Purre	Pur (3.6.47)

These outrageous names could have no other source; Shakespeare borrowed them from the Declaration for use by the disguised Edgar on the heath in his last words as a demoniac:

> Five fiends have been in poor Tom at once: of lust, as Obidicut; Hobbididence, prince of dumbness; Mahu, of stealing; Modo, of murder; Flibbertigibbet, of mopping and mowing, who since possesses chamber-maids and waiting-women. (4.1.58-63)

The chamber-maids and waiting-women refer to Sara Williams, Friswood Williams, and Ann Smith, all demoniacs in Harsnett's A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures. The "mopping and mowing" of which Edgar speaks came from an identical comment by Harsnett on the performance of these women (308).

In addition to his naming of the devils, Edgar fabricates his disguise of madness with other rantings that allude to or follow the form of episodes of exorcism or dispossession. These episodes and snatches of episodes, almost like fragments of overheard conversations, do not consist of gibberish thrown together to mimic a madman's speech. Far from nonsense, these allusions may be

traced to events recounted by Harsnett that do not have significance when detached from their context. One such allusion is Edgar's mention of a fiend that "hath laid knives under his pillow, and halters in his pew" (3.4.54). These apparently random actions described as having been performed by a demon do not make much sense by themselves. But they are actually a direct reference to an episode recounted by Friswood Williams in her examination in A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures:

> This examinate further saith that one . . . Apothecarie, having brought with him from London to *Denham* on a time a new halter and two blades of knives, did leave the same upon the gallerie floare in her Maisters house. The next morning . . . a great search was made in the house to know how the said halter and knife blades came thether. . . . (368)

Another superficially obscure reference made by Edgar concerns "[a] servingman, proud in heart and mind; that curl'd my hair, wore gloves in my cap" (3.4.85). The origin of this reference is the priests' description of Richard Mainy's enactment of the seven deadly sins in the last confession of the Declaration: "*Ma:* Mainy . . . *curled his haire, and used such gestures as Ma:* Edmunds *presently affirmed that that spirit was* Pride" (410).[3] Sometimes the

---

[3] Spalding speculates about a connection between Edgar and Mainy: "nearly all of the allusions in the play refer to the performance of the youth, Richard Mainy. Even Edgar's hypothetical account of his moral failings in the past seems to have been an accurate reproduction of Mainy's conduct in some particulars, as the quotation below wil prove; [Harsnet reports from the examination of Sara Williams: 'He would needs have persuaded... extraordinary affection towards her.' Compare *King Lear* 3.4. 82-101, especially 84] and as there appears to be no necessity for these remarks of Edgar's, that it seems almost possible that there may have been some point in these passages that has since been lost. A careful search, however, has failed to disclose any reason why Mainy should be held up to

protagonists engage in discourse which follows the form of an episode of exorcism. Edgar and Lear partake together of an exchange (in 3.4) which mimics the formulae of the catechetical injunctions and confessional strategies of a Catholic exorcist.

Edgar is not the only character, however, who regularly engages in wandering or apparently obscure discourse in *King Lear.* The Fool and Cordelia -- both also tainted with madness at different times, in different ways, and for different reasons -- produce an occasional reference to an episode which can be contextualized by consulting Harsnett. The Fool laments in a song "[t]hat such a king should play bo-peep" (1.4.177). An explication of what it meant to play bo-peep may be found in an episode in which a devil hides in a girl's toenail, "[w]here hee must lye for a skout like the Sentinel in a watch, and suffer every boy to play bo-peepe with his devilship" (251). The Fool continues a few lines later, "[t]hou hast par'd thy wit o' both sides . . . . Here comes one o' the parings" (1.4.187-88). This remark to Lear draws from the same episode of the toenail devil. Harsnett wrote of the opportunity to "pare away the devil lying in the dead of the nayle" (251). Just as the Fool's discourse draws occasionally from Harsnett, so Cordelia makes one utterance which may be traced to the Declaration. Her cry of "poor perdu!" (4.7.34) may have been inspired by this exposed sentinel described by Harsnett (251). The tainting of the rhetoric of these characters

---

obloquy; and the passages in question were evidently not the result of a direct reference to the 'Declaration.' After his (Mainy's) examination by Harsnet in 1602 nothing more is heard of him; so the references to him must be accidental merely" (Spalding 71).

-- the ones who are supposed to be less prominent and less mad -- by allusions to exorcist episodes contaminates them with the madness of the major characters. This madness, again conceived in demonic terms, spreads like a legion of demons to anyone with whom the protagonists have contact.

A reversal of this contamination process occurs with yet another appropriation technique of Shakespeare: the use of demonic animals, mentioned by Harsnett, with which Shakespeare surrounded his mad protagonists. The contamination or transmittal of madness occurs in reverse order because, with this technique, Shakespeare uses animals embodying demons to incite his protagonists to a heightened madness. In this case, they did not impart their madness to those surrounding them; instead, they absorbed more madness from the surrounding animals. Lear's mouse originated with a mouse-devil in a passage of Harsnett's Declaration (255), which is reminiscent of the herd of pigs episode in which Jesus cast a legion of demons out of a man and into the swine (Luke 8:26-39). The appearance of a demon-associated mouse in *King Lear* suggests an upside-down world in which animals as well as persons have succumbed to a madness that simulates demonic possession.
Another possessed animal appearing in both the treatise and the play is the horse. One confession by the supposed demoniac Richard Mainy contains the gentleman's recollection of his supposedly demonic horse: "it was given forth . . . that the horse I rid upon was a devil, and that I had devils attending upon me in liverie coates" (400). Shakespeare appropriates this demonic animal by giving to his character Edgar a "[b]ay trotting-horse" that rides over "four-inch'd

bridges" (3.4.56-57). He also borrowed from Harsnett the demon dogs which Poor Tom tries to drive away with a rhyming spell. In using demonic animals to create an upside-down world of madness, Shakespeare of course plays upon the facile transition from demonic bestiality to demonic personality. By having a woman character such as Goneril make the animal (and for Elizabethans, diabolical) noise "mew!" (4.2.68) within the context he had established of demonic bestiality, Shakespeare associates her with possession -- and thus, also with madness.

Women were further associated with possession and madness through another, different appropriation technique of Shakespeare: he added from the Harsnett material new sexual metaphors to his already ample repertoire. The priests whom Harsnett denounced had hunted devils in possessed women's bodies (261), and the exorcists had told Sara Williams that her first menstruation was diabolic because a devil inhabited her vagina (297, 350, 357). This horrifying treatment of women by the exorcists afforded a rich, sexually charged language for Lear in the mad scene:

> Beneath is all the fiends': there's hell, there's darkness,
> There is the sulphurous pit, burning, scalding,
> Stench, consumption. (4.6.127-29)

Lear is raving about his daughters Regan and Goneril here, for only in the body of a woman is found this "bottomlesse pit of hell" (250). With exorcist terminology, Harsnett offered to Shakespeare an unsurpassed technique for linking femininity and feminine sexuality with madness and evil.

Descriptions by protagonists of their own madness in terms of demonic possession, internal stage directions designed to typify the symptoms of possession, introductions of specific devils' names, mad rantings of major characters which allude to or follow the form of episodes of exorcism, allusions to exorcist episodes in the speeches of lesser characters, the use of demonic animals, and the acquisition of new sexual metaphors: these are the methods of appropriation which Shakespeare followed in his use of Harsnett's material. Other tendencies which may be traced in his patterns of appropriation either are specific to this play only or are not tied to the demonology subject matter.

The tendency of Shakespeare to appropriate material from other writers was not limited to treatises on demonology and exorcism. He borrowed plot conventions and physical details for certain scenes from many different authors whose works stirred his imagination. In this sense some of his appropriations from the demonology material were similar to other borrowings from other texts. The scholar seeking connections between Shakespeare's plays and treatises on exorcism should be careful not to overemphasize or misinterpret the significance of appropriations which would fall into the more common categories of details for scenery and properties or details of certain characters' personalities. For example, in *King Lear* Shakespeare drew upon Harsnett's Declaration for physical scenery and properties such as the hovel on the heath, Kent's stocks, or the chair and joint-stool in the mock trial. He fashioned the characters of the Fool, Lear, and Edgar, using details

collected from Harsnettian adjectives and anecdotes. In these cases he used Harsnett as a source for material in much the same way that he might have used any other historical document or chronicle.

Shakespeare also took from Harsnett's recurrent storm imagery the idea for the symbolic dramatic event of the storm. This appropriation does bear an association with demonology, however, because Shakespeare infused the storm with all the dramatic tension of the spectacle of an exorcism. Because Harsnett described an exorcism as a storm, Shakespeare inverted the relationship to invoke the possibility that his storm could be viewed as an exorcism.

But in other instances, the appropriations were not meant to allude to demonology. For example, Shakespeare sometimes borrowed from Harsnett outlandish or exotic words which he valued for their shock potential anywhere he chose to use them, even outside of their Harsnettian context. He simply liked the way words like "conspirants" (218), "auricular" (209), "apish" (229), "gaster" (307), and "asquint" (277) sounded. It is clear that Shakespeare acquired some fresh words for his vocabulary from Harsnett because as Brownlow notices, some Harsnettian words appear in *King Lear* as words which Shakespeare had never used before in his other writings. The same is true, inevitably, for figurative expressions; Shakespeare placed Harsnettian expressions in the mouths of characters to describe things totally unrelated to any subjects in Harsnett's text. Shakespeare evidently just liked the way these expressions sounded and pirated them without any intention of denoting demonic connections. This borrowing occurs with phrases

like "pendulous air" (3.4.66) and "belly-pinched wolf" (3.1.13) in the speeches of Lear and the gentleman. Although these phrases originated with Harsnett, they were not meant to signify anything demonic.

Most Shakespearean appropriations from Harsnett were deliberate references to relevant demonology material, however. As an Anglican ecclesiastical governing authority, Harsnett did not believe in the authenticity of the exorcisms because to do so would have been to acknowledge that some forces in the world were ungovernable. Shakespeare appropriated both Harsnett's explicit language and his implicit fear confronting the exorcisms for precisely this reason: to create a world out of control, an atmosphere of madness for *King Lear.* These appropriations, once again, fall into the seven categories of descriptions by protagonists of their own madness in terms of demonic possession, internal stage directions designed to typify the symptoms of possession, introductions of specific devils' names, mad rantings of major characters which allude to or follow the form of episodes of exorcism, allusions to exorcist episodes in the speeches of lesser characters, the use of demonic animals, and the acquisition of new sexual metaphors. This set of general categories of appropriation techniques is a transferable tool which can be used in the future to assess possible appropriations by Shakespeare from this and other treatises for his other plays.

Part One: Models of Madness (Historicity of Texts)
II. Intertextuality:
The Devil, the Enchanter and
The Madness Pursuing Don Quixote

In the trajectory of his history, Don Quixote is always conscious that something or someone pursues him. At the beginning his perception is limited to the basic idea that someone, his enemy, attacks him and follows him wherever he goes. This perception disturbs him and robs him of his tranquility. But who is it? And why? Did Cervantes leave for his readers implicit clues as to the identity of this pursuer, with the purpose of guiding them through the laberinth of his fiction?

I will establish a relationship among the "lucid intervals" of Don Quixote, his constant sense that someone is pursuing him, and the use of "diablo," the word for devil, in *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de La Mancha*. Don Quixote, the victim, always complains of a presence that torments him. But who performs the other role in this pursuit? Before seeking an answer, first let us examine other texts written during the same epoch, but from an opposite perspective -- that of the pursuer. Let us explore the intertextuality among these books.

The first and most significant text, written by Benito Remigio Noydens, is an ecclesiastical manual, <u>Practica de exorcistas y ministros de la Iglesia. En que con mucha erudicion, y singular claridad, se trata de la instruccion de los Exorcismos para lançar, y ahuyentar los demonios, y curar espiritualmente todo genero de</u>

maleficio, y hechizos (1660). The pursuers here, the exorcists, form one of the four minor orders of the Catholic Church. Within this text, the pursued entity is, of course, the demon. But the demoniac is pursued also, as is proven by the fact that the exorcists -- powerful officials of the Church -- utilized violent and painful rites during their ceremonies.

The Satan of this Catholic doctrine of exorcism would be an implicit identity for the "sabio encantador" ("wise enchanter") that pursues Don Quixote. During the Spanish Golden Age, many priests called any lunatic "possessed." The method for curing a possessed person of his or her illness was exorcism. According to the exorcist, the possession of the soul of a person by a demon manifested itself by certain symptoms, among which the feeling of being pursued was especially significant. The possessed person always tried to escape from the demon who would return to attack him.

The connection between the madness of Don Quixote and the concept of possession in the Golden Age would be established with more difficulty if Cervantes had not left for us some clues that he himself saw the phenomenon of possession as a model which could help him in creating the manifestations of Don Quixote's madness. Michael Hasbrouck has mentioned Cervantes' allusions to general exorcist formulas, Biblical episodes, and diabolical places and objects -- for example, the carriage of the Courts of Death in the second part of the *Quijote*. He has also made reference to contemporaneous ecclesiastical treatises (all written in Latin,

which Cervantes could not read with facility[1]), like the Malleus maleficarum, the Rituale Romanium and the Manuale exorcismorum, as what I would call artifacts from the socio-historical epoch in which Cervantes was writing. According to Hasbrouck, Don Quixote experiences a slow process of successful exorcism, at the end of which he feels liberated because God has won the battle for his soul. I do not concur with this interpretation of grand schemes and supernatural forces, but I do believe that Cervantes utilizes the model of diabolical possession to lend verosimilitude to Don Quixote's madness. The following is an attempt to explore the intertextuality between the *Quijote* and contemporaneous exorcist manuals like the one by Remigio Noydens.

When a soul is inhabited by a demon, the victim's comportment changes in a drastic manner: he speaks with the voice of the devil and, at times, assumes another personality distinct from his own. The treatise-writer Remigio Noydens signals potential occurrences that cause suspicion of demonic possession: "mudança repentina de vida, como aver sido hombre agradable, y ser aora agreste, y furiolo" (16). Don Quixote, in his transformation from poor *hidalgo* to knight errant, would be the classic example of a person who experiences a "mudança repentina de vida." According to Remigio Noydens, the demoniac also experiences "un desaslossiego extraordinario, de manera, que el enfermo no puede estar quieto, busca lugares lobregos, y apartados" (17). Don Quixote exemplifies this behavior when he decides to isolate himself in the Sierra Morena to practice

---

[1] According to Luisa López-Grigera, personal interview, 2 April 1994.

penitence (I, 299).[2] Sancho, who does not like this idea very much, complains that this awful place is like purgatory; it is significant that Don Quixote responds, "[m]ejor hicieras de llamarle infierno, y aún peor, si hay cosa que los sea" (I, 310). The reaction of Sancho is immediate, and it even appears partially in Latin; it is the Church's pronouncement over the souls of the dead: *"[q]uien ha infierno . . . nula es retencio*, según he oído decir" (I, 310). This formula sparks Don Quixote's interest, and he asks what it means. In a very significant reply, Sancho says, *"[r]etencio* es . . . que quien está en el infierno nunca sale dél, ni puede. Lo cual será al revés en vuestra merced" (I, 310).

What is the meaning of this last strange sentence? In the Sierra Morena, Don Quixote almost seems simultaneously to play both the roles of the exorcist and the exorcised. Sancho hints at Don Quixote's awareness of his infirmity when he allows, "[d]igo que de verdad es vuestra merced el mesmo diablo, y que no hay cosa que no sepa" (I, 315). This dual role of exorcist/exorcized appears with some frequency in contemporaneous treatises: "[h]ay otros conjuradores singulares para conjurar a los endemoniados, y aun algunas veces son los mesmos sobredichos, y tienen para esto otras maneras diabólicas" (Castañega 123). The dual role always appears in connection with penitence, as when the exorcist fasts with the demoniac or prays with him late into the night.

Penitence carries great significance in several of these texts. Remigio Noydens cites the gospel of Matthew (chapter 17)

---

[2] All quotations from the *Quijote* follow the edition of Luis Andrés Murillo.

concerning the relationship between penitence and demonic possession: "este genero de demonio no se lança, sino por medio de la oracion, y ayuno" (5). According to the manual, the exorcist "tendrá particular cuydado de . . . no llegar a hazer los *Exorcismos* sin averse prevenido con el ayuno, ò otras obras de satisfacion, y penitencia" (5-6) because "estos requisitos de la Oracion, y ayuno conducen grandemente para la expulsion a todo genero de demonio" (49).

But we observe how penitence has failed in these texts. For both Cervantes and Remigio Noydens, a more rigorous process is required to cure the pursued individual. During the epoch of Cervantes and these church authorities, exorcism was conceived in terms of a battle. And what is his history, from the perspective of Don Quixote, except a series of battles? Germinating during the same cultural *milieu*, this treatise begins with a Latin citation from the *Aeneid* of Virgil which, translated, reads: "I sing of the arms and the man" (Remigio Noydens 1). It may seem strange to cite this pagan verse at the beginning of an ecclesiastical treatise. He continues the metaphor with the phrases "sangrienta batalla" and "lid, y contienda." The author refers to Saint Paul in another extension of the military analogy: "Es la guerra en lo espiritual, y contra enemigos mas poderosos" (Remigio Noydens 2). He then describes how "los Ministros de la Iglesia han de sacar las armas de su armeria" (119):

> los Ministros de la Iglesia, a quien toca de oficio tomar las armas, para rendir, y vencerlos: y como no han de guerrear con armas de fuego, y sangre, sino con las de la

> Iglesia, las han de sacar de su armeria, reconociendo con humildad su flaqueza. . . .
>
> La primera, y principal armadura, de que se ha de armar el Exorcista, es una viva, é indubitable fé, y confiança en Dios . . . y pisar, no solamente al Leon mas bravo sino tambien al Dragon, aunque venga del Infierno. (Remigio Noydens 2)

The intertextuality among the exorcist manuals and the *Quijote* becomes more explicable when we realize that the faith of Don Quixote in his chivalric mission becomes almost a religion. The battle against a lion (II, 161) is highlighted as a significant event when Don Quixote acquires another knightly name, "el Caballero de los Leones." It is no accident that the devil is compared to a roaring lion in the Bible (2 Timothy 4:17). In a similar manner, the author of this ecclesiastical treatise cites Saint Bernard to compose a catalog of names of the enemy demons, including the terms "Bestia fiera," "Dragon infernal," "ladron," and "robador." The author writes here in all seriousness; he alludes in another place to a specific demon in the form of an "espantoso Dragon, que se hundiò en el mar Bermexo" (53). In addition to the adventure of the lion, Don Quixote encounters the majority of these figures in the trajectory of his journeys, while the church authority explains that the exorcist "se arma para la pelea espiritual" (81) with a "cuchillo . . . riguroso" (83) against the "enemigo . . . de Dios" (142). Remigio Noydens writes warnings for the exorcist with the purpose of helping him to "alcança mas presto la victoria" (3) over the "comun enemigo" (184). He explains to the exorcists "con què confiança pueden pelear con el demonio" (21): "debe el Exorcista no desmayar, y no mostrar

señales de desconfiança en su contienda" (47). An exorcism which is considered to be successful is called a "conquista" (22), and the question of honor presents itself here in an almost chivalric metaphor. The purpose of the exorcist is that the victim "cobra tanto animo para resistir a sus enemigos, que no podràn dél llevar triunfo, ni honra ninguna" (Remigio Noydens 82). The theme of chivalric honor recurs in this treatise in a manner that could well be applied to the attitudes of the demon that possesses Don Quixote: "[q]ue el demonio dessee estar en los cuerpos humanos . . . bien se entiende, pues es tanta su codicia de tener honra . . . de ser revenrenciado, y temido" (99). The demon inspires Don Quixote to seek honor time and time again within the context of his chivalric fantasy.

Timothy Mitchell offers us the best explanation for what is happening here: "Spanish history offers repeated and instructive examples of the way in which consciousness of victimization reinforces a militant brand of Christianity" (62). Beginning with this generalization and inverting it, would it not be logical to conclude that the militant genres of Christianity usually originate with an awareness of victimization? The militant and chivalric Christian is a stereotype of which Don Quixote partakes with his sensibility of victimization by a demon.

To explore the birth of this sensibility, we shall now scrutinize every quixotic adventure which bears as a preface or epilogue a commentary by Sancho which alludes to the devil. The problematic aspect of this type of investigation is that the word

"diablo" also entered into many proverbial phrases in the Spain of Cervantes. I have resolved this problem by consulting the exhaustive linguistic catalog or "Indice analítico" of José Bergúa which consists of "Exclamaciones," "Insultos," "Maldiciones y parabienes," etc., that form part of the characteristic dialogue of the fictional voices. After consulting the work of Bergúa, I have excluded from my study examples of the occurrence of the word "diablo," which Bergúa includes in his list of common proverbial phrases. I have also excluded the examples which, although not included in Bergúa's study, are obviously nothing more than the rustic language of Sancho the *campesino*. Frequently the examples of this type are constructed with "el diablo" after a form of "dar a," "llevar a," or another similar verb, as in: "[q]ué dé al diablo vuestra merced tales juramentos, señor mío -- replicó Sancho -- que son muy en daño de la salud y muy en perjuicio de la conciencia. . . . Mire vuestra merced bien . . ." (I, 151). Another vituperation of Sancho illustrates the same phenomenon: "¿Qué diablos de venganza hemos de tomar -- respondió Sancho -- si éstos son más de veinte, y nosotros no más de dos, y aun quizá nosotros sino uno y medio?" (I, 191). These examples occur when Sancho or another character feels frustrated, and the word "diablo" is the strongest way he knows to express himself.

The first *pertinent* occurrence of the word appears in the mouth of Sancho immediately after he is introduced in the history. Sancho warns Don Quixote, "Mire que digo que mire bien lo que hace, no sea el diablo que le engañe" (I,133). It is interesting to note here that just prior to these words of Sancho, Don Quixote, like a

demoniac, has attacked something sacred -- something related to the Church; he has charged against the Benedictine priests in the company of travellers, but not against any other members of the party. Hasbrouck makes a meaningful observation on this point: "el héroe ataca a los frailes, que simbolizan lo religioso, y no a los que van a caballo, que debieran haberle recordado más a los caballeros andantes" (121). Another factor here might just be that the *frailes*, who are mounted on mules, seem easier targets for the fury of the knight errant. But even this detail would not explain why he became so upset in the presence of something sacred. The situation becomes more complicated when Don Quixote imagines that the *frailes* and the carriage are enchanters with captive princesses and demands the release of the "prisoners" immediately; he even addresses the supposed enchanters as "[g]ente endiablada"(I, 134). Psychoanalysts would say that his fantasy is a projection of his own captivity. The women of the company, in turn, flee from him, "haciéndose más cruces que si llevaran al diablo a las espaldas" (I, 135). In his theory of persecution texts, Girard proposes what Mitchell calls "mimetic rivalry, and the mimetic propagation of hostilities and hallucinations during times of crisis" (Mitchell 68). I believe the visions or hallucinations of Don Quixote are also explicable as demonic apparitions. As the cleric Remigio Noydens describes,

> Algunas vezes suelen los demonios, saliendo de los cuerpos de los Energumenos, mostrarse, y aparecer en figura espantosa de varios animales, y otras cosas terribles, aunque no sean vistos de los circunstantes . . . estas apariciones pueden ser solamente imaginarias, por mover el demonio la sangre, y los humores del hombre, y

> formar alguna imagen, que le representa, y esta por ser vision imaginaria, solo aparece a quien se haze la vision . . .
>
> [A]unque no fuessen semejantes apariciones meramente imaginarias, bien se compadece, que pueden aparecer visiblemente en cuerpos formados, porque los Angeles, assi buenos, como malos, tienen tanta potestad sobre los cuerpos, que toman . . . [imágenes] sobre sus cuerpos proprios. (71-72)

These diabolical hallucinations can take various forms because "suelen los demonios antes de entrar en cuerpo de algun hombre, aparecersele en horrible, y espantosa forma, y esto de noche, ò en lugares lobregos, y obscuros. . . . Otras vezes entran en forma de ayre, de raton, y de otros animalejos" (Remigio Noydens 9). A common argument invoked by the treatise writers was that the devil had taken the form of a snake in the Garden of Eden and thus could take any shape he chose. One episode with "animalejos" precipitates the next occurrence of the word "diablo" in the *Quijote*. Sancho reacts to the plan Don Quixote unfolds to avenge himself against *los arrieros*, who have beaten his horse Rocinante after the latter's attempt to play with the mares. Sancho remembers this adventure of *las yeguas* and expresses his fear of experiencing another similar adventure in the future: "[a]un ahí sería el diablo -- dijo Sancho" (I,197). Remigio Noydens offers us one explanation of the episode with the mares which corresponds to the opinion of Sancho: "el demonio tal vez entra en los cuerpos de los animales brutos . . . no . . . para atormentar a ellos, sino para hazer daño al hombre en sus bienes, y haziendas, ò para engañarle, y armarle algun peligro, como le armó a nuestras primeros Padres en la Serpiente"

(103-104). Later Remigio Noydens provides an example of a demon that entered a *papagayo* -- not an animal, but a vegetable -- for the purpose of deceiving one of the popes. Perhaps Cervantes parodies this type of superstitious episode with the adventures of Sancho with *las yeguas* and, again, with the herd of six hundred pigs (II, 553). Incidentally, Hasbrouck makes an unsatisfactory attempt to relate this latter episode to the Biblical account of the demoniac in Luke 8:27-33. Be that as it may, according to Del Río and others, devils may also appear in the shapes of military armies. This detail would explain why Don Quixote imagines that flocks of animals turn into armies that he must fight.

Many of the comical-mysterious adventures could be explained with the intervention of poltergeists (*los duendes*), the demons who specialize in practical jokes. Given the superstitious agrarian atmosphere, Don Quixote undoubtedly believes in the possibility of intervention by one of these tricksters. One text which formed part of Don Quixote's library was the Jardín de flores curiosas (Salamanca, 1570) of Antonio de Torquemada. This book contains descriptions of the poltergeists in Salamanca. Remigio Noydens describes these notorious demons: "[l]a experiencia enseña, que ay otros demonios, que sin espantar, ni fatigar a los hombres (porque Dios no se lo permite, ni les da mano para ello) son caseros, familiares, y tratables, ocupandose en jugar con las personas, y hazerles burlas ridiculas. A estos llamamos comunmente trasgos, ò duendes" (254).

The question here is, does it matter or not whether Don Quixote and Sancho interpret any given situation by viewing it

through the lens of belief in the supernatural? Sancho does not understand what has happened with the adventure in the inn with Maritornes, and thus he arrives at an imprecise conclusion. He reflects upon the adventure that same night, a little later: "¿[q]ué tengo de dormir, pesia a mí -- respondió Sancho, lleno de pesadumbre y de despecho --, que no parece sino que todos los diablos han andado conmigo esta noche?" (I, 207). Sancho's question does not appear strange to us when we consider that the treatise of Remigio Noydens contains a reference to a demon who "se manifestò en forma humana, vestido de rustico" (256). The peasant atmosphere of the *Quijote* is conducive to belief systems containing these apparitions of figures from superstitious folklore. Sancho later begins to realize that the tormenting demons seem to gravitate toward his master and says of Don Quixote, "Dios le saque desta tormenta" (I, 574). When more misadventures mount up in the second part of the *Quijote*, Sancho blames the demons: "¡[e]l diablo, el diablo me ha metido en esto; que otro no!" (II, 106).

In reference to the inn, when Don Quixote and Sancho leave each inn and go to the next resting place, the language describing their departure resembles the words treatise writers used to explain how a legion of demons departs: "señálanle día de su salida, y toma el demonio plazo de cuándo saldrá él y cuantos están con él, *y dejarán libre la posada*" (Castañega 125, emphasis mine). The inns take on added significance when we realize that several important fragments of potential intertextuality occur inside or around them. When Don Quixote is watching his arms at the inn in his all-night vigil, he resembles the conjurors who "[h]acen unos cercos en tierra

con ciertas señales y letras dentro repetidas en cierta manera, y hacen al endemoniado hincar las rodillas dentro de aquel cerco; y luego que le dice el conjurador ciertas palabras, pierden el sentido, y viene a hacer gestos espantosos y gritar muy reciamente, e decir palabras desvariadas e muchas veces en infamia de los presentes" (Castañega 123). We recall that Don Quixote fits this description of the demoniac when he harms the innkeeper's servant while guarding his arms. He seeks justification for the incident in the chivalric code he follows as a knight-errant who must guard his arms before being officially knighted, but even the knighting ceremony resembles certain rites of the exorcists.

In another instance, Don Quixote, in the process of realizing who could be his pursuer, once again seeks and finds an equivocal answer in his books of chivalry. These books contain the deeds of the famous enchanters of the chivalric myths. Once again associating his experiences with his readings, the knight errant tries to explain the phenomenon of feeling pursued by means of the intervention of an enchanter, whom he names Frestón (I, 130). His hypothesis of enchantment is understandable when we read the following uses of the word for "enchanter" in the exorcist manual of Remigio Noydens:

> [N]o se vale el Exorcista de la industria de otros demonios . . . como lo hazen los encantadores. (Remigio Noydens 45)

> [L]os que están enfermos por . . . encantos del demonio. (Remigio Noydens 89)

> Suele el demonio, quando le aprietan con los Exorcismos, dezir, que no puede salir del Energumeno, por estar en él ligado por los conjuros de algun encantado. (Remigio Noydens 246)

But when Don Quixote invents a specific action for Frestón, this action is presented with dramatic irony: Don Quixote believes that the enchanter has robbed him of his library, but the readers know that the books have been lost in a bonfire lit by his own friends. The insinuation is that Frestón is not the proper identification for the enchanter. This is not his correct name, just as this was not an action of his. But a splendid piece of demon lore explains Don Quixote's attempt to seek a name for his enchanter: "[k]nowledge of a devil's name was considered to give the exorcist, by a primitive animistic theory, control over him" (Robbins 128).

Strangely enough, his stolen library may actually have been the source of Don Quixote's woes. It was common knowledge during the Golden Age that some demoniacs had called their affliction upon themselves by reading aloud from conjuring books. In these diabolical conjurations, prayers intermingled with superstitious formulae until the average listener could not tell the difference. One man processed by the Inquisition in Deza, Román Ramírez, recited entire books from memory (Menéndez Pelayo 377). Perhaps Don Quixote's books which were burned by his friends did contain devilish material, by means of which he might have invoked evil spirits unintentionally. The *cura* swears in reference to the books, "[e]ncomendados a Satanás y a Barrabás sean tales libros" (I, 107) and later speaks of "las endiabladas y revueltas razones" they

contain (I, 112). The Indice expurgatorio totally prohibited "los libros, cédulas, memoriales, recetas o nóminas, ensalmos y supersticiones" (Menéndez Pelayo 375). On 10 December 1564, an offender was punished by the Inquisition for using a conjuring book. Continental demonologists were aware of the dangers their investigations posed for their own safety; there was always the possibility that they might call up a demon without intending to. Scot reports that Bodin was worried about these occupational hazards: "[a]nd yet *J. Bodin* confesseth, that he is afraid to read such conjurations as *John Wierus* reciteth, least (belike) the divell would come up, and scratch him with his fowle long nailes" (Scot 443).

As every reader knows, Don Quixote's mind is a mass of intertextual confusion. He mixes together fragments of texts he has read, including the *libros de caballerías*. At least one of these chivalric romances, that of Jorge de Montemayor, was placed on the prohibition list of 17 August 1559 "en lo que toca a devoción y cosas cristianas" (Olmos García 55). How do we know that Don Quixote did not poison his brain with magical formulae as well? This theory is supported by the fact that the bonfire of his library is a parody of the Inquisitorial *auto de fe*. Books were burned by the Inquisition because of heretical content. Don Quixote's niece confirms that their content must be heretical when she brings hyssop and holy water to the barber and the priest, asking them to bless the room of the library so that a demon (invoked by the books to be burned) will not come back to haunt her: "[t]ome vuestra merced . . . rocíe este aposento, no esté algún encantador de los muchos que tienen estos

libros, y nos encanten, en pena de las que les queremos dar echándolos del mundo" (I, 109). If we were not convinced of Cervantes's orthodoxy, we might assume that he is trying to tell us (without mentioning titles and thus jeopardizing himself by revealing his familiarity with such books) that there is something grossly heretical about Don Quixote's books which are burned. The state of possession -- resulting from reciting from conjuring books -- matches his confused state exactly; and identically, the texts are to blame.

But Don Quixote owns so much power to fictionalize his life, that in one sense at least, his beliefs convert themselves into realities. In this manner we can say that it is not so important to determine whether Don Quixote is possessed by a demon; instead, we must discover whether he believes himself to be possessed in this way. But how can we investigate the protagonist's self-concept? One way would be to study the words spoken by the narrative voice. All the examples already cited of the use of the word "diablo" have come from the mouth of Sancho or from some of the minor characters. But suddenly the narrator begins to use the word as well, in a literary technique which usually signals an emphasis which the author intends to give a word or phrase: "[o]rdenó, pues, la suerte, y el diablo, que no todas veces duerme, que andaban por aquel valle paciendo una manada de hacas . . ." (I, 191). The axiom from which the narrator derives this variation says that the devil never sleeps. Later Sancho creates another variation of the same axiom when he refers to the "diablo, que no duerme y que todo lo añasca" (I, 243). But aside from the obvious humor of the

variations, the narrator insinuates here that the devil who pursues Don Quixote *does* sleep sometimes and leaves him to enjoy his "lucid intervals." A possessed person could appear crazy at some moments and normal enough at others, like Don Quixote in his "lúcidos intervalos." If we did not take into account these lucid intervals, the words of the wise fool, Don Quixote, would make us think that he did not believe himself bedeviled.

Remigio Noydens warns us of the same potential mistake:

> se advierte que tal vez suele dissimular, de que no està en el cuerpo del Energumeno, pues aunque el Sacerdote le exorcize, no responde, ni tiembla . . . el principal motivo deste dissimulo, es querer librarse entonces del Exorcismo, y también para mostrarse valiente, y dar a entender, que el Exorcista no tiene que esperar en esta espiritual contienda, victoria . . . suelen tener allà dentro su razonamiento con el Energumeno, sin querer que los manifieste en publico. (66-67)

The madness of Don Quixote has been described by Otis Green, among others, as a mixture of "moments of excitement -- with their outpouring of gall and the resulting exaltation of the imagination -- and his moments of relative quiet (as at the goatherds' campfire) which make possible his intervals of lucidity" (190). Carroll B. Johnson clarifies this form of madness somewhat by his assessment that "the mentality of the psychotic includes the essential qualities of normal thinking" (12). But no one has explained satisfactorily just exactly *what* catalyzes the transition of Don Quixote from one mental state to another in each isolated occasion. One of the lucid intervals occurs with the shepherds in the pastoral landscape. If we

accept the Golden Age commonplace that musical instruments chase away demons, then the lucid interval which enables Don Quixote to deliver his "armas y letras" speech is explicable. One treatise-writer illuminates this commonplace in reference to "Saúl, delante quien solía David mancebo tañer la vihuela, porque más ligeramente pasase y olvidase el tormento del demonio" (Castañega 140).
Again and again in the *Quijote* the narrator comments that none of his observers can believe that the knight errant of the lucid intervals is the same crazy old man who sallies forth in search of adventures. It could be said that he assumes another personality every time when, in a rare moment, he speaks with lucidity and wisdom. In this sense the wise fool greatly resembles the demoniacs of the Golden Age. It is astonishing that, some years later, the author of an ecclesiastical treatise uses the same phrase which has been used for many years of literary criticism to describe Don Quixote. Remigio Noydens uses the exact phrase "luzidos intervalos"! In his words, "para esto mandará el Exorcista al demonio, que no le ponga obstaculo, y que le dexe con sus luzidos intervalos" (Remigio Noydens 74). Castañega, an earlier *tratadista*, recorded the belief that in the case of a demoniac, "algunas veces le venían algunos intérvalos y espacios breves de alguna devoción, que poco duraban, y en tal tiempo de aquella devoción (que era espíritu de Dios) profetizó y anduvo elevado en espíritu entre los profetas, y no cuando el demonio lo atormentaba" (Castañega 143). And even if we interpret these lucid intervals as periods when the demon has gone out of the body of Don Quixote, he does not remain free from danger. The demon, according to Remigio Noydens, "aunque no estè

dentro del cuerpo, le assiste a la persona, y con sus persuasivas, y perjudiciales consejos, le suele causar grandes peligros" (282).

We observe one of these dangers the next time the narrator uses the word for devil, during the adventure of the encounter with the priests (notice: another encounter with the sacred) who accompanying the dead body on the litter: " . . . don Quijote los apaleó a todos y les hizo dejar el sitio, mal de su grado, porque todos pensaron que aquél no era hombre, sino diablo del infierno que les salía a quitar el cuerpo muerto que en la litera llevaban" (I, 232). In this manner the narrator suggests, by means of the perspective of other characters within the history, a connection between Don Quixote and the devil. This connection may be illuminated by means of another psychoanalytical projection; we have already seen several instances of the tendency of Don Quixote to project onto other characters his own sentiments, but from this point on, we see that they project theirs onto him. We will see how they begin to isolate and polarize him. They begin to call him "el diablo." The priest, as a spiritual man, conceives the idea that the devil comes at times to attack or possess Don Quixote: "determinaba de no pasar adelante, aunque a don Quijote se le llevase el diablo" (I, 328). And the innkeeper, with only the benefit of a rustic knowledge of popular religion, also recognizes the possiblity that Don Quixote is possessed when he refers to "don Quijote, o don diablo" (I, 438) with a manifestation of equivalence.

One explanation for this marginalization -- even persecution -- of Don Quixote as a malevolent force would be his physical aspect, which contains indicatory signs of demonic possesion.

As Remigio Noydens clarifies, "[e]s pues señal conocida, que uno està hechizado, quando al enfermo se le ha trocado el color natural en pardo, y color de cedro, y tiene los ojos apretados, los humores secos, y al parecer todos sus miembros ligados" (90). Much has been written about the dry humours of Don Quixote. And the old *hidalgo* is so sick at several points in the history that he cannot rise out of bed. Remigio Noydens refers to the demoniac as a sick person (169), and the symptoms of this sickness conform to those which Don Quixote manifests: "[s]uele el demonio en tiempo de los Exorcismos causar en el Energumeno algunos accidentes; de suerte, que parece, que le maltrata, y que le aflige con una inflamacion, ò hinchazon en la garganta, o cabeza, &c. y es ardid suyo, para obligar al Exorcista, que no passe adelante con el conjuro" (206). Castañega also affirms that "el demonio más atormenta a quien la . . . complexión corporal le es contraria y desfavoresce" (Castañega 147). He reiterates, "muchas veces la enfermedad corporal (como la que habemos dicho) es disposición para que el demonio tenga más entrada para atormentar aquel cuerpo, así mal dispuesto y enfermo" (Castañega 146).

We have already analyzed the words of Sancho, the narrator, and other characters surrounding Don Quixote to search for points of contact with exorcist manuals and ecclesiastical treatises. But the primary source of evidence that will demonstrate this intertextuality will be the words of the knight errant himself. As the end of the first part of his history draws near, Don Quixote begins to suspect that the devil and his demons might have been responsible: with demonic possession lies the explanation for his

adventures (or misadventures). The knight errant considers the inn, the sight of several misadventures, to be a bad place where demons live: "-- ¿[n]o os dije yo, señores, que este castillo era encantado, y que alguna región de demonios debe de habitar en él?" (I, 544). We should note that Remigio Noydens uses the word "encanto" as a synonym for possession (7). Suspicious also of the prophetic monkey of maese Pedro, Don Quixote ascertains that the animal must be "en concierto con el demonio" and warns Sancho that to the devil, the monkey "le dará su alma, que es lo que este universal enemigo pretende" (II, 237). After an argument with a goat herder, Don Quixote engages in a fist fight with him, which the goat herder wins easily. The only way Don Quixote can explain his defeat is to conclude, "[h]ermano demonio, que no es posible que dejes de serlo, pues has tenido valor y fuerzas para sujetar las mías" (I, 598). It was commonly believed in the Renaissance that demons gave to the human beings they possessed the gift of unnatural strength, and that this strength was a sign of possession. King James I of England refers to "the incredible strength of the possessed creature, which will farre exceede the strength of six of the wightest and wodest of any other men that are not so troubled" (K. James 70). Ciruelo, a Spanish treatise-writer, affirms that spirits, good and bad, are by nature superior to men, and so they possess more natural power and strength than the strongest man (267).

A little later Don Quixote realizes the import of his supernatural infirmity and gravely discusses the theme of possession. A prisoner in the cage, he believes that the priest, the barber, and the other characters are demons who are taking him

away: "son todos demonios que han tomado cuerpos fantásticos para venir a hacer esto y a ponerme en este estado" (I, 558). The following quotation from Remigio Noydens reminds us of this scene in the novel: "què harèmos con la persona endemoniada, que haze maravillas, y le haze pedazos? . . . la encierran, y si fuere menester la aten, como se suele hazer con los locos, porque no acaezca el refran comun, *un loco haze ciento*, como ha acaecido muchas vezes por curar estas enfermedades" (56). With his characteristic wisdom, Don Quixote describes to Sancho the special abilities of demons: "porque te hago saber que los diablos saben mucho . . . Y la razón es que como ellos, dondequiera que están, traen el infierno consigo, y no pueden recebir género de alivio alguno de sus tormentos . . ." (I, 558). Ultimately, Don Quixote cannot receive alleviation from his torments either. But it appears that he does complete a process through which he identifies the source of these torments: the devil is the enchanter who pursues him. This idea tortures him, and it appears that his belief in his own possession continues to grow. At the end of his life he is still fighting off demons, as on the night of San Juan in Barcelona.[3] At the party in his honor, Don Quixote tries to drive away his own evil spirits by shouting the exact words of the official exorcism ritual of the Church: *"¡[f]ugite, partes adversae!"*

I have analyzed significant occurrences of the word "diablo" and related themes in the *Quijote* to demonstrate that the devil is the presence who pursues the knight errant. Without doubt

---

[3] This festival had been celebrated by the pagans, replete with bonfires, to drive away evil spirits (Hasbrouck 126).

Cervantes saw the phenomenon of possession as a model he could utilize in the creation of the manifestations of the madness of Don Quixote. That he did so is supported by several symbolic episodes in the second part of the novel, such as the encounter with the *Cortes de la Muerte* and the descent into the Cave of Montesinos. Of the first instance, Ruth El Saffar has written that "[t]he Devil driven wagon portrays Don Quijote's state well" (95). I would suggest that a parallel situation is generated when the dukes set up, for their own entertainment, a devil figure who gives an order to disenchant Dulcinea. As for the Cave of Montesinos, Avalle-Arce believes the descent into the cave is a symbolic journey into hell. Another scholar, Henry Sullivan, offers a different interpretation of the cave episode as a descent into purgatory, but I do not agree with this allegorizing approach. Don Quixote's adventure in the cave of Montesinos could be seen in a different light if we remember that the demonologist Del Río describes treasure demons who guard their hordes in caverns. A conjuror in Spain, Marquina, was prosecuted for invoking these demons with conjuring books and speaking to them when they arrived; one of his clients was Diego de Heredia, of Bárboles, and a witness against both of them was Pedro Gonzalo de Castel (Menéndez Pelayo 375-76). The demons were supposed to aid in finding buried treasure, and when it was not uncovered, their response was, "no era cumplido el tiempo del encanto."[4] All the treasure-hunters found were coal and ashes. The phrasing of the demons' response -- typically present in all the stories told by

[4] "Proceso de D. Diego de Heredia," manuscript 85 of the National Library of Paris, the Llorente collection, quoted in Menéndez Pelayo 376.

conjurors before the Inquisition -- reminds us of the plight of Don Quixote as he tries to find his treasure, Dulcinea, whose time of enchanted is not completed either. Perhaps not incidentally, Cervantes returns to the cave metaphor in his *entremés* about the cave of Salamanca. But it is interesting that while inside the Cave of Montesinos, Don Quixote encounters two imprisoned knights who remain there under enchantment by Merlin, who even according to the *libros de caballerías*, was the son of the devil. This linkage of the chivalric romances with demonic power and occult activities provides an even firmer foundation for the theory that Don Quixote's possession derives from his reading.

There is no question that Cervantes appropriates certain details from exorcism treatises to infuse authenticity into his fiction. In the episode of Clavileño in the second part, for example (344), flying through the air is a sure sign of demonic activity. The explicit reference to Eugenio Torralba (II, 350) alludes to a spectacular rumor, a supposed demonic possession, which enjoyed tremendous popularity in Spain for a long time after it occurred, as will be explained in another section of this study.

Does Cervantes make fun of exorcism? Are the priest and the barber the parodied exorcists? It is curious that these two friends of his are the two figures in Spanish Golden Age society who were called in most frequently to deal with cases of possession. The barber performed most of the medical tasks for any given village. I think it is safe to say that Cervantes explored the territory of exorcism and possession with the purpose of giving his readers one possible explanation for the madness of his protagonist. Most

Cervantes scholars have remained satisfied with a vague generalization to the effect that

> [e]n ninguno de nuestros novelistas y dramaturgos del gran siglo puede estudiarse lo que fueron las artes mágicas tan bien como en la rica galería de las obras de Cervantes . . . No hay encantamiento, ni trasmigración, ni viaje aéreo que resista al poder de la cómica fantasía que creó la cueva de Montesinos, encantó a Dulcinea y montó a sus héroes en Clavileño. . . . (Menéndez Pelayo 390, 392)

But very few scholars, if any, are willing to read the contemporaneous treatises on the supernatural and make the specific connections which, I am confident, are there to be found. We know Cervantes was attuned to the specifics of the exorcism ritual because a *novela intercalada* of the *Persiles* (chapters 21 and 22 of the third book) is about the demonic possession and exorcism of Isabela Castrucho.

There are certainly other explanations for the madness of Don Quixote. But this one has not been studied enough.

Part One: Models of Madness (Historicity of Texts)
II. Intertextuality:
Plays of Shakespeare and Demonology Treatises

My purpose is to demonstrate and explain the intertextuality found among great works of literature about madness and persecution, and religious treatises on the same topics. As has already been explained in detail, the only lengthy and substantive precedent for this study was Kenneth Muir's analysis of *King Lear* in relation to Harsnett's A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures. Although Muir considered his list of parallels to be definitive, I believe that the play contains resonances from other treatises. But his study is so exhaustive that I have therefore not attempted to milk much additional demonic meaning from this play.

I have, moreover, tried to treat more thoroughly the few plays which have been subjected to New Historicist readings -- usually in brief notes or conference proceedings -- relating them to contemporary exorcisms. One of my original contributions is to show just how many other Shakespearean protagonists should be included in this pattern of appropriation. I argue that the specific (often previously unnoticed) appropriations which Shakespeare made from these sources probably followed some of the borrowing patterns that he tended to follow in his use of Harsnett's treatise. These patterns, once again, fall into my seven categories of descriptions by protagonists of their own madness in terms of demonic possession, internal stage directions designed to typify the symptoms of possession, introductions of specific devils' names,

mad rantings of major characters which allude to or follow the form of episodes of exorcism, allusions to exorcist episodes in the speeches of lesser characters, the use of demonic animals, and the acquisition of new sexual metaphors.

I have also tried to expand the field of treatise writers to its original proportions, not seating Harsnett at the head of the table when he was really only one of many. Although I have read many additional treatises and, I believe, discovered parallels in them also, I have limited this study for the most part to the treatises we already know Shakespeare read. In the section that follows, I have assessed Shakespeare's appropriations from key sources such as King James's Daemonologie. This text has afforded answers to some questions of Shakespearean borrowing which Reginald Scot's treatise and other contemporary sources have failed to illuminate.

But as I have progressed, I have discovered that any theories about which sources Shakespeare used for specific words or lines tend to fall apart as soon as someone discovers that the same textual fragments appear in many other discourses of the era. Therefore these same borrowing patterns I have categorized may also be used to assess possible appropriations from multiple sources, even the less famous pamphlets which may have been distributed at our equivalent of a newsstand. My methodology has thus been expansive, not restrictive. I will explain how multiple sources could have been utilized for any specific appropriation of wording or *topos*. Allow me to illustrate this method as we proceed, play by play, recording multiple-source fragments of these ongoing dialogues. First in tragedies, then history plays, and finally

romances and comedies, I shall show how Shakespeare appropriates the language of the exorcists and transforms it to foster credulity or parody, depending on which his material demands.

HAMLET

One of the plays that has not been studied sufficiently in connection with possession and exorcism is *Hamlet* (1600-1601). The half-dressed Hamlet who appears to Ophelia in her closet "[a]s if he had been loosed out of hell" (2.1.80) could be equated to the deliberate imitation of a lunatic which Don Quixote performs. They both role-play for a specific purpose on this one occasion; they themselves identify their behavior as distraction, feigned madness, or "antic disposition" (1.5.172). It should certainly not be confused with the more serious malady to which both protagonists are prone, but it is interesting for our purposes to note that Claudius's test of Hamlet to uncover fraud has been compared to the exposure of fraudulent, pretending "demoniacs" (Neely 321).

These two "melancholic" characters, Don Quixote and Hamlet, have been compared by various scholars, and I have run across an instance where King James, in his Daemonologie, describes this illness in the same words used by Spanish exorcists. These words have also used by generations of scholars describing Don Quixote: "I take it to have proceeded but of a naturall super-abundance of Melancholie . . . suppose I that it hath so viciat the imagination and memorie of some, as *per lucida interualla*, it hath so highlie occupyed them" (61). I must note that both of the two most

important sources I use in the discussion that follows were published before the play was written and thus would have been accessible to Shakespeare.

Having shown how Don Quixote's lucid intervals are signs of demonic possession, I shall try to do the same for Hamlet. He is afflicted by spiritual madness in the form of possession by a demon appearing as the ghost of his father. The attacks or onslaughts of this madness carry the young protagonist through progressive stages of possession; these stages correspond with the audience's developing awareness of his torment. As with Cervantes, instruments utilized by Shakespeare in conveying the concept of possession to his audience are the words of Hamlet himself, the words of the Ghost, the recognition by another character of Hamlet's condition, and the later awareness of Hamlet that he no longer owns his soul.

The most powerful evidence for Hamlet's demonic possession is found in the following lines:

> . . . . The spirit that I have seen
> May be a [dev'l], and the [dev'l] hath power
> T' assume a pleasing shape, yea, and perhaps,
> Out of my weakness and my melancholy,
> As he is very potent with such spirits,
> Abuses me to damn me. . . . (2.2.598-603)

One scholar has noted the implications of these lines: "Shakespeare thus could count on his audience accepting Hamlet's questioning of the genuineness of the Ghost when he reflects that the devil through him . . . [abuses him to damn him.] His temperamental disposition, which he has inadequately curbed, makes

him vulnerable to devilish influence" (Hoeniger 201). Kenneth Muir agrees that this meaning is a possibility: he says Shakespeare exploits "Hamlet's fear that the devil is making use of his melancholy to abuse him with a 'phantasticall apparition'" and that the playwright "could be implying that the devil had appeared in his father's shape" (The Sources 167, 303).

I have found several passages in contemporary discussions of demonology that I believe may be connected to Hamlet's lines (all the emphases are mine):

> Devils conversing in the earth . . . where/by he affrayeth and troubeth the bodies of men: For . . . the *abusing* of the soule. (K. James 56)
>
> But surelie it is almost incredible, how imagination shall *abuse* such as are subject unto melancholie; so as they shall beleeve they see, heare, and doo that, which never was nor shall be. (Scot 68)
>
> Hath the Devill then power to appeare to any other, except to such as are his sworne disciples: especially since al Oracles, and such like kinds of illusiones were taken awaie and abolished by the cumming of Christ? [Answer:] . . . . that these *abusing* spirites, ceases not sensine at sometimes to appeare, dailie experience teaches us . . . . This his appearing to any Christians, troubling of them outwardly, or possessing of thim constraynedly. (K. James 53)
>
> [There are] spirites, who for *abusing* the more of mankinde, takes on these sundrie shapes, and uses diverse formes of out-ward actiones. (K. James 57)

One of these shapes that devils could take on was that of a dead friend. King James I believed that, as in the case of Old

Hamlet, the devil, when appearing to men, frequently assumed the form of a person newly dead to possess the soul of one still alive (60). This was especially prone to happen in cases where the person was already melancholy, or susceptible to demonic influence: "[m]anie thorough melancholie doo imagine, that they see or heare visions, spirits, ghosts, strange noises . . ." (Scot 461). King James agrees:

> [a]nd finding them in an utter despair . . . he prepares the way by feeding them craftely in their humour, and filling them further and further with dispaire, while he finde the time proper to discover himself unto them. At which time . . . in likeness of a man, inquires of them, what troubles them : and promiseth/ them, a suddaine and certaine waie of remedie. (32-33)

And it certainly fits the Elizabethan picture that the younger, suicidal Hamlet should see a demon, for "they are oftenest seene by them that are readie to die" (Scot "A Discourse" 535). Renaissance writers explain this concept:

> these kindes of spirites, when they appeare in the shaddow of a person newlie dead ... to his friendes... When they appeare upon that occasion, they are called Wraithes in our language. Amongst the Gentiles the Devill used that much, to make them beleeve that it was some good spirite that appeared to them . . . to discover unto them, the will of the defunct, or what was the way of his slauchter, as is written in the booke of the histories Prodigious. And this way hee easelie deceived the Gentiles, because they knew not God: And to the same effect is it, that he now appeares in that maner to some ignorant Christians. (K. James 60-61)

> [The devil will appear] in the formes he will oblish him/selfe, to enter in a dead bodie, and there out of to

> give such answers, of the event of battels, of maters concerning the estate of commonwelths, and such like other great questions. (K. James 20)

> they either appeare imaginatiuely by mouing humours and blood (and thereby forme certain apparitions) or they appeare in assumpted bodies, appropriat to their intents . . . and if according to imagination, they appeare to none but to those to whom the vision appertaineth: but if in an assumed body, it is by their power, and in that sort are subiect to many mens sights. (Lodge The Divel Coniured 16-17)

According to this last belief -- that if people other than the one for whom it was intended could see the apparition, then it must be an assumed body -- then the Ghost in this play must be a spirit in an assumed body, for Horatio and Marcellus can see the Ghost as well as Hamlet. The Ghost, whose exact nature and characterization many critics have debated, has been misinterpreted many times over the years by scholars who fail to stay within period assumptions. More than one scholar has argued that the ghost is old Hamlet's "spirit in arms" (West 1107; Bullough agrees, 28). Bullough does, however, allow the door to open onto other possible interpretations: "the soldiers fear lest the Ghost may be a demon and . . . Hamlet himself doubts it for a short time" (28). Aside from the fact that anything Catholic was outlawed at this time, those who see the Ghost as the spirit of Old Hamlet coming back from the Catholic Purgatory do not seem to realize that if we follow popular belief, Old Hamlet could not use his own body anyway: "they hold, that all soules in heaven may come downe and appeare to us when they list, and assume anie bodie saving their owne" (Scot "A Discourse" 534). Besides, the

only logical identification for a place from which no traveller returns would be hell. The very concept of Purgatory requires that it be a finite experience.

The whole scene where the Ghost first appears is illuminated by period beliefs about demons and their appearances. Scholars such as Gibson have called Horatio an exorcist and cited 1.1.42, in which Marcellus calls him a scholar and urges him to speak to the Ghost: "[t]hou art a scholar; speak to it, Horatio." The word "scholar" is important because most exorcists were learned enough to know Latin. The internal stage directions tell us that the Ghost walks away -- no surprise, considering that "[n]o man is lord ouer a spirit, to reteine a spirit at his pleasure" (Scot "A Discourse" 516). It is also no surprise that the Ghost appears wearing armor, a detail which corresponds with many Biblical expressions of diabolical strength invoked by Renaissance treatise writers: "the diuell is called . . . a strong armed man . . . the most subtill, strong and mightie enimie" (Scot "A Discourse" 539). And of course, the Ghost/demon appears at night; the Elizabethan audience would expect "his nightwalkings, his visible appearings" (Scot "A Discourse" 540). It also fits the Elizabethan template for this sort of experience that Hamlet warns his friends not to hinder him. This passage, which describes an exorcism, sounds like the scene with the guards, the Ghost, and Hamlet and their various interactions:

> [i]f the spirit make anie sound of voice, or knocking, at naming of anie one, he is the cousener (the conjuror I would saie) that must have the charge of this conjuration

> or examination. And these forsooth must be the interrogatories, to wit: Whose soule ar thou? Wherefore comest thou? What wouldest thou have? . . . This must be done in the night . . . . There is no feare (they saie) that such a spirit will hurt the conjuror. . . . (Scot 434)

Of course the Ghost/demon returns to speak with Hamlet, for the possessing demon always "settes an other tryist, where they may meete againe" (K. James 33). His ultimate purpose fits neatly into the Elizabethan scheme for demonic strategies. All the treatise writers label the desire for revenge as an allurement of the devil: "[s]uch as . . . burnes in a despaire desire of revenge, hee allures them by promises, to get their turne satisfied to their hartes contentment" (K. James 32). With demoniacs, the devil specializes in "teaching them waies howe to get themselves revenged" (K. James 34).

With this and so many other crucial details of the *Hamlet* plot to be found in the exorcism material, it is no wonder that Shakespeare could most accurately create the dramatic situation he wanted through the Ghost's identity as the diabolical possessor of Hamlet's soul. He used the words of the Ghost, the recognition by another character of Hamlet's condition, and the later awareness by Hamlet of his own affliction to create a plausible model of madness.

It is the Ghost who bestows upon the audience their first revelation of the relation between Hamlet and himself. The assertion of his authority over Hamlet -- and his ability to manipulate the vulnerable young man -- takes the form of a boast of the demonic powers to which he has access:

> I could a tale unfold whose lightest word
> Would harrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood,
> Make thy two eyes like stars start from their spheres,
> Thy knotted and combined locks to part,
> And each particular hair to stand on end,
> Like quills upon the fearful porpentine. (1.5.15-20)

The words he uses appear in many treatises on exorcism to describe the appearance of demoniacs. As Hamlet's later symptoms of possession demonstrate, the Ghost is capable of engendering all these responses and more. The Ghost then shifts his attention from his own prowess to Hamlet's vulnerability for the occurrence of the phenomenon of possession. In assessing the boy's ripeness for this onslaught -- the probability that Hamlet will succumb to this attack of spiritual madness -- the Ghost attacks him forcefully, in the area where he is weakest: the memory of his father.

Another Shakespearean instrument for signalling the presence of the possession phenomenon is the description of Hamlet's demonic attacks by other characters who observe one of these occurrences. The episode in Ophelia's closet becomes more explicable in its details once we take the exorcism material into account. The exorcism manuals described demoniacs "which were bound by diuels with garters" (Scot 132). From hearsay of this incident and then from her own experience, Gertrude watches in horror as the Ghost takes over control even of Hamlet's body, not to mention his soul. Because Gertrude is the only character who directly witnesses an encounter between her son and the Ghost (even though she cannot see the Ghost), she is the most qualified to

describe the evidences of Hamlet's possession. She speaks to her son as if to inform him of the physical changes transforming his appearance. Her message sounds almost as if she thinks he may not be aware of what is happening to him:

> Forth at your eyes your spirits wildly peep,
> And as the sleeping soldiers in th' alarm,
> Your bedded hair, like life in excrements,
> Start up and stand an end. . . . (3.4.119-22)

But on the contrary, as shall be seen, Hamlet is acutely aware of the phenomenon and begins to ponder its source. Once more, she describes his physical appearance using the language of the exorcists to describe the demoniacs.

The next technique that Shakespeare uses to unveil the possession motif is the initial acknowledgement by Hamlet himself that this loss of self-control is occurring. This appropriation falls into the category of a protagonist describing his own madness. His words imply an unresisting acceptance of the new ownership and domination of his soul by the Ghost:

> Yea, from the table of my memory
> I'll wipe away all trivial fond records,
> All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past
> That youth and observation copied there,
> And thy commandment all alone shall live
> Within the book and volume of my brain,
> Unmixed with baser matter. . . . (1.5.98-104)

In almost the same breath, however, Hamlet calls his head "this distracted globe" (1.5.97) and thus signals the simultaneous

beginnings both of his displacement and his distraction. He resolves "[t]o put an antic disposition on" (1.5.172) in order to feign distraction. But the obvious stimulus for this controlled decision is the recent displacement of his will by the Ghost's -- a possession which he *cannot* control. He wonders aloud, asking who is responsible for the symptoms he feels:

> Who calls me villain, breaks my pate across,
> Plucks off my beard and blows it in my face,
> Tweaks me by the nose, gives me the lie i' th' throat
> As deep as the lungs? Who does me this?
> (2.2.572-75)

For the third time, Hamlet's appearance is described in the language of the exorcists. This last technique of Shakespeare in the diabolical progression is the dawning realization in Hamlet himself that he is the object of a supernatural pursuit. Here again, a protagonist describes his own madness in terms of demonic possession. And again, through his rumination, Hamlet admits acquiescence to the manipulations of the Ghost in his explicit description of himself in terms of possession. He identifies the diabolical source of his torment and expresses a fear of the overwhelmingly powerful supernatural force he has encountered.

Acting in conjunction with one another, these four instruments -- Hamlet's own words, the Ghost's voice, Gertrude's observations, and Hamlet's later analysis -- inject subtle and insidious suggestions of a diabolical presence into this Shakespearean play. But to clear up further doubt concerning Hamlet's madness, let us examine period concepts of melancholy, the term most often used to

describe him. How well the following describes Hamlet: "[f]or as the humor of Melancholie in the selfe is blacke, heaule and terrene, so are the symptomes thereof, in any persones that are subject thereunto, leannes, palenes, desires of solitude: and of they come to the highest degree thereof, mere folie and Manie" (K. James 30). Sound familiar so far? What most critics seem to ignore is the fact that within period assumptions melancholy was caused by demons. The devil "provoketh the merrie to loosenesse, and the sad to despaire" (Scot "A Discourse" 508). King James explains how Satan and his devils produce the symptoms we recognize: "[t]hey can make folkes to becom phrenticque or Maniacque, which likewise is very possible to their master to do, sence they are but naturall sicknesses" (K. James 47). We recognize further symptoms of Hamlet: "[t]his maketh sufferance of torments, and (as some saie) foresight of things to come . . . it maketh men subject to leanenesse, and to the quartane ague. They that are vexed therewith, are destroiers of themselves, stout to suffer injurie, fearefull to offer violence" (Scot 58). Thus we see that even if Hamlet's "only" ailment is melancholy, it is demon-inspired; and if we do not agree, King James will argue with us, leaving "the reasones refuted of all such as would call it but an imagination and Melancholique humor" (K. James 27). He defines demonic possession to be what "is thought likewise to be but verie melancholicque imaginations of simple raving creatures" (K. James 28). Shakespeare probably knew Timothy Bright's Treatise of Melancholie (1586), and it probably contributed toward his portrayal of Hamlet; but unfortunately, few scholars have bothered to look further to see what other sources

might also lie beneath the play. Bullough never mentions Daemonologie as a source for the play. Reginald Scot wrote an entire chapter entitled "Of visions, noises, apparitions, and imagined sounds, and of other illusions, of wandering soules . . .". At the very least, I think the case could be made for establishing Scot and King James as sources for *Hamlet*.

Now that I have demonstrated Shakespeare's appropriation techniques in one play not studied before in connection with exorcism, for the sake of brevity I will explore only the most important parallel references in some of his other plays. I will use the template above for the interpretations that follow.

MACBETH

W. Moelwyn Merchant, in "His Fiend-Like Queen," proposes that Lady Macbeth was actually possessed by demons. I shall modify his argument to assert that whether Shakespeare intended for his audience to believe that she (or any other protagonist, for that matter) was possessed, he appropriated exorcist terminology to depict her as mad. I will reproduce here some useful quotations from the play and connect them to the language of the exorcists.

The most obvious example of possession in the play *Macbeth* is, of course, Lady Macbeth. She specifically calls on "spirits . . . you murdering ministers" (1.5.38, 46):

> . . . . Come, you spirits,
> That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here,
> And fill me, from the crown to the toe, top-full

> Of direst cruelty! (1.5.40-43)

Lady Macbeth also asks the demons to thicken her blood, and her requests fall into the appropriation category of descriptions by protagonists of their own madness in terms of demonic possession. Critics have called this invocation "a formal stage in demonic possession -- though the implications of that statement are rarely if ever pursued. . . . [T]he impact of the demonic invocation is reduced, both in critical reading and in our experience in the theatre" (Merchant 75).

It is curious that such a key element of this character is often ignored, for the above-mentioned lines are not the only clues she gives us about her madness. Lady Macbeth's Doctor speaks lines which must fall into the appropriation category of allusions to exorcist episodes in the speeches of lesser characters:

> This disease is beyond by practice; yet I have known those which have walked in their sleep who have died holily in their beds. (5.1.55-57)

The doctor also speaks of "infected minds" (5.1.68) and confirms his diagnosis:

> More needs she the divine than the physician.
> God, God forgive us all! Look after her,
> Remove from her the means of all annoyance
> And still keep eyes upon her. . . .
> . . . .
> I think, but dare not speak. (5.1.70-75)

Two scenes later the doctor reiterates that "she is troubled with thick-coming fancies" (5.3.39). Macbeth responds by commenting on

the anguish of "a mind diseased" and asks the doctor to "[c]leanse that stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff" (5.3.42,46). A source which Shakespeare might have consulted in reference to somnambulism has often been identified as Bright's Treatise of Melancholie. But King James writes of somnambulism too: "where spirites followes upon certaine persones, and at devers houres troubles them" (K. James 57). Reginald Scot describes male somnambulists in terms that could just as easily apply to Lady Macbeth: "it is possible that the . . . midwife hath not baptised him well, but omitted some part of the sacrament . . . . [W]ho or whatsoever is newlie exorcised must be rebaptised: as also such as walke or talke in their sleepe" (Scot 442). The treatise writers repeat frequently that sleep-walking is a tell-tale sign of demonic possession.

Lady Macbeth is not the only character manifesting textbook symptoms of diabolical inhabitation. Reginald Scot writes of a witch who makes her husband believe he is mad: "she maketh him beleeve he is mad or possessed, & that he dooth he knoweth not what" (Scot 76). We should become suspicious of Macbeth himself as soon as she pours the contagious "spirits" into his ear (1.5.26). Even before she contaminates him, however, Macbeth questions his sanity in front of Banquo:

> [o]r have we eaten on the insane root
> That takes the reason prisoner? (1.3.82-84)

Macbeth's hallucination of the dagger and the episode when he sees Banquo's ghost would have registered immediately to an Elizabethan

audience as diabolical apparitions. Banquo's ghost may have been suggested by Le Loier's Treatise of Specters, the English translation of which appeared in 1605 (Muir 216). Critics have assented that "Banquo's Ghost is here certainly a devilish illusion" (Bullough 465). One treatise writer explains that if the demons chose to appear corporally, then all in the room would be able to see them in whatever shape they chose; but "if according to imagination, [then] they appeare to none but to those to whom the vision appertaineth" (Lodge The Divel Coniured 16-17). The voices Macbeth hears are also explicable after this fashion because as King James reports, the devil may appear by voice only (K. James 20). The dichotomy between Macbeth and his wife could be explained in an interesting concept of two different forms of torment from demons:

> As to the . . . two kindes, that is, either these that outwardlie troubles and followes some persones, or else inwardlie possesses them: I will conjoyne them in one, because aswel the causes ar alike in the persons that they are permitted to trouble. (K. James 62)

The contamination continues as we see further descriptions by characters of their own states of mind in terms of demonic possession. Banquo speaks here of the "instruments of darkness":

> oftentimes, to win us to our harm,
> The instruments of darkness tell us truths,
> Win us with honest trifles, to betray's
> In deepest consequence. (1.3.123-26)

There are also allusions to exorcist episodes in the speeches of lesser characters. The Porter plays at being the keeper of hell's gate soon after the murder of Duncan:

> Knock, knock. Who's there, in th' other devil's name?
> (2.3.6-11)[1]

And if we were not already certain enough about the presence of the demonic in this play, we actually have an appropriation which falls into the category of introductions of specific devils' names. The song "Black spirits" has been identified by several scholars as having its unmistakeable source in Reginald Scot. Another song in the play, "Come away", draws demons' names from Scot: Hoppo, Stadlin, Puckle, and Hellwain. Some spells of the Weïrd Sisters may have come from Reginald Scot's excerpts from old conjuring books (47-62 in the 1584 edition). Obviously, their prognostications are diabolical; official Anglican dogma proclaimed "[t]hat since all Prophecies and visiones are nowe ceased, all spirites that appeares in these formes are evill" (K. James 62). One line spoken by the Weïrd Sisters is particularly interesting because it demonstrates how Shakespeare used a contemporary leaflet Newes from Scotland (1591) or Reginald Scot's account of the same events to obtain a peculiar phrase for his witch. Several scholars have noticed the similarity between the line of the first witch "[b]ut in a sieve I'll thither sail" (1.3.8) and the wording in the leaflet: "conuayed into

---

[1] These remarks refer to Henry Garnet, who was executed for treason in the Gunpowder Plot (Kaula 84).

the middest of the sea by all these witches, sayling in their riddles or cives [sieves]" (quoted in Anders 114-15; the pamphlet is very rare). The context of the witch's line, and the immediate cause for the publication of the leaflet, was that in 1589 there was a storm which struck the fleet of Anne of Denmark, James's bride. The tempest sank a boat-load of jewels and caused a contrary wind for James's boat, but not for the ships accompanying his. This incident provoked James to write his Daemonologie.

Yet some critics continue to ignore these appropriation patterns; one erroneously generalizes, "[n]owhere in Shakespeare's Macbeth do we find our poet *closely* following Scott" (Anders 113). Another wrongly concludes, "Shakespeare is often said to have likewise turned to Scot while writing *Macbeth*, though the evidence for this is inconclusive" (Hoeniger 200). Bullough turns ineffectively to Burton (1621) to explain diabolical undertones in the play and appeals to the general cultural atmosphere that Shakespeare lived in. But I really think we can do better than this. Burton's treatise is far too late to do us any good in answering questions about Shakespeare's borrowing patterns. Refreshingly, and quite typically, Kenneth Muir is on the right track with this play as well: "James I's *Daemonologie* has clearly left its mark on all those scenes in which the Weird Sisters appear, although Shakespeare probably derived some of his information from Reginald Scot . . . [h]e would naturally have paid particular attention to his royal patron's views" (The Sources 216-17).

I will demonstrate that Shakespeare appropriated material from King James not out of deference, as Muir suggests, but out of

pragmatic audience analysis and appeal to popular beliefs. Before we move on, one final note on possession in this play: Macbeth is also epileptic, and he describes himself in a fit as "cabin'd, cribb'd, confin'd, bound in" (3.4.21). This is a classic description of a demoniac in exorcist language. It fits into the appropriation category of descriptions by protagonists of their own madness in terms of demonic possession. We will explore the consequences of this illness in the next segment on Othello, another epileptic protagonist.

OTHELLO

When we read Reginald Scot's bigoted statement that "a damned soule may and dooth take the shape of a blacke moore" (Scot "A Discourse" 535), we are immediately reminded of Othello. He in turn calls women "devils being offended" (2.1.112) in a passage which echoes Middleton. The most obvious example of exorcist language in the play occurs in Othello's speech over Desdemona's dead body:

> This look of thine will hurl my soul from heaven,
> And fiends will snatch at it. . . .
> . . . O cursed, cursed slave!
> Whip me, ye devils,
> From the possession of this heavenly sight!
> Blow me about in winds! roast me in sulphur!
> Wash me in steep-down gulfs of liquid fire! (5.2.274-80)

This speech certainly fits the appropriation category of descriptions by protagonists of their own madness in terms of demonic possession. His word play on possession is confirmed by Othello's

fit on stage (4.1). The physical collapse would be explained by a modern physician with an assumption that Othello suffers from both epilepsy and madness (possession). But I will demonstrate that for the Elizabethan audience, the two conditions might as well have been one and the same. Epilepsy was called the sacred disease in ancient times, and we still call fits "seizures" because "[m]ost sixteenth and seventeenth century physicians believed that epileptic attacks were linked to demoniac possession" (Kail 87). Brownlow insists that

> Iago's effect on Othello is implicitly compared in these lines with the phenomena of possession. . . .
> Othello suffers a fit which, to a contemporary audience will have looked like a demoniac's seizure. . . . Not that one intends to make Iago into an allegory. . . . [I]n the play's imagery [he appears] as the emblem and minister of an evil that, by his agency, possesses his master. ("Samuel Harsnett and the Meaning of Othello's 'Suffocating Streams'" 112-13)

This connection would explain Othello's howling, crying, and foaming at the mouth before the murder of Des*demon*a, whose name might be significant. Hoeniger inaccurately concludes that Iago invents the diagnosis of epilepsy to embarrass Othello and notes that no modern symptoms of epilepsy are ever described. He fails to see that this is the whole point: epilepsy was not understood then in at all the same way as it is now. Iago describes Othello's fit to Cassio, who demonstrates concern for Othello in his disturbed state:

> No, forbear.
> The lethargy must have his quiet course.

> If not, he foams at mouth; and by and by
> Breaks out to savage madness. (4.1.502-505)

Compare these lines with a passage from Reginald Scot describing a similar fit:

> And if it be a subterrene diuell, it doth writh and bow the possessed, and speaketh by him, using the spirit of the patient as his instrument . . . . when *Lucifugus* possesseth a man, he maketh him dumbe, and as it were dead: and these be they that are cast out . . . onelie by fasting and praier. (Scot "A Discourse" 496)

F. W. Brownlow has engaged in this same type of assessment with his analysis of one phrase in *Othello* (1604) to find traces of Harsnett's Declaration. He has explained the significance of the following passage spoken by Othello describing his possession:

> Her name, that was as fresh
> As Dian's visage, is now begrim'd and black
> As mine own face. If there be cords, or knives,
> Poison, or fire, or suffocating streams,
> I'll not endure it! Would I were satisfied! (3.2.383-90)

Brownlow complains that most commentators pass over the speech but notes that it does not appear in the first quarto. Nevertheless, his explication reveals that the last part of Othello's suicide list does not fit with the rest: suffocation or drowning, each taken separately, were components of contemporary suicide enumerations, but the two words taken together make little sense. Brownlow is convinced that both "suffocating streams" and the image of Desdemona's blackened name both came from Harsnett's Declaration.

The original context was a description of an exorcism component called fumigation, in which the demoniac was forced to inhale fumes from brimstone and poisonous herbs. He also notes that like the demoniacs who had suffered the rigors of exorcism at Denham, Othello finally yields to psychic torture. I would add that Iago, appropriately, refers to "the spite of hell, the fiend's arch-mock" (4.1.70) and that Othello says about Iago "[i]f thou be'st a devil, I cannot kill thee" (5.2.285).

OTHER TRAGEDIES

In *Julius Caesar* Ligarius says, "[t]hou, like an exorcist, hast conjured up/ [m]y mortified spirit . . ." (2.1.323). As we have already seen with the Ghost in Hamlet, the only orthodox Anglican interpretation of the nature of this apparition would be that it is a demon. King James reiterates this point about demonic activity: "[i]f they appeared in likenesse of anie defunct to some friends of his, they wer called *umbra mortuorum*" (K. James 57). Note that in the original context, it is clearly demons of whom he is speaking in this sentence. In a similar example from the same play, the Ghost proclaims to Brutus, "I am thine evil angel" (4.3.279).

But aside from explicit reference to the supernatural, we also find in this play another epileptic protagonist. The envious Cassius ruminates about Caesar:

> He had a fever when he was in Spain,
> And when the fit was on him, I did mark
> How he did shake; 'tis true, this god did shake;

> His coward lips did from their colour fly,
> And that same eye whose bend does awe the world
> Did lose his lustre; I did hear him groan. (1.2.119-24)

I do not believe Shakespeare used exorcist terminology to describe every epileptic character of his. Sometimes he used other epileptics to highlight the contrast between mad characters and merely unpleasant ones. In one example of this definite contrast, Kent curses Oswald, the servant of Goneril, by swearing, "[a] plague upon your epileptic visage" (2.2.79). The issue of Oswald's epilepsy is not really pursued because Shakespeare does not choose to emphasize his madness. Epilepsy is not usually mentioned alone in Shakespeare's plays, but in the context of words alluding to madness. If it is mentioned alone, a clear distinction is made with characterization so that we know we are not supposed to see the character as mad. It may seem disturbing that these terms were used so loosely during this time. The issue is further complicated by theological debates about what forms demons can *pretend* to take: "[like] the example of that Demoniack, who when he would, could counterfeit to beé dead, faine blindnesse, seéme lame, or resemble a man troubled with the dropsie" (Lodge The Divel Coniured 24). In isolation, we cannot know for sure how Shakespeare meant for us to interpret the terminology; that is why context is so important. In the descriptions of most epileptics, too, Shakespeare appropriated the language of the exorcists -- sometimes to create models of madness and other times to create models of persecution.

Keeping in mind, then, that epilepsy was often thought of, even by doctors, in terms of attacks by demons, let us take a closer look

at the symptoms of an attack of demonic possession as an Elizabethan conceived them. The following are some of Sommers' symptoms repeated many times in John Darrell's Apologie.

- "[He] stared with his eies"
- "His face and his mouth were fearfully distorted: one lip towards one eare, and the other lippe towards the other eare"
- "His face was turned directly backward"
- "His necke doubled under him".

In what would appear to the modern reader to be a strange reversal of the process of appropriation we have been describing, John Darrell does not know any other language to use to describe the symptoms he sees except the words we might use to explain an epileptic seizure. And he was not the only one who conceived demonic attacks in these terms. Here is another example from a different source: "[h]is bodie doubled, his head betweene his legges, suddenly plucked round, like a round browne loafe: he was cast up like a ball from the bed" (Deacon and Walker 4). Now recall the passage where Casca describes vividly how after Caesar refused three times to take the crown offered to him by the people,

> [h]e fell down in the market-place, and foamed at mouth, and was speechless . . . . When he came to himself again, he said, if he had done or said anything amiss, he desired their worships to think it was his infirmity. Three or four wenches, where I stood, cried, "Alas, good soul!" and forgave him with all their hearts. (1.2.250-51,266-70)

Here Caesar is described as a "good soul"; earlier, he was called a "god." But these strong recommendations do not diminish the case

for seeing demonic activity in the play. If anything, they enhance the effect of the tragedy. We must remember that for the Elizabethan audience, there was no plausibility problem here; good people as well as bad could suffer from demonic possession: "being persones of the beste nature peraduenture, that yee shall finde in all the Countrie about them, GOD permittes them to be troubled in that sort, for the wakening up of their zeale" (K. James 63).

In other tragedies there are only glancing allusions to exorcism. Usually all it takes to recognize them is a familiarity with the jargon. In *Titus Andronicus* 3.2.66-67 Martius explains of the "fly" he killed: ". . . 'twas a black ill-favoured fly,/ [l]ike to the empress' Moor; therefore I kill'd him." To Elizabethans, a "fly" bore at least the connotation of an evil spirit. Beelzebub, the lord of flies, trapped his victims in a web. Also in this play, at least one critic, Märtin, calls Tamora a fiendish queen.

In *Romeo and Juliet* one line refers to a treatment often used in exorcism. In 1.2.55-56 Benvolio asks, "[w]hy, Romeo, art thou mad?", and Romeo declares himself to be "[n]ot mad, but bound more than a madman is." Usually the madmen who were bound were at least suspected of being possessed.

I believe it is not a coincidence that there is also a reference to a "daemon" in *Antony and Cleopatra*. In fact, mysterious music is heard as the "daemons" depart.

Demons were commonly imagined as being able to assume any shape, as in these lines from *Timon of Athens*:

> . . . . sometime it appears like a lord; sometime like a lawyer; sometime like a philosopher . . . . and, generally, in all shapes that man goes up and down in from four score to thirteen this spirit walks in. (2.2.115-18)

Biblical precedents abounded for the devil's appearing in other forms. When the shape of Samuel appears to Saul in 1. Samuel 28, he is really a demon, according to Elizabethan theologians. The same thing happens when Micheas prophesies to King Achab in 1. Kings 22. By now we are used to reading the treatise writers' descriptions of "the divers formes of apparitiones, that that craftie spirit illudes them with" (K. James 17-18), but so far we have only seen the shapes of old friends or daggers hanging in the air as examples of this. An excerpt from King James explains "lord," a puzzling word choice given the others in the series. He declares of the ranks of demons "that there are so manie Princes, Dukes, and Kinges amongst them" (K. James 21).

KING LEAR

Because Muir has already treated this play so thoroughly, I only list here a few additional observations.

When King Lear is turned out into the storm, he is merely following a standard procedure used by the exorcists with demoniacs: "[a]lso they must change all their bedding, their clothing, and their habitation . . ." (Scot 441). Demons were thought to inhabit specific places, and beds were often likely candidates:

"the papists have manie conjurations, so as neither . . . beds, nor bedstaves, &C; are without their forme of conjuration" (Scot 446). Viewed from the perspective of the exorcists, one reason why Lear was turned out of Gloucester's house is so that he will have an opportunity to be exorcised and recover. In addition to bedding, clothing also takes on symbolic significance for the exorcists; time and again in the treatises on exorcism, torn clothes are associated not only with madness but also with counterfeiting, dual aspects of Edgar's performance: "reason . . . should sift such cloked and pretended practises, turning them out of their rags and patched clowts, that they may appeere discovered, and shew themselves in their nakednesse" (Scot 466).

Given that one of Shakespeare's appropriation categories is that of internal stage directions designed to typify the symptoms of possession, consider the following passage:

> they buffet mens minds with fearefull tentations: they endeuour to sifte, and to winnowe mens soules as men winnow wheate: they circumuent them with wiles: they make men uncleane . . . they strike them with blindenes . . . they ouercome them by lamenesse. (Deacon and Walker 60-61)

Then think of the obvious blindness in the play. For lameness, think of Kent in the stocks. Both the torture and the disease metaphors in Lear become more understandable as diabolical strategies for onslaught: "[the] diuell, that sworne aduersarie of man, [causes harm] by deuising, procuring, applying, and by ministring many strange sicknesses, diseases, and deathes to the bodie" (Deacon and Walker 61). In the exorcist treatises, the soul of the victim is

likened to a cage, a stie, and a dungeon, while the devil appears as the Biblical strong armed man. The devil wins over the victim every time "by assaulting, by battring, by undermyning, by pyning, by wounding, yea, and by slaying some of his souldiers before his face" (Deacon and Walker 61). Lear's soldiers are treated badly before his face as well, but ultimately it is he and Gloucester who must face the consequences of possession.

Given that it is now generally accepted that possession is a motif in this play, let us imagine the pretended cliff scene of Gloucester and Edgar in terms of the following passage:

> whatsoever is newlie exorcised must be rebaptised: for (saie they) call them by their names, and presentlie they wake, *or fall if they clime*. . . . (Scot 442, emphasis mine)

On a lighter note, the Fool's joke about noses has long been a focus of debate. No one is sure quite what it means or, in particular, where it came from. He quips: "[a]ll that follow their noses are led by their eyes but blind men, and there's not a nose among twenty but can smell him that's stinking" (2.4.69-71). I would like to propose several possible connections from Reginald Scot, who seemed fond of noses:

> I saw a neighbour of mine, one *Eleazer*, that in the presence of *Vespasian* and his sonnes, and the rest of the soldiers, cured many that were possessed with spirits. The maner and order of his cure was this. He did put unto the nose of the possessed a ring, under the seale whereof was inclosed a kind of roote, whose verture *Salomon*

> declared, and the savour thereof drewe the divell out at his nose. (Scot 454)

> For as some of these melancholike persons imagine . . . troubled with this disease . . . manie strange, incredible, and impossible things . . . . But the notablest example heereof is, of one that was in great perplexitie, imagining that his nose was as big as a house. . . . (Scot 52-53)

I wonder how much of the Fool's nonsensical language really makes a great deal of sense after all. With that, let us move to less serious plays.

HISTORIES

There is not much to say about the histories, but the few allusions to exorcism material contained in them are significant ones. Obvious appropriations from exorcism material appear in the history plays in introductions of specific devils' names. In *Henry V* Corporal Nym retorts, "I am not Barbason, you cannot conjure me" (2.1.54) in response to Pistol's calling him an "egregious dog" (2.1.45) in an obvious echo from Harsnett. In the same play, we see Fluellen speaking about Williams: "[t]hough he be as good a gentleman as the devil is, as Lucifer and Belzebub himself . . ." (4.7.145). These appropriations soon degenerate into name-calling, as we see from "that fiend Douglas, that spirit Percy, and that devil Glendower" (*1. Henry IV* 2.4.368-69).

Additional specific appropriations of demons' names occur in *1. Henry VI* when Joan La Pucelle conjures "the lordly monarch of the north" (5.3.6). This has been noted by critics as the only time in

Shakespeare when fiends actually appear on stage. We realize the significance of their appearance when we hear King James's rationalization of effective conjurations: "[f]or manie denies that anie such spirites can appeare in these daies as I have said . . . For convicting of whose errour, there is cause inough . . . that God should permit at sometimes spirits visible to kyith" (K. James 55). When this Maid of Orleans invokes her familiars in this scene, she utters the lines sounding like Lady Macbeth's: "[t]hen take my soul, my body, soul and all." This appropriation, which critics have argued was made from Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*, fits the category of descriptions by characters of themselves in terms of demonic possession. Another echo from *Dr. Faustus*, incidentally, has also been recognized in the conjuring scene of *2. Henry VI* (1.4.24-34), in which Bolingbroke the conjuror practices his art with Margaret Jourdain. We have another conjuring scene in *1. Henry IV* 3.1 when Glendower conjures the distant musicians:

> *Glendower*. I can call spirits from the vasty deep.
> *Hotspur*. Why, so can I, or so can any man;
> But will they come when you do call for them?
> (3.1.53-55)

They do appear, immediately. Also, angels appear in *Henry VIII*. But we are warned by King James that devils are really fallen angels, and that the ones who still appear in angels' form may actually be the most dangerous: "[a]nd *likewise* they can make some to bi possessed with spirites, and so to becom verie Daemoniacques: and this last sorte is verie possible likewise to the Devill their Master

to do, since he may easilie send his owne angells to trouble in what forme he pleases" (K. James 47).

Although she does not go into any details, Latham alludes to demonic overtones in Shakespeare's *Richard III*. Perhaps she refers to the processions of spirits and ghosts. But another obvious example of demonic activity is the deformity of Richard described in terms of paternity by an incubus devil in the lines of Queen Margaret:

> Thou elvish-mark'd, abortive, rooting hog!
> Thou that was seal'd in thy nativity
> The slave of nature and the son of hell! (1.3.228-30)

Incidentally, Margaret is described by Märtin as a fiendish queen, as is Eleanor of Gloucester in *Henry VI*. Here Margaret's speech clearly falls into the category of mad rantings of major characters which allude to or follow the form of episodes of exorcism. We can better understand the concept of the succubus devil through the Elizabethan notion that outer deformity must indicate moral depravity -- in this case, on the part of the mother. Another reference in another play to Richard as a monster again confirms his demonic paternity. In *3. Henry VI* the birth of this Richard, Duke of Gloucester is described. An owl shrieked, and his mother bore

> To wit an indigest deformed lump,
> Not like the fruit of such a goodly tree. (5.6.51-52)

The incubus devil and its relationship to demonic possession will be described later in greater detail in reference to *The Tempest*. For now, let it suffice to hear from King James that physical manifestations of supernatural conditions are common: 'as is dailie

seene by the uilde diseases and corruptions, that the bodies of the faythfull are subject unto, as yee will see clearelie proved, when I speake of he possessed and Daemoniacques" (K. James 60).

Returning to the theme of demonic possession, King Henry VI prays for the dying Bishop of Winchester:

> O Thou eternal Mover of the heavens,
> Look with a gentle eye upon this wretch!
> O, beat away the busy meddling fiend
> That lays strong siege unto this wretch's soul,
> And from his bosom purge this black despair!
> (*2. Henry VI* 3.3.19-23)

This appropriation falls into the category of urgent speeches made by major characters which allude to or follow the form of episodes of exorcism.

ROMANCES

Brownlow proposes that Harsnett's book influenced *Cymbeline* (1609-1610) 5.5.210-14, a passage which begins with "[a]y, so thou dost,/ Italian fiend!". But the correspondences are mostly single words or phrases like "credulous fool," "Egregious," "ingenious," and "cord, or knife, or poison" which happen to be used in both texts. To this list I would add 4.2.276-81 in the same play, a burial ceremony which begins when Guiderius says, "[n]o exorcisor harm thee" (4.2.276). There are also processions of spirits and ghosts in *Cymbeline*.

Furthermore, Kenneth Muir suggests that traces of A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures could also be found in

Pericles (1607-1608) 4.6.118-19. I think these were also just words that Shakespeare happened to like. It has been noted by others, however, that the "[s]ail seas in cockles" of *Pericles* 4.4.2 was derived from descriptions of witches sailing in egg-shells and cockle-shells found in Reginald Scot.

Jacqueline E. M. Latham, in an article on *The Tempest* (1611), claims a tenuous connection between the play and the treatise Daemonologie by King James. She also discusses Caliban's demonic paternity through the intercourse of his mother, Sycorax, with an incubus. Thus Sycorax was, at least temporarily, possessed by a demon. I would propose a different source, Reginald Scot, for both the situation here and the exact words used elsewhere in the play. The conjunction of the same words and the same situation in this passage and this play seems (to me, at least) to be a strong argument for this specific source. The Scot passage describes an attack of the devil in a girl:

> [b]ut he would not speake, but rored and cried mightilie . . . striuing, and gnashing of teeth; and otherwhile with *mowing*, and other terrible countenances, and was so strong in the maid, that foure men could scarse hold hir downe . . . . [Two hours] he spake, but verie strangelie . . . He comes, he comes . . . He goes, he goes. And then we charged him to tell us who sent him. And he said: I laie in hir waie like a log, and I made hir runne like fier, but I could not hurt hir . . . . When camest thou to hir, said we? *To night in hir bed*, said he. (Scot 128, emphasis mine)

Now, Kenneth Muir had suggested before that the following passage from the play contained traces of A Declaration of Egregious Popish

Impostures. It is a passage where Caliban is speaking of Prospero's spirits:

> For every trifle are they set upon me;
> Sometime like apes that *mow* and chatter at me,
> And after bite me; then like hedgehogs which
> Lie tumbling in my barefoot way. . . .
> (*The Tempest* 2.2.5-12, emphasis mine)

The argument in favor of Muir's source connection is that Harsnett's passage reads "mow, and mop like an Ape, tumble like a Hedgehogge" (136). This phrasing matches the later lines from the same play: "Each one, tripping on his toe,/ Will be here with mop and mow" (4.1.46-47). But Reginald Scot's use of the same word "mow" may have been an additional source where Shakespeare read the word originally. Anyway, I think my connection with the Scot passage also explains -- better than Latham does -- the connection of the incubus.

The very name of this play suggests demonic activity. Consider King James's double use of the same word in connection with demons: "[t]hey can rayse stormes and tempestes in the aire... Which likewise is verie easie to be discerned from anie other naturall tempestes that are meteore, in respect of the suddaine and violent raising thereof, together with short induring of the same" (K. James 46). The specific devils who raise tempests, if you care, are the fourth ones classified by Reginald Scot, the *Aquei* -- "waterie, of the sea" -- who raise tempests (like also the storm in *Lear*)

and provoke lust in human beings (495). This latter characteristic also fits well with my source connection of this play with Reginald Scot instead of King James.

Latham does, however, make a plausible point about one appropriation which Shakespeare probably made from King James. In Daemonologie he writes of a pleasurable temptation by demons: "faire banquets and daintie dishes, carryed in short space fra the farthest part of the worlde" (22). In *The Tempest* the spirits do bring in refreshments on a table and set them before Miranda and Ferdinand. Also, Prospero charms the court party in the fifth act by making circles, a conjuring ritual. Magicians make circles in <u>Daemonologie</u> as well.

As for the result of the demonic paternity, Prospero describes Caliban as "[a] devil, a born devil" (4.1.188), and even in the list of characters he appears as a "deformed slave." Stephano calls him a mooncalf in 2.2, and Trinculo calls him a monster in the same scene. That name is repeated thirteen times before the scene's closing. Prospero later calls him "this thing of darkness" (5.1.275-76). These appropriations appear as mad rantings of major characters which allude to or follow the form of episodes of exorcism. When his identity is once again called into question -- "a man or a fish?" (2.2.25) -- there may be a veiled reference to another exorcist motif. Thomas Lodge informs us that some people of his day erroneously think that devils can be expelled through use of a fish liver (as with Tobie in the Bible); but they are mistaken because the only remedy is prayer (Lodge 25). Caliban's demonic paternity also means that history is doomed to repeat itself, as we see in his

attempted rape of Miranda. He also relishes the details of the proposed murder of Prospero. His last intention is to "seek for grace" (5.1.295). The supposed goddesses descend in *The Tempest*, but Ariel assesses the situation at the outset: "[h]ell is empty,/ And all the devils here" (1.2.214).

One final note: Latham sees the devil's three strategies for temptation as presented in Daemonologie -- curiosity, revenge, and greed -- to be displayed in the vices of the characters of *The Tempest*. As a direct textual correlation, I think this is a real stretch. Establishment of correspondences should rely on better proof than this.

THE COMEDY OF ERRORS

In *The Comedy of Errors* Doctor Pinch, a schoolmaster, is called in by Adriana to act as an exorcist -- to cast the devil out of her husband, Antipholus of Ephesus: "[g]ood Doctor Pinch, you are a conjurer,/ [e]stablish him in his true sense again" (4.4.52-53). He attempts to do so in a speech which follows the form of episodes of exorcism:

> I charge thee, Satan, housed within this man
> To yield possession to my holy prayers.
> And to thy state of darkness hie thee straight;
> I conjure thee by all the saints in heaven! (4.4.57-60)

Antipholus protests with, "[p]eace, doting wizard, peace! I am not mad" (4.4.106). But Pinch makes his diagnosis: "the fiend is strong within him" (4.4.107). He recommends,

> Mistress, both man and master is possess'd;
> I know it by their pale and deadly looks,
> They must be bound, and laid in some dark room.
> (4.4.108-10)

Ironically, in the light of what we know is happening to his brother, Antipholus of Syracuse encounters his twin's mistress and imagines that she is the devil: "Sathan, avoid. I charge thee tempt me not" (4.3.48). Later the Abbess asks Adriana her purpose in coming, and Adriana responds:

> To fetch my poor distracted husband hence.
> Let us come in, that we may bind him fast,
> And bear him home for his recovery. (5.1.40)

We are reminded of the methods of the exorcists as the Abbess makes her objections:

> Be patient; for I will not let him stir
> Till I have us'd the approved means I have,
> With wholesome syrups, drugs, and holy prayers,
> To make of him a formal man again. (5.1.101)

Later he is locked into "a dark and dankish vault" (5.1.248). As I will explain later in greater detail, the purpose of the appropriations in this play is to construct models not of madness, but of persecution. The same is true of *Twelfth Night.*

TWELFTH NIGHT

Some scholars claim to have identified the influences of Samuel Harsnett's The Discovery and Confutation of John Darrell (1599) on *Twelfth Night* (1601-1602); these scholars view Malvolio

as part of a parody of this Protestant exorcist who was arrested, tried, and condemned by Elizabethan ecclesiastical officials. Greenblatt dictates a categorical progression in Shakespeare's thinking about exorcism in this play as opposed to *The Comedy of Errors*: "[i]n *Twelfth Night*, written some ten years later, Shakespeare's view of exorcism, though still comic, has darkened. Possession now is . . . a fraud, a malicious practical joke played on Malvolio" (Shakespearean Negotiations 115).

Maria, Toby, and Feste lure Malvolio to engage in an absurd performance or exhibition before Olivia, ostensibly because Malvolio deserves a come-uppance, being "[t]he dev'l a puritan that he is" (2.3.146). Olivia is convinced of his madness, even though he suffers from no such malady, and the conspirators discuss the hypothetical possibility that "all the devils of hell . . . and Legion himself possessed him" and that "the fiend speaks within him" (3.4.84-86, 91). Hamilton speculates about the potential sources for these lines, and comes up with two: Harsnett's Declaration and Darrell's Detection. But the word "Legion," derived from the Biblical account in Luke 8:27-33, is so common in exorcist lore that it would be difficult to trace a specific source. The conspirators also refer to the urine of the possessed: "[c]arry his water to th' wise woman" (3.4.103). Fabian and Maria in *Twelfth Night* speak of this wise woman as if they deem her capable of diagnosing and curing demonic possession. For this allusion, Hamilton proposes several possible sources, the Darrell books as well as Deacon and Walker. Again, however, it would be impossible to identify a specific textual

parallel; I have seen many other references to the same indicator of possession in other contemporaneous pamphlets.

Sir Toby Belch gives instructions for the handling of Malvolio, ordering that he be placed in a dark room and bound. This appropriation falls into the category of internal stage directions, and at the opening of 4.2 they are followed. Feste pretends to be Sir Topas, a Calvinist minister, and Feste comments on the role of Sir Topas which he is instructed to play: "I would I were the first that ever dissembled in such a gown" (4.2.5-6). He probably refers to the fraudulent exorcists running rampant in England at the time. Malvolio becomes angry when they instruct him to pray, and ironically, his refusal only corroborates their accusations. Malvolio cannot extricate himself by answering questions correctly because Darrell claimed that demoniacs could not be held responsible for the questions they answered since it was the devil who was really talking. Further exorcisms follow: "[o]ut, hyperbolical fiend, how vexest thou this man!" (4.2.25). These rantings follow the ritual for exorcism and have long been recognized as such by literary critics: "[f]ie, thou dishonest Sathan! I call thee by the most modest terms, for I am one of those gentle ones that will use the devil himself with courtesy" (4.2.29-33).

Like Hamlet, Malvolio appears with his garters crossed. I do not agree with Winfried Schleiner that the only significance here is an infraction of the Puritan dress code (50). Remember that crossed garters were mentioned specifically in the treatises on exorcism as one of the tell-tale signs of possession.

Shakespeare may also have remembered John Darrell's exorcisms of Nicholas Starkey's children, as described in his True Narration (1600), in which we find the words "bible bable . . . prittle prattle" (10). Shakespeare borrows the words of the demoniacs for his bogus priest Feste, acting as Sir Topas, who urges Malvolio to leave his "vain bibble-babble" (4.2.100). The words also appear in Harsnett's Discovery, George More's (John Darrell's assistant's) treatise, and the Marprelate tracts; they are part of a continuing cultural dialogue, a fragment of a discourse, "an idiom widely used in English religious polemical writing to discredit someone's religious position" (Hamilton 100).

Counterfeiting becomes a theme as Sir Toby, speaking to Maria, compliments Feste: "[t]he knave counterfeits well; a good knave" (4.2.19). Feste also asks Malvolio, "[b]ut tell me true, are you not mad indeed, or do you but counterfeit?" (4.2.18). Feste sings a song at the end of the scene which contains the words, "[a]dieu, goodman devil" and "I am gone, sir, and anon, sir,/ I'll be with you again" (4.2.113-14); Hamilton has notice that these words echo the usual message of devils departing from demoniacs and gives George More and John Darrell (True Narration) as specific sources.

Several of the characters also bear what Schleiner calls speaking names. Schleiner suggests, not very plausibly, that Feste refers to Festus, a Biblical judge and a metaphor used by John Darrell. Even less plausibly, she speculates that Sir Topas' name is a corruption of "topaz," a stone which, according to Reginald Scot, healed lunatics of lunacy. In another not very plausible argument, Hamilton tries to trace Feste's questions about Pythagoras to

Deacon and Walker, Robert Beale, or Sutcliffe. Surely this name from antiquity was only part of an ongoing cultural repertoir of rhetorical *topoi*. In an equally arbitrary fashion, she decides that Malvolio's letter to Olivia bears the resonance of Darrell's and other exorcists' letters from prison. I think this assessment attributes to Shakespeare political purposes that were probably not there.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW

The only study I am aware of which offers a reading of this play in the light of the exorcist dialogues is an obscure, not easily obtainable one by Terry Ann Craig. This play is not mentioned as exorcism parody by Bullough, who seems rather oblivious to this treasure-trove of source material. Craig shows how Petruchio's "taming" of his wife Kate which takes place in the course of the comedy could be a parody of exorcism. Kate is described in the play as "stark mad" (1.1.69), a "fiend of hell" (1.1.88), "curst Katherine" (1.2.185), and a "hilding of a devilish spirit" (2.1.26). Her storming, shrieking, struggling, and cursing remind us of the demoniacs of the era. She shakes visibly during the wedding ceremony. She hits Petruchio, threatens Hortensio, and beats Grumio and Bianca.
As the mock exorcist, Petruchio urges her to pray, delivers a "sermon" (4.1.186) to her, and beats his servants in her presence. Various puns interlaced through the dialogue bear religious overtones, and the the techniques for exorcising include enforced fasting, little sleep, and constant refutations of what Kate's senses tell her to be true. The isolated setting of the play, a country home,

also reminds us of the manor houses where exorcisms were conducted near Denham in 1585-1586. The author of this article writes with only a dim perception of the larger pattern involved (of exorcism in the Shakespeare corpus), but the idea was certainly right on target, and no one else seems to have recognized it.

OTHER COMEDIES

There are glancing references to exorcism material in some of the other comedies. In *All's Well that Ends Well* the King of France exclaims (after the widow returns with Helena, whom he had presumed dead): "[i]s there no exorcist/ [b]eguiles the truer office of mine eyes?" (5.3.306). The implication here is that exorcists are experts at legerdemain and deceptive illusions.

In *As You Like It* Rosalind declares to Orlando:

> Love is merely a madness; and, I tell you, deserves as well a dark house and a whip as madmen do. (3.2.420-21)

Reginald Scot's Discovery of Witchcraft is an acknowledged source for *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595-1596), a passage from which describes apparitional abilities of demons: "[s]ometimes a horse I'll be, sometime a hound,/ [a] hog, a headless bear, sometime a fire" (3.1.3-4).

In *Measure for Measure* we find an ontological meditation on how demons pass their time:

> the delighted spirit
> To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
> In thrilling region of thick-ribbed ice;
> To be imprison'd in the viewless winds,
> And blown with restless violence round about
> The pendent world; or to be worse than worst
> Of those that lawless and incertain thought
> Imagine howling. (3.1.121-28)

In *The Merry Wives of Windsor* Falstaff is pinched black and blue by fairies, supposedly, but such actions are normally also associated with demon activity. Aside from such dubious references, there are explicit appropriations of specific devils' names. From *Merry Wives* 2.2.311 we obtain Amaimon, Lucifer, and Barbason, names which Shakespeare also repeated in other plays. His source for these was probably Reginald Scot, but he also could have turned to Dekker's Hierarchie, in which appear the greater devils Lucifer, Beelzebub, Amaymon king of the East, Zimimar king of the North, and Barbason [Barbas] and Asmath [Asmodeus]. All of these are mentioned or referred to by Shakespeare.

"Evidently the Elizabethan audience enjoyed seeing madmen on the stage" (Hoeniger 56), and evidently they also enjoyed references to the exorcists. Mentally disturbed characters -- many of whom we did not even discuss -- abound in the plays of Shakespeare: the "melancholy" Jaques, Bottom the weaver, Launcelot Gobbo, Touchstone, and Sir Andrew Aguecheek. At this time in England, madmen were placed on exhibition in asylums, and spectators were charged admission, as at a tourist attraction. People visited Bedlam

on holidays for amusement.[2] How can we account for this proliferation of mad characters while forgetting demonology, as most critics have tended to do?

Using the categories I established in the section on precedents for this study, I have noticed that usually only in the tragedies does a protagonist describe his own madness in terms of possession. In the tragedies, Shakespeare creates plausible models of madness to gain the sympathy of the audience for the mad characters and to heighten the sense of impending tragedy. In the comedies, however, there is always an accusation involved as one character denounces another as mad or possessed. I conclude that Shakespeare's purpose in these appropriations for the comedies was to construct models of persecution in the form of accusations of madness.

In choosing exorcism lore as source material, Shakespeare was participating in a larger trend that contemporaneous playwrights were following: "[i]n the 1590s the popular playhouses began to tap that reservoir of curiosity about the real lives of living people which is now the chief refreshment in newspapers. Newsworthy people and events, the quotidian gossip of journalism, turned up as stage fare for a wide range of audience appetites. . . . [I]t was also the first great market for daily journalism" (Gurr 141). Strangely enough, Gurr does not mention -- in his section on current events affecting the playwrights or showing up in their work -- anything about the exorcisms. This omission is rather egregious.

---

[2] Among many appearances of Bedlam in Shakespeare is the word's usage in *Lear* 2.3.14.

The premise behind a project of this nature is that "[a]wareness of such possible allusions . . . is not an antiquarian matter" (Schleiner 56). As one scholar concluded in discussing a different set of alleged parallels (which, by the way, Kenneth Muir does not accept [8]),"[i]f individually the parallels do not always seem remarkable, as they accumulate they tend to appear less and less accidental" (Kaula 3-4). It is essential that a few scholars continue diligently to attempt to trace words, phrases, and motifs to their original contexts so that scholars not bothering to undertake such work will not be able to support unjustifiable interpretations of the literature:

> [A] commentator who wants to gloss his text accurately needs an explorer's willingness to travel in unmapped country as well as an archaeologist's patience in moving, tentatively and sceptically, from clue to clue. If critics are to know what they are talking about, however, such work is necessary; and besides extending the mental boundaries of the contemporary reader, the ideas recovered often throw light upon the whole meaning and atmosphere of a work. . . . Risky as it is to trace the workings of another mind, . . . [o]ne age's clichés are another's preoccupations. (Brownlow, "Samuel Harsnett and the Meaning of Othello's 'Suffocating Streams'" 107, 112-13)

Recognizing (and re-cognizing) another age's preoccupations almost requires a certain respect for them. Many modern critics arrive at the premature conclusion that Elizabethan dramatists usually ridiculed popular belief. They say Shakespeare's attitude

toward his material was always one of skepticism; one wrote about Shakespeare's presentation of demons, "his general treatment of it suggests humour" (Gibson 33). In the same vein, Greenblatt argues that "[b]y 1600, then, Shakespeare had clearly marked out possession and exorcism as frauds" (Shakespearean Negotiations 115).

While I agree with him that the bard was experimenting with the issues involved, I see evidence in plays after this date that Shakespeare had not abandoned entirely the usefulness of demonic possession as a tragic device. Greenblatt acknowledges in relation to the comedies that "[e]xorcism is the straw people clutch at when the world seems to have gone mad" (Shakespearean Negotiations 115). The comedies do take a position of mocking and skepticism, but the Shakespeare who could stir men's souls with his tragedies was too shrewd to reject entirely a system of allusions and symbols which would make the religious and superstitious in his audience tremble. As we will see, religion and superstition pervaded all social classes of the time. In this case as in others, I think Greenblatt should admit that as a New Historicist, he is allowing his own cultural lens to color his view of a *milieu* which was radically different from our own.

Part Two: Religious Climates (Textuality of History)

I. Current Events: Cultural Ambience in Spain

The exorcisms in Spain did not begin with William Weston, the same Jesuit priest who had conducted the exorcisms at Denham in England, but his presence there during his banishment probably raised the statistics. After a long imprisonment in the Tower of London, he was expelled from the country in 1603 and spent the rest of his life in Sevilla and then at Valladolid, where he was rector of the college at his death (9 June 1615). His portrait still hangs in Valladolid and Rome. How true was the Castillian proverb, "Roma, Roma, que a los locos domas, y a los cuerdos no perdonas" (De la Pinta Llorente 14).

The Christianized paganism of the Romans dominated Spain after the superstitions of the Visigoth conquerors had infiltrated the popular belief systems from the fifth to the seventh centuries B. C. The occult traditions of the Jews also permeated the folklore of the regions they inhabited. But it was the Muslims (believers in genii, spells, and talismans) who established schools of medicine and philosophy -- including occult lore -- in Toledo, Zaragoza, and later, Salamanca. The Spanish universities in these three cities which offered formal courses in astrology and necromancy "became notorious throughout Europe as nurseries of the black art" (Summers Geography 591) which fostered necromantic societies. In 1582 the

Inquisition attacked the University of Salamanca for teaching astrology. Civil laws covering sorcery or witchcraft were rare in Spain because such activities were considered heresy, which always fell under the jurisdiction of the Holy Inquisition. By 1600, the Inquisition had assumed jurisdiction over all forms of sorcery and often forced civil courts to deliver prisoners. Various sets of instructions were distributed for questioning suspects. But the government's lack of legal authority did not mean that offenders escaped from punishment; if anything, they were treated more harshly by the Inquisitors than they might have been by a partially secular power: "[i]t is noticeable that in Spain the regulations of the Papal Bulls dealing with magic were adhered to very closely, and prosecutions were conducted upon the prescribed lines" (Summers Geography 593).

Famous people were sometimes prosecuted and rarely received special treatment. The accusation of necromancy became a political instrument, and the accused were people in high places, such as Don Rodrigo Calderón, Juan de Espina, and the Count-Duke of Olivares. Some were guilty, like Carlos II was later discovered to be. Denouncers or spies, called "familiares," often received monetary rewards. Lope de Vega might have experienced a run-in with the Inquisition -- after all, he had his horoscope published and used astrology to justify his romantic misfortunes -- if he had not become an informer and thus pre-empted any suspicion of transgression. Even Spaniards who would later be canonized were not immune. Saint Teresa's Vida was condemned by the Inquisition in 1554, and one of the supposed heresies it contained may well have

been its frequent mention of the demons she fought off during her prayers. She was imprisoned by the Inquisition of Toledo in 1577.

What was the nature of the punishments for the worst of the offenders? As early as 1560 the king ordered an *auto de fe* to impress his new bride; in it, several people were burned alive. For an *auto de fe* ordered by Carlos V in Valladolid in the previous year, the participants had ranged from the highest to the lowest members of society: "altas dignidades eclesiásticas, nobles de rancio abolengo, altos funcionarios del Estado, sacerdotes, frailes y monjas, mezclados con menestrales, artesanos, sirvientes y gente menuda del pueblo" (Olmos García 40). On 8 March 1600, Philip III attended an *auto de fe* in Toledo, attended by his courtiers and their ladies. One person was burned, while thirty penitents were displayed (Olmos García 72). One of these spectacles was cancelled in 1604 in Triana, to the disappointment of 500 participants in a parade who had awaited the arrival of the prisoners. In the same year, on 7 November, a second similar celebration was cancelled even though it had been publicized in all the usual ways. That year did mark a temporary suspension of the *autos* by order of the king for political reasons. But they resumed again: "t]he Spanish Inquisition determined to join with the King, the Archbishop of Burgos, local bishops, and the leaders of monastic orders in a wholesale campaign to inform the populace of the dangers of witchcraft. . . . To stimulate public co-operation, an elaborate two-day auto-da-fé was arranged for November 7, 1610 . . ." (Robbins 428). Further performances were staged in Granada and Toledo in

1615, the year in which the second volume of the *Quijote* was published.

What were the crimes of the people who burned in these fires? The case of Eugenio Torralba of Cuenca (6 May 1527) is parodied in the *Quijote* itself, and he was perhaps the most famous cohort of the devil. Torralba and his constant companion may even have been parodied in some way by Cervantes, the creator of that most enduring pair of companions, Don Quixote and Sancho. Cervantes relates the circumstances in the following manner, as Don Quixote sits astride the wooden horse Clavileño:

> Acuérdate del verdadero cuento del licenciado Torralba, a quien llevaron los diablos en volandas por el aire, caballero en una caña, cerrados los ojos, y en doce horas llegó a Roma y se apeó en Torre de Nona . . . y vió todo el fracaso, asalto y muerte de Borbón, y por la mañana estaba de vuelta en Madrid ya, donde dió cuenta de todo lo que había visto; el cual asimismo dijo que cuando iba por el aire le mandó el diablo que abriese los ojos y los abrió, y se vió tan cerca, a su parecer, del cuerpo de la luna, que la pudiera asir por la mano, y que no osó mirar a la tierra por no desvanecerse. (II, 350-51)

What Cervantes does not include in this narrative, perhaps out of fear of the Inquisitorial censors, is the fact that Torralba set out on his adventures only with the help of his familiar demon, Zequiel, who was supposedly given to him by a Dominican friar. This demon provided him and his friends with accurate predictions of future events and magical words to help them win games. The reason Torralba flew to Rome was that he knew from the demon that Rome

would be sacked on the following day. He observed the sacking from the Torre de Nona and witnessed the death of Borbón; afterwards he returned to Valladolid and told everyone about his experience. At least during the nocturnal flight, when Torralba felt such typical possession symptoms as "unas veces creyó que ahogaba, y otras que se quemaba" (Menéndez Pelayo 373), he was possessed by his demon and out of control of his own actions. The Inquisition of Cuenca arrested him in 1528, and his sentence was lightened to four years in prison by Don Alonso Manrique.[1]

Torralba was not the only beneficiary of a demonic companion during these years. A priest in Bargota, close to Viana, also flew through the air for the purpose of witnessing or aiding in spectacular events; these included the battle of Pavia and the discovery of a scheme to murder Alexander VI. On 20 May 1563 in Murcia, Felipe de Aragón was punished in an *auto de fe* for having a familiar demon named Xaguax who appeared to him in the form of a little black man (Menéndez Pelayo 374-75). Torralba was also not the only man who claimed to have flown through the air. Román Ramírez was apprehended by the Inquisition of Toledo and punished in 1600 for a similar fantasy.

From this time onward the Inquisition included in its list of crimes many different forms of alliance with demonic activity, including love potions and enchantments, which were common. In the early sixteenth century the Grand Inquisitor Alfonzo Manríquez

---

[1] "Proceso fulminado contra el doctor Eugenio de Torralua en la Inquisición de Cuenca, año de 1531," manuscript 8.252 of the National Library of Madrid, quoted in De la Pinta Llorente, vol. II, 177.

passed an edict stating that the Catholic layman's duty was to denounce to the Inquisition any person who entertained familiars or spirits. In 1585 a bull of Pope Sixtus V condemned incantations and conjurors' alleged control over demons. Conjurors sometimes produced demoniacs, as the following passage demonstrates:

> el cerco que hacen con aquellas figuras y letras es cosa de superstición e invocación expresa del demonio; e no es mucho que donde primero no era endemoniado, salvo por alguna pasión del celebro o del corazón alterado, responda el demonio a su invocación e llamamiento tan expreso . . . después de puesta dentro del cerco, y comenzando el conjuro, luego se altera y pierde el sentido, donde parece la obra diabólica del cerco y del conjuro. (Castañega 124-25)

But interestingly enough, the Spanish Suprema, the policy-making body of the Spanish Inquisition, held up the circulation of the bull prohibiting conjuration until the beginning of the next century. Perhaps the officials debated about the policy for so long because the practices it prohibited were so widespread in their area.

Or perhaps they were simply tired of fighting against popular superstition. The fight had been in progress for a long time already: "[t]he church in Spain had long waged a frustrating battle against 'pagan' customs and institutions, which it often characterized as traffic with the devil. The manuals of superstition and witchcraft of Ciruelo (1530) and Castañega (1528) are examples of this pre-Trent preoccupation" (Christian 161). These and other manuals not only include anecdotes of popular beliefs, but also present official ecclesiastical attempts to stem the tide of folk magic. Usually

written in response to Inquisitorial proceedings, they were designed as preventative measures to warn people not to make the same mistakes which had led others to burn in the *hogueras*.

Alphonsus de Spina (d. 1491), who in 1467 published the first book in Spain to discuss witchcraft (Fortalicium fidei), believed in most forms of demon activity. The five parts of his book describe the "armor" of the faithful to be worn in battle against demons. He was a professor at Salamanca and the confessor of King John of Castille. He enumerated ten varieties of devils, including poltergeists, demons who appear in human form, and marching hosts who appear like hordes of men and make much noise.

Ciruelo's and Castañega's treatises, the first ones to be printed in the vernacular, appeared almost at the same time (approximately 1529). Castañega's was not reprinted until this century, but Ciruelo's work saw multiple editions, including 1540, 1541, 1544, 1547, 1548, 1551, 1556, and 1557. The first edition was printed in Alcalá, where Ciruelo (1475-1560) held the chair of Thomistic theology. Having served as an Inquisitor in Zaragoza for thirty years, he later became a resident theologian at the cathedral in Salamanca. Ciruelo enjoyed a reputation extending throughout Spain for being a great theologian, and in this treatise he drew from Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas. He became the supreme authority on questions concerning magic and the supernatural. Some specific points he made were that apparitions are not physical bodies but fantasies, and that possession occurs with demons, not with souls of the defunct. "The Reprobación is addressed primarily to the layman who did not read Latin, and Ciruelo's illustrations are often

drawn from the everyday things the ordinary Spaniard would have been familiar with" (Pearson 20). As such, and particularly because it was reprinted so many times, this document would have been accessible to Cervantes.

He also might have seen the equally interesting treatise of Castañega which, along with that of Ciruelo, was a rarity because it was written in the vernacular Spanish. Castañega was a Franciscan friar of the province of Burgos who probably wrote from direct experiences with the Tribunal of the Inquisition for Logroño in the reign of Navarre, but did not include many anecdotes because of the secrecy to which he had been sworn. His treatise is "por desgracia, harto parca y sobria en el relato de casos vivos y hechos concretos, que tanta valía e interés la hubieran dado, pero que deliberadamente aquél omitió, por temor explicable suyo a quebrantar el sigilo inquisitorial" (Amezúa x). Bishop Don Alonso de Castilla had ordered him to write a handbook to serve as a guide for parish priests in the diocese.

The next several important ecclesiastical handbooks written on topics of the supernatural were all in Latin, and thus could not have been read by Cervantes. Francisco de Vitoria, in Relectiones theologicae (1565), speaks of the magic of demons and their capacity to transport physical entities across long distances and even alter the composition of objects occurring in nature. Two important works on demonology were written by two Jesuits, Benito Perer and Martín del Río (1551-1608). Perer's Adversus fallaces et superstitiosas artes, id est, de magia, de observatione somniorum et de divinatione astrologica (1603) confirms that demons appear to

mortals on earth, not souls in torment, according to one popular notion of purgatory. It states that demons cannot create matter or resurrect the dead; in other words, their powers are limited but acknowledged by this author.

Del Río's Disquisitionum magicarum became an authoritative code for theologists and judges. He studied and taught at Valladolid and Salamanca. This treatise, also, attempts to circumscribe the exact powers of devils to help and reward their cohorts: procure honor and dignity by worldly standards, release prisoners from jail, bring darkness, wipe out flocks of animals or enchant them, dry up water, cause earthquakes, and create tempests. It also describes monsters as the physical forms of demons and alleges that witches can, in fact, fly on broomsticks. As far as apparitions, the devil can either create fantastical images or transform the appearance (but not the essence) of physical objects. Del Río describes spectres and catalogs the different types of demons: among others, they may appear in human, giant, or military form. They may also use cadavers to appear to the living or even create corporal forms for the same purpose. The final parts of the book give detailed legal procedures for confessors as well as judges to follow, along with gradations of punishments to be inflicted upon offenders. They discuss real and false apparitions and exorcisms and explored how and why God allowed men to be tormented by evil spirits. His treatise was not, however, accessible to the common person, its Latin being out of reach for all but professors and church officials.

The last treatise appearing publically during the lifetime of Cervantes came in 1608 from Hieronimus Mengus. It was titled

Flagellum demonum. A testament to its longevity appeared in 1699 when a copy of the book was recorded as having been used for black magic: discovered in a bag owned by a conjuror, the treatise became an artifact of the investigation of the Inquisition: "un exorçismo escrito de Ymprenta a forma de Cruz lo escrito, que pareçe ser de vn libro que llaman flaxelum demonum" (Cirac Estopañán 46).

Unfortunately for our purposes, the next treatise did appear in the vernacular, but it was too late, for Cervantes had already died. Gaspar Navarro produced the Tribunal de superstición ladina, printed in Huesca in 1631.

At one of the *autos de fe* in Logroño in 1610, witches were burned, as was typical at these gruesome public displays of church authority. In reaction, Pedro de Valencia wrote to the Inquisitor General, Cardinal D. Bernardo de Sandoval y Rojas, his Discurso sobre las brujas y cosas tocantes a magia. In this discourse, he advised the Cardinal not to allow accounts of the Inquisitorial proceeding to be published for fear that, first of all, they would be too scandalous, and, secondly, that such reports would only induce further offenses by describing previous ones. His advice was followed (Menéndez Pelayo 381-82). Earlier, for the same reason, Ciruelo and other treatise writers had refrained from including concrete examples because they were afraid of propagating the activities they were condemning. Thus all of the treatises described above are helpful to the modern reader who wishes to learn about the Church's official position on demonic activities during the Golden Age. But they are

of little use for providing us with anecdotes or actual instances of the offenses they described.

One of these offenses, oddly enough, was a corruption of the official exorcism ceremony which the Church sanctioned. William A. Christian describes exorcisms of locusts, severe exorcisms which took the form of trials with patron saints called in as witnesses for the prosecution (30). The punishment for the offending insects: excommunication. It was common for fraudulent exorcists to attempt to expel locusts, other epidemics, or even storms from rural farming villages -- all, of course, in exchange for a small fee. When cloud chasers were hired by villagers, these wizards held matches with the clergy.

> The clergy had their own 'legal' prayers and exorcisms to chase the clouds. After prohibiting 'enchanters, fortune-tellers, bewitchers, magicians, and enpsalmers,' the Synodal Constitutions of Toledo of 1566 continue, 'and for this reason we do not prohibit, but on the contrary we order and exhort all clergy of this archdiocese who are responsible for souls: that decently and without scandal for those cases in the form that is in the manuals, they employ the exorcisms approved by the Church.'
> (Christian 30: CS Toledo 1566 [1568])

Ciruelo classifies three differences between genuine and fraudulent exorcists, even for cases concerning human beings instead of the weather. A genuine exorcist adds no ceremonies not already prescribed by the Church, while a fraud adds secret formulae and uses herbs or foul-smelling incense. Of the two types of

exorcist, the sincere one does not allow the devil to speak, immediately commanding him to be silent; the fraud asks the demon for signs, including loud noises upon departure. The true exorcist casts out demons quietly: "amenazándolos con el dedo lanzaba y echaba los demonios y los hacía callar" (Castañega 139). The implication here is that the fraudulent exorcist secretly aids the devil to achieve his purposes of evil propaganda. Ciruelo states that the devil desires to preach and speak publicly to men because then he can inject poison into the hearts of his listeners and lead them to damnation (Ciruelo 266). The devil is compared to a dragon in this passage, yet another example of how demons were imagined as enemies to be fought. The fraudulent exorcist always debated at length with the devil, displaying before the onlookers a routine of questions and answers (Ciruelo 267):

> y todas las veces que los conjuran, hacen muestra que salen uno a uno y se van, mas con licencia para se volver al mesmo cuerpo hasta tal día; y esta licencia toman del mesmo conjurador, y él se la da como su ministro y familiar por vía de partido, y dice que lo hace por mejor sanar y asegurar de allí adelante al paciente, porque no sería tan firme la seguridad ni la sanidad, si primero no sacase aquellos partidos, y no tomase del demonio señal para ello, la cual da y echa por la boca. (Castañega 125-26)

Following a prolonged discussion with the devil, the fraudulent exorcist frequently conducted a lawsuit or a trial, as has already been described in the cases of the locusts (Ciruelo 267). The fraudulent exorcist pretended to force the demon to depart from the

possessed person by way of quarrelling with it and threatening it. Treatise writers accused the illegitimate exorcists of working out set routines in advance with the demons, almost like dress rehearsals, so that both would know their roles so well that on cue a threat from one would elicit a response from the other (Ciruelo 272-73). These fictitious rites, sets of previously-arranged questions and answers, and almost poetic formulae must have appeared quite ludicrous as viewed from the modern perspective. But the dramatic tension of the situation in that time period was only intensified because it was believed that literally, a soul was at stake.

The popular interest of this form of village entertainment increased drastically when the fraudulent exorcists spread the word that the entity inhabiting the crazy person was really the spirit of a dead friend:

> [c]onjúrale que diga quién está dentro (*testigo soy de vista desto que digo*); respóndele que está en aquel cuerpo por príncipe y capitán tal demonio llamado Satanás o Beelcebut, etc., con tantos; y algunas veces dice que están allí con él tales e tantas ánimas de tales hombres que morieron, y señala cuáles, y habla en su nombre dellos, representando sus personas; y si morieron en campo o en batalla, piden que les den a beber como fatigados de sed, y si fueron ahogados en la mar hacen gestos como si echasen agua por la boca, y si morieron de enfermedad habla como enfermo, e otros semejantes engaños pasan. (Castañega 123-24, emphasis mine)

Church officials reprimanded the false exorcists for being so superstitious, especially in the area of the souls of the dead. One

treatise writer affirms that only demons, not souls, can possess people:

> pídenle cuenta y razón como si hablasen con el ánima de hulano, o con el mesmo y afinado, en qué estado está, si está en el Infierno o en el Purgatorio, y si le pueden socorrer con algunos beneficios, y semejantes razones y pláticas pasan, todo lo cual es supersticioso y diabólico, y mani[f]iesto engaño del demonio. (Castañega 125)

The treatise writers, generally skeptics and social critics, reproved those who placed their trust in the illegitimate exorcisms: "[t]odo lo cual es pacto expreso diabólico, y solos los mesmos que son engañados, o los muy simples e ignorantes, no conocerán todo esto ser supersticiosos, y familiaridad e pacto expreso del demonio" (Castañega 126). The most skeptical of the treatise writers, however, never questioned the efficacy of the exorcisms sanctioned by the Church. It was not uncommon for them to claim that in the region where a genuine and saintly exorcist practiced, there were very few possessed persons -- or none at all -- because the devil did not achieve his propagandistic purposes there (Ciruelo 267).

But where there was no such holy officer of the Church presiding, it was believed that God allowed the devil to send these plagues upon the villages so that priests would have an opportunity to confront the forces of evil and emerge victorious for all the people to see (Christian 55). The villagers saw the devil as an adversary to be conquered, and they were ready to use various means, legitimate and illegitimate, to be rid of him (Christian 56). Priests had to proceed with the most extreme caution in these

matters. We must remember that priests were tried by the Inquisition also, not just peasants or the ignorant. This was the era when "a number of reforms were made to sanitize local religious custom, ensure that it was under diocesan control, and eliminate any conflicts with religion as ordained from Rome. To some extent the Inquisition performed this function, and so did parish visits; but it can also be followed through diocesan legislation" (Christian 162). Priests could not afford to succumb to the desires of their parishioners who requested them to perform paganistic, superstitious rites not sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Church.

From 1575 to 1610 in Toledo, one and one-half percent of all cases brought before the Inquisition were related to sorcery (Robbins 475). Statistics are not available for cases involving fraudulent exorcisms, and it must be remembered that legitimate exorcisms were performed without record because they were so common. Exorcists were not tried before the Inquisition because they were not doing anything to which it objected; they were, in fact, upholding the faith by performing signs and wonders as in the time of Christ. Many scholars have proposed that exorcisms were used as propaganda in the Renaissance, and for a discussion of how they were used as weapons among various religious sects, see the later section in this study on persecution texts in the Spanish Golden Age.

Exorcisms were needed when anyone began to manifest symptoms like the ones seen in 1560 in Xante when nuns began to bleat like sheep, tearing their veils and going into convulsions in the

middle of church (Robbins 393). Remigio Noydens, writer of the Golden Age exorcist manual, reports an exorcism in the city of Regia in 1575 of "una señora nobilissima" (92). Ostensibly, his source was Hieronimus (Gerónimo) Mengus. Another such event was publicized enough for Remigion Noydens to know about it:

> dexando varios ejemplos, solo diré que aconteció en el año 1565 con un ministro Calvinista, que viendo, que no se podia averiguar con el demonio, que estava en el cuerpo de un hombre, le hizo meter en un costal, y cargandole muchas piedras, le arroyó en el rio . . . los errores de los hereges de nuestros tiempos. (6-7)

He also writes of an exorcism in 1582 in the city of Bologna, and he mentions an undated exorcism in the city of Colonia which happened near a convent (32). The city of Cologne shows up again in this treatise when Remigio Noydens reports that according to a certain Iacobo Werchio, "avia un demonio por los años de 1550" who resided in that place (259). Another exorcism for which he did not record a date occurred at Epila; the exorcist was the Augustinian Prior of the College of Saint Sebastian, and the demoniac was Geronimo Peix, a *morisco* (23). In a different exorcism, the demons' names were Belial, Asmodeus, Mandilete, Baruquel, and Buenas noches (13). Remigio Noydens writes of a public exorcism in 1605 in Rome in the Church of Saint Vincent and Saint Anastasius, next to the Tiber (29). The demon in this one called himself simply Luzifer. We must remember that Remigio Noydens lived from 1630 to 1685. These events must have been publicized enough for him to know about them

even though they occurred before his time, but during the years when Cervantes lived.

"Writing in 1580, Bodin thought demoniacal possession most common in Spain and Italy" (Robbins 393). It was sometimes intertwined with other popular beliefs, as in a case recorded in the miracle book of Our Lady of Prado in Ciudad Real. The case was not unprecedented, for the treatise writers described how "de Sant Bartolomé y de otros santos y santas se lee que solían tener y mostrar a los demonios presos y atados" (Castañega 139), and relics were also thought to contain special properties of use against demons. But this was the case of a man from Daimiel who was possessed by a devil. He made pilgrimages to various shrines, hoping to be cured of his affliction. He was cured in Ciudad Real in 1580 when the veil around image of Our Lady of Prado was opened (Christian 123: J. de la Jara, Nuestra Señora del Prado, 448).

Thus Cervantes lived "en tiempos que esta maléfica cizaña invadía y señoreaba en las más variadas formas todos los campos de aquella sociedad, y sobre todo el del vulgo, ignorante y crédulo" (Amezúa xi). Most mental disorders and some physical ones, such as epilepsy, were considered to be either possession itself or at least the work of a demon: "[c]reíase . . . que los epilépticos, neurasténicos, histéricos y otros pacientes aquejados de dolencias nerviosas lo estaban por influencia y acción diabólicas" (Amezúa xiv). One treatise writer of the time laments that even natural diseases are attributed to supernatural causes:

> Otros hay que son enfermos de enfermedades naturales no conocidas de los médicos de la tierra, ni destos hay tantos hombres como mujeres, que son enfermas como de alguna especie de manía o flaqueza de celebro o pusilanimidad y desfallecimiento del corazón; o semejantes pasiones ocultas, que muchas veces por no poder conocer la causa de la enfermedad, ni saberles poner el remedio natural que se requiere, dicen que tienen espíritus o demonios, y algunas veces con estas pasiones dicen cosas maravillosas, como con frenesía, conociendo las personas que nunca vieron, o hablando palabras y razones que nunca supieron ni oyeron, como acontecen en los que están soñando, y dicen que ven al demonio, o alguno que está ausente o muerto, y otras semejantes cosas; y con feos meneos y gestos del cuerpo, en tal manera que los que están presentes juzgan que tienen demonios. (Castañega 145-46)

One treatise writer even admits that sometimes what appears to be a demon is actually something else, and therefore consultation with a wise physician is necessary (Ciruelo 269). But he was way ahead of his time. Demon possession was so widely accepted that the designated topic for the homily every year on the third Sunday of Lent was the Gospel story of Jesus casting out demons (Luke 11: 14-26 and Matthew 12:24). Exorcism was a constant element of the baptismal formula, and the same rite was repeated during the blessing of the baptismal water on Holy Saturday. In fact, the same words were repeated during any blessing of holy water, and the sign of the cross was repeated over and over because the cross was considered a frightening symbol to the devil. This "use of the cross as a weapon" against hail, locusts, Moors, and even the Black Death -- all considered signs of demonic interference with human affairs

-- traced its roots to late medieval theology, which championed the cross as a powerful shield for turning back the devil (Christian 184).

Let us examine the contemporaneous descriptions of demoniacs to survey the sights with which Cervantes must have been familiar. Castañega recounts various details of the nonsensical behavior of the demoniac, otherwise known as an "arrepticio":

> el . . . arrepticio . . . aunque algunas veces diga algunas cosas a los otros ocultas . . . nunca, o por maravilla, tiene el juicio claro ni habla con concierto, ni tiene sosiego en su persona . . . aunque algunos particulares más ciegos, alguna vez sin pensar lo que decían, tales palabras soltasen con enojo, como parece en una disensión que hubo entre ellos. (Castañega 142)

The treatise writers were not immune to what we would consider to be superstition either, as in the case of this one who firmly believes that demoniacs' seizures are affected by the movements of the planets:

> a las vueltas de la luna, o mudándose los aspectos della con el sol, o ayuntándose con Saturno, o apartándose dél, más o menos se descubre el demonio en atormentar el cuerpo . . . y esto es porque los cuerpos humanos cuanto a sus disposiciones naturales son subjetos a los movimientos de los cuerpos celestiales, y viendo el demonio estar el celebro . . . más húmido, o el corazón más flaco, o el humor melancólico más enseñoreado . . . así atormenta más en un día que en otro, y en una hora más que en otra; como quien ayuda a la naturaleza a hacer mal. (Castañega 146-47)

The exorcist, to deal with this behavior in the context of this situation, spoke to the demoniac -- or rather, the demon within him -- in the prescribed manner. A successful exorcism could then be celebrated: "[c]on estas, y otras armas de virtudes, caminarà el Exorcista sin temor, y con seguridad, para vencer al comun enemigo, sin usar de otras oraciones y ceremonias" (Remigio Noydens 6).

Remigio Noydens' treatise was the only exorcist manual in the vernacular published at any time close to the era in which Cervantes lived. There were no Spanish-language editions of the Malleus maleficarum. But two exorcist manuals were published in Latin in 1614, the year before the second volume of the Quijote was printed. One of these was the Manuale exorcismorum. The other, Rituale Romanum, provided official ceremonies for interrogating devils during exorcisms. In surprisingly literary language, the priest demanded to know the demon's name and rank, the same information required from a prisoner of war. The demon was supposedly bound in honor to respond. It appears that Michael Hasbrouck, the only critic to have studied Don Quixote's madness in connection with exorcism, cannot read Latin, for he does not cite these two manuals directly. He does, however, rest his case almost completely on these two texts. He also neglects to mention the manual of Remigio Noydens, Práctica de exorcistas. I argue that this text gives us a better idea of the vernacular language being used to describe demoniacs -- words like "lúcidos intervalos" and "encantamientos" -- during the time when Cervantes lived.

I believe Cervantes was influenced in some way by these fragments of cultural dialogues heard in the air all around him.

We must also take into account the influence of supernatural events of other countries in the cultural *milieu* of Spain. D. P. Walker demonstrates Spanish contact with the French exorcisms of the same epoch:

> the Miracle of Laon . . . is the earliest of the large-scale anti-Huguenot exorcisms. . . . [A]ccounts, by three eye-witnesses of the exorcisms, were collected and published in 1578 by Jean Boulaese. . . . Boulaese was extraordinarily active in publicizing the Miracle of Laon. Soon after Charles IX's and Catherine's visit to Laon in August 1566, at which they gave royal approval to the exorcisms and at which Boulaese was present, he went to Spain to tell Philip II about the miracle and give him a copy of the pamphlet. (240)

King Philip II, who reigned from 1555 to 1598, was probably happy to receive the pamphlet, considering the fact that he and Juan de Herrera, the architect of the Escorial, both possessed large collections of occult books (De Armas 7).

But the religious and cultural milieu of Cervantes was not limited to current events, or even literary works. It included paintings as well. An artistic rendition of the *Cartuja* of Granada, painted by Sánchez Cotán (now in the Museum of Seville), concentrates on the details of an exorcism:

> el obseso es el centro de clérigos expectantes, de mozalbetes curiosos y de monaguillos, uno que con miedo se esconde y otro que, entre curioso y atrevido, se le acerca. El exorcista revestido y solemne rocía con agua bendita al paciente que grita y se deshace de su túnica . . . . Valdés Leal . . . pinta también a San Ignacio exorcizando a un endemoniado cuyo violento dinamismo y

> barroco dramatismo le convierten en una hábil materialización del demonio. . . . (Lisón Tolosana 97)

With a king interested in the occult and a population ravished by roaming conjurors and fraudulent exorcists, it is little wonder that the treatise writers became discouraged: "ni . . . Castañega, ni Ciruelo, ni sus discípulos y seguidores lograron atajar la corriente de la superstición, que continuó fluyendo copiosa e irrestañable . . . contagiando a todas las clases sociales, desde las más encumbradas y regias hasta las rústicas y populares, corriente que tan pronto invadía las cocinas lugareñas" (Amezúa xvii-xviii). Superstition remained equally prevalent in the court and the cities. Cervantes could not avoid being influenced by cultural phenomena cherished by some of his readers and virulently polemicized by others: "La marea supersticiosa sube sin cesar, y raros son los novelistas que dejan de beber en sus turbias aguas, para comunicar a sus relatos más interés y asombro" (Amezúa xviii).

Part Two: Religious Climates (Textuality of History)

I. Current Events: Actual Exorcisms, Case Studies in England

As has already been mentioned, between the spring of 1585 and the summer of 1586, six English demoniacs were exorcized by twelve Catholic priests in the houses of various recusants, but mostly in the house of Lord Vaux at Hackney, at the estate of the Earl of Lincoln in Cannon Row at Fulmer and Uxbridge, and in the home of Sir George Peckham of Denham, Buckinghamshire. The chief exorcist was William Weston, alias Edmunds, of the Society of Jesus.[1] Possessed persons included Anthony Tyrell, a Jesuit who deserted his friends during the subsequent investigations;[2] Marwood, Anthony Babington's private servant who subsequently left the country and was never examined by the commissioners; Trayford and Mainy, two young gentlemen, separated by social class from the other demoniacs;[3] Sara and Friswood Williams and Anne Smith -- all maid servants; and Richard Mainy -- 17 years old, supposedly possessed by the devils representing the seven deadly sins, and under suspicion by the government (while passing through Paris, he

---

[1] "Weston did not pretend to deny that he had the power of exorcism, or that he exercised it upon the persons in question, but he did not admit the truth of any of the more ridiculous stories which Harsnet so triumphantly brings forward to convict him of intentional deceit" (Spaldings 69). Weston has been described as giving the subjective "impression of feeble, unpractical piety that one is loth to associate with a malicious impostor" (Spaldings 69).

[2] Witnesses against him referred to Tyrell as "a manifest knave and coward" (many sources).

[3] Witnesses against him referred to Mainy as "as cospicuous a fool" as Tyrell.

had come under the influence of Charles Paget and Morgan). He was examined by the government, which suspected his connection with the Paris Conspirators. The gift of tongues, of real and previously unknown languages, was a prominent feature of these cases. D. P. Walker outlines, with inimitable nuances, the implications of these spectacular events:

> It seems most surprising that for over a year . . . Catholic priests, headed by a Jesuit, could in the south of England successfully conduct exorcisms attended by large numbers of people, not all of them papists -- for the lowest estimate of the conversions achieved by the exorcisms is 500. The Act of 1585 made Jesuits and seminary priests guilty of high treason merely by being in England. In 1581 the Jesuit Edmund Campion had been martyred and Robert Parsons had had to flee the country, and there were several more martyrs in the early 1580's. When Weston arrived in England in 1584, it would not seem an auspicious moment to launch a campaign of conversion by exorcism. The reason why the exorcisms were allowed to go on for so long is that they were regarded by the government as part of the Babington plot, which aimed at the assassination of Elizabeth, the invasion of England by the Spanish, and the installation of Mary Stuart as Queen of Britain. Walsingham knew all about this plot, and held his hand so that his net might catch the biggest fish; and in fact it caught Mary Queen of Scots. Now, the first demoniac exorcized by Weston was a servant of Anthony Babington, who later visited Denham to see the exorcisms, and a leading conspirator in the plot was John Ballard, who was one of the exorcists. It seems highly probable that Weston knew of the plot, and he may, as Harsnett suggests, have regarded his converting exorcisms as preparing the way for its successful outcome. Both the plot and the exorcisms came to an end when, between June and August 1586, everyone concerned was arrested.
>
> The chief performers among the demoniacs were two servant-girls, sisters, Sara and Fid Williams, and a youth Richard Mainey, who had been educated at the English seminary at Rheims. The method of exorcism used had some most unusual features. The patient was bound fast to a chair, was

made to drink a hallowed potion, consisting of oil, sack and rue, and had held close under the nose a dish of burning brimstone. The potion must have been both nauseating and intoxicating, and we may believe Fid Williams' testimony that its bemusing effects induced her to believe that she really was possessed, as did the other demoniacs.

There is no evidence even from these unfavourable witnesses that the priests openly instructed the demoniacs in what to do or say. But they certainly did tell them about the edifying exorcisms on the continent (not specified, but surely Laon and Soissons must have been among them) and about each other's demoniac performances. All the witnesses emphasize that they were anxious to please the priests, and some suggest that the horrible exorcisms were used as a threat or punishment. Richard Mainey, for example, having had a vision of Christ's body while at Mass, and his devil having done some anti-Protestant propaganda, states that, by this conformity to the Fathers' wishes, 'I escaped sometimes (as I thinke) theyr loathsome drinks, and intolerable fumigations.'

The Williams girls, in imitation of Mainey, also had visions confirming the Real Presence. The anti-Protestant propaganda consisted in the devils praising Anglicans, Queen Elizabeth and her courtiers, and claiming them as obedient disciples. The pro-Catholic propaganda was concentrated on the power of relics, especially those of recent English martyrs, whose sanctity was thus demonstrated. . . [R]evulsion was of course attributed to the devil's horror of sacred objects. She [Fid] had already learned to distinguish one relic from another. . . . Sara's devil also did some doctrinal propaganda. . . .

Weston already suspected that the devil was here disguising himself as an angel of light, and this suspicion was confirmed by the final exorcism. . . .

Modu was constrained by Weston to tell the truth about Mainey's visions: they were all false, contrived, with diabolical cunning, to induce Catholics to worship devils, thinking them to be Christ and the Virgin Mary. ("Demonic Possession Used as Propaganda in the Later 16th Century" 243-45)

It seems strange, then, that the most often-cited occurrence of exorcism in the English Renaissance was actually one of the earliest. It certainly created one of the loudest uproars, particularly considering such contemporaneous rumors as the one that claimed Fid Williams went on to become a concubine of Bancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Law 399). Precedents for the exorcisms certainly existed, however, and these would have to include the 1533 episode of Elizabeth Barton, the so-called Maid of Kent. In the Chapel at Aldington, Kent, a priest encouraged her to fake fits and report a cure by the intercession of the Virgin Mary. The priest wanted the chapel to become a shrine and draw financial gain from pilgrims. Before her execution, she confessed: "because the thing which I feigned was profitable to them, therefore they much praised me" (Robbins 95). In 1574 in London, Agnes Bridges, age 11 and Rachel Pindar, age 12, faked possession by vomiting straws and pins: they were known to "spue pins, clowts, &c . . . till the miracles were detected, and they set to open penance" (Scot 132). The girls were exposed and confessed deception. They performed public penance by standing in the pillory as impostors. In 1575 Mildred Norrington of Kent, called the Maid of Westwell, confessed to a similar deception; she publicly performed her fits and mimicry at St. Paul's. In 1579 Elizabeth Orton of Flitshire faked trances, and her public confession was heard at Chester Cathedral in 1582.

Given the multiplicity and variety of these similar cases, the tendency to cite the Catholic Denham exorcisms as the most memorable is only explicable by the fact that the case was re-

opened (and evaluated by Harsnett) just before Shakespeare wrote *King Lear*: one witness was re-examined in May of 1602 (this was one of two who had been examined previously by the commissioners in 1598), while another three were interrogated in April and June of 1602. Sworn statements describing the exorcisms were made before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in 1602 by four demoniacs and one exorcist -- even though the events described had occurred 17 years before. The fact that the evidence from the witnesses was not taken for so long certainly adds to the fictional quality of the accounts, although Harsnett supposedly took information for his account of exorcism of Mainy by Weston from Weston's own account of the matter, a manuscript which has since been lost or destroyed. As for the witnesses, by this point they were "[a]ll of them interested in exonerating themselves from the stigma of having been adherents of a lost cause" (Spalding 69).

This attitude was also prevalent among possessed Protestant adolescents[4] of the period following the Catholic exorcisms, most of whom were exorcised by John Darrell. Darrell (1562-1602), a Protestant who nonetheless admired William Weston, was the most famous English exorcist. His reputation provoked the establishment of Canon 72 (1603), a Puritan document which prohibited exorcisim in the Church of England. His first exorcism occurred in 1586. The

---

4 It is not surprising that most of the demoniacs were children or adolescents, considering that earlier English astrologers had also made use of children when they pretended to correspond with various spirits of the elements, using principles of Rosicrucian philosophy. These astrologers said they could bind to their service and imprison in an object a fairy, sylph, or salamander and compel it both to appear when called and to answer questions. The astrologer did not see the spirit; but supposedly, the child did.

subject was C[K]atherine Wright of Derbyshire who lived at Mansfield, Nottingham on Bridgway lane near Blackwell. After a day of prayer (four o'clock in the morning until noon), at his urging, she accused Margaret Roper of sending the demon Middlecub to possess her. An investigation followed; the Justice of the Peace was one Mr. Fouliamb. When the supposed demoniac admitted to having faked the fits and visions, magistrates threatened Darrell with imprisonment. The girl's motive? Her antics had temporarily made her severe father-in-law treat her kindly.

Darrell conducted no more exorcisms for 10 years, but to keep the public's interest in the supernatural at an acceptably high level, there were the 1593 Warboys Witches. Warboys was actually a place, and this was the title of the pamphlet describing the events. Among other idiosyncracies, this case offered to the public three familiar spirits named Pluck, Catch, and White who were supposedly invoked by Mother Samuel, the chief accused witch. There were also the Chelmsford Trials of 1597, which featured such illustrious characters as Ellen Smith's white dog, her Great Dick in a wicker bottle, her Little Dick in a leather bottle, and her Willet in a wool-pack.[5]

---

[5] These familiar spirits, commonly called familiars, had appeared before on the English supernatural front in the 1582 case of the St. Osyth's (also spelled Osees/Oses) witches. This trial was the immediate occasion for the publication of Reginald Scot's famous treatise; he attended the hearings and described them thoroughly. There was also a pamphlet printed which gave details of the case -- probably the equivalent of a modern-day tabloid. The familiars encountered were reported as follows:

- Females who could maim: Tyffin, a white lambe (spied on people) and Pigine, a black toad (made a child sick).
- Males who could kill: Tissey (Tittey), a grey Cat and Iacke, a black cat (plagued a neighbor's wife).
- Others: Robin, Jack, Will, and Puppet.

Meanwhile, the next phase of Darrell's career began with the cases first of the Burton Boy (Thomas Darling), then of the Starkies, and finally of Will Somers. The Burton Boy case, marking his second debut into 16th-century tabloids, took place at Burton-upon-Trent. Then in 1597 the children of Nicholas Starkie (variable spelling: Starchie) in Lancashire took on fits and melancholy. The fraudulent exorcist Hartley, another minister who had exorcised them previously, had supposedly imparted a demon to them. Later John Darrell took over the case. In November of 1597 came Darrell's most celebrated case, that of Will Somers, the Nottingham Boy. Darrell's assistant, George More, was minister at Nottingham at the time of the Will Somers case. This final case resulted in Darrell's being banned by the Archbishop of York in 1599. Samuel Harsnett, who has been described as a violent Protestant and almost maniacal exorcist-hunter, had won the battle begun with his intention of exposing Parson Darrell. The latter was questioned at Lambeth Palace, pronounced an impostor, defrocked, and made to serve a one-

---

- Two toades, Tom and Robbyn.
- The familiars associated with Elizabeth Bennet: Suckin, a black Dogge and Lierd (Lyerd), a red Lion or hare.
- Six blackbirds and rats.
- Two colts.
- Sotheons Hercules, Jack, and Mercury.

Similarly, the following familiars appeared to be permanent residents of Essex, as is demonstrated by two tallies spread five years apart:

1583 in Essex:	1588 in Essex:
Pygine mole	Lightfoot cat
Russoll gray cat	Lunch toad
Dunsott dun dog	Makeshift weasel

Also appearing there were Swein, Rorie, MakHector, and Robert the Rule.

year jail term. The rest of his life was spent in obscurity, although some sources indicate that he died in prison in 1602.[6]

Almost all of the possessed adolescents of this time period either were exorcised by Darrell or turned to information circulating about him -- through pamphlets, adult conversations, and sermons -- for the current nomenclature being used in these cases.[7] In 1597 William Somers studied the popular pamphlet about the Warboys Witches in order to learn how to manifest the appropriate symptoms of possession. Also in 1597 he went to observe Thomas Darling in his fits to learn how to mimic his convulsions. In 1604 there was Thomas Harrison, the Northwich Boy. The last relevant case of this time period also occurred in 1604 and involved Anne Gunter, who used the same Warboys Witches pamphlet to learn how a bewitched child should act. This 14-year-old of North Moreton (Berkshire) accused an old woman of bewitching her. The old woman was acquitted, but Anne was examined by a doctor -- who diagnosed hysteria from natural causes. Anne confessed she had counterfeited possession and was charged with conspiracy, along with her father, by Sir Edward Coke, Attorney General. This incident led to King James' statute which seemed to eliminate the governmental and public tolerance for subsequent cases of possession. In three years (1598-1601), more than a dozen accounts had been published of the Somers case alone; there was even a ballad circulating about it, which Harsnett quotes partially. Thus ended an era of virulent

---

[6] Paraphrased from Robbins.

[7] Demonology was "a phase of religious belief that acquired peculiar distinctness and prominence during Shakspere's lifetime - more perhaps, than it ever did before, or has done since" (Spalding 11).

pamphlet writing, ecclesiastical soul-searching, growing discomfort for the government, and crowd-attracting public exorcisms. To demonstrate how the exorcism craze seemed to spread through the country like a grass fire, the following charts -- easily accessible for quick reference later -- provide the basic information in the format of case studies.

DATE	October 13, 1574
DEMONIAC	Mildred Norrington of Kent, called the "Maid of Westwell": "Mildred, the base daughter of Alice Norrington, and now seruant to William Sponer of Westwell in the countie of Kent, being of the age of seventéene yeares" (Scot 128)
EXORCIST	"there came to the same Sponers house *Roger Newman minister of Westwell* (vicar), *John Brainford minister of Kenington* . . . who . . . then commanded sathan . . . to speake with such a voice as they might understand, and to declare from whence he came" (Scot 128)
PLACE	Westwell in Kent, six miles from where Reginald Scot dwelled
SYMPTOMS	- She "was possessed with Sathan in the night and daie . . ." (Scot 128) - The demon threatened to tear her in pieces - "Sathans voice did differ much from the maids voice, and all that he spake, was in his owne name" (Scot 128)
POTENTIAL MOTIVE FOR COUNTERFEIT	Ventriloquist

DEMONS' NAMES	- The demon, when asked the name of the one who had sent him, insisted: "Old Alice, old Alice" - Old Alice called him "Partener" - She had kept him for twenty years in two bottles under a wall behind her house in the ground - He fetches her meat, drink, and corn from others' houses (families: Petmans, Farmes, Millers, Fullers) - He cast her into the water of a moat ("mote") - He came to her in the likeness of two birds - He bragged that he had killed Edward and Richard Ager and Wolton's wife at Dig (Scot 129)
OUTCOME	- She was convented before M. Thomas Wotton of Bocton Malherbe and Justice M. George Darrell, Esq. - "after due triall she shewed hir feats, illusions and transes, with the residue of all hir miraculous works" in the presence of many (Scot 131) - She confessed to deception - She publicly performed her fits and mimicry at St. Paul's
POINTS OF INTEREST	An account was written by many witnesses who signed their names at the end

DATE	Feb. 27, 1596 (beginning of symptoms)
DEMONIAC	Thomas Darling, age 14, "The Boy of Burton" (a devil also possessed a red and white dog named Minny)
EXORCIST	May 27, 1596 marked the arrival of the notorious exorcist John Darrell (later accused of being a ventriloquist)
PLACE	Derbyshire, at Burton-on-Trent
SYMPTOMS	- The reading aloud of the Bible -- especially the gospel of John, chapter 1 -- threw him into frantic convulsions - Became possessed while hunting in the woods - During fits, saw green cat, green angels, Mother Red Cap, toads, a man out of a chamber pot, flames of hell, and the open heavens - The boy was sick for three months - Partly paralyzed
POTENTIAL MOTIVE FOR COUNTERFEIT	- A physician suggested he was bewitched - Darrell was accused of faking and coaching him
DEMONS' NAMES	- demon: Brother Glassap - demon: Brother Radulphus - The demons threatened to double Christians' tongues
OUTCOME	- Accused Alice (Alse) Gooderidge and her mother Elizabeth Wright of being witches - Alice -- the "Witch of Stapenhill" -- was sentenced to death but died in prison - The exorcism worked, but only temporarily (three months) - Pamphlet war: Samuel Harsnett examined the boy, who admitted fraud, but Darrell argued that it was a false confession extorted after threats and prison
POINTS OF INTEREST	- A pamphlet about the events was written by John Denison; this tract (1597) is now in the Lambeth Palace Library

DATE	1597
DEMONIAC	Starkies (Starchies) Ann - 9 - "a certaine fearefull starting and pulling together of her body" John - 10 - "compelled to shout " on way to school (Summers History 227) Jane Ashton - 30 fits Dr. Dee summoned 3 young wards: Margaret Hardman, 14 Elinor H., 10 Elizabeth Ellin Holland + visitor, Margaret Byrom of Salford, 33 + servant, Johan Smyth
EXORCIST	John Darrell and George More (minister of church in Derbyshire) exorcised successfully
PLACE	at Cleworth in Lancashire
SYMPTOMS	"they waxed worse and worse, falling into often and extreame fits" (Darrell A True Narration 1) "All or most of them joyned together in a strange and supernatural loud whupping that the house and grounde did sounde therwith again" (Darrell A True Narration 9)
POTENTIAL MOTIVE FOR COUNTERFEIT	Their father consulted Edmund Hartley, a famous conjuror who quieted the kids with charms but insisted on more money and started a quarrel

OUTCOME	- Justice of the Peace Maister Hopwood committed Hartley to the assizes because from his kissing and continually embracing all the possessed, it was thought he had sent them a spirit- "breathed the divell" (Darrell True Narration 3) - Hartley was accused of drawing magic circles on the ground (an action he denied) - Hartlay couldn't say the Lord's Prayer - He was convicted of felony and hanged at Lancaster, but the rope broke

DATE	November 1597
DEMONIAC	William Somers, the “Boy of Nottingham” Nicknames: Bill, Will
EXORCIST	John Darrell and George More On November 5 Darrell was invited to take command
PLACE	Nottingham
SYMPTOMS	- “He would speak with his mouth scarce moving; and when they looked, his tongue would seem drawn down his throat” (Summers 119) - “did use such strang and idle kind of gestures in laughing, dancing, and such like lighte behaviour, that he suspected to be madd” (Summers 228) - “he tore; he foamed; he wallowed; his face was drawn awry; his eyes would stare and his tongue hang out” (Summers 228) - Then three signs: -crying -rending -lying as dead for 15 minutes

POTENTIAL MOTIVE FOR COUNTERFEIT	- William Somers disliked his apprenticeship to a town (Bellyn) musician, Anthonie Brackenberie - Twice ran away from his new master, Thomas Porter of Nottingham - Wanted his new master to turn him away - Pretended to be sick - Had taken a chill in water and vomited - Some years before, he had met John Darrell at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, where both had lived - Now neighbors suspected possession and brought copies of the Witches of Warboys pamphlet to compare symptoms - He claimed bewitchment by an old woman on the way to Bramsgrove because he wouldn't give her a copper hat band he'd found - Darrell told Bill he was similar to the Burton Boy and described Darling's hysterics: -gnashing teeth -writhing - "their faces stood backward, drawing their mouths away, foaming" (Summers History 118) - Darrell said the boy suffered for the sins of Nottingham, called a public fast day, and ordered all men to refrain from sex with their wives that night; if they obeyed, then "the next day they would see strange things" (Summers History 119) - Darrell preached a sermon detailing 14 signs of possession AND 3 signs of deliverances, which Bill demonstrated - Somers immediately appeared to have recovered, but John Darrell hinted at possible recurrences and took up a collection - Darrell was chosen preacher at St. Mary's

OUTCOME	- Bill accused 13 women of bewitching him into demonic possession but did not have a fit every time one of them approached - John Darrell's sister-in-law Mary Cowper accused Alice Freeman as a witch - Alice said she was pregnant and could not be arrested - A "public scandal" ensued (Summers History 228) - John Darrell said she was pregnant from a devil - Alice's brother, an alderman, told the town council of Somers' deception and had John Darrell taken to a workhouse - John Darrell insisted that Bill was possessed - March 1598: A public inquiry held -- Bill insisted on his possession and the examiners were convinced - Nottingham assizes: At the trial of the accused witches, Bill confessed: "by working the spittle in his mouth, he foamed till the froth ran his chin" (Summers History 119) - March 1598: Upon report of the Archdeacon of Derby, the Archbishop of York appointed a commission to inquire into the facts - Examination of Somers and John Darrell by the Court of High Commission: -Archbishop of Canterbury -Bancroft, Bishop of London, who controlled the exam (Harsnett = his chaplain) -two of the Lord Chief Justices -others, including the Master of Requests 34 of 44 witnesses = John Darrell's friends - Will admitted John Darrell had taught him Katherine Wright's tricks and made him practice many of them - More and John Darrell were imprisoned and deposed from ministry - Darrell's father-in-law Robert Cowper testified against him - The whole case was reported by Harsnett in 1599 (His 1603 book contained 324 pp.) - Many pamphlets were sold and distributed

POINTS OF INTEREST	- Nottingham assizes: Lord Chief Justice Sir Edmund Anderson, a firm believer in witchcraft, was shocked at this fraud - His views "may be regarded as an expression of recognized Anglican authority" (Summers History 230) - Harsnett = mouthpiece of ideas of Bancroft and persecutor of Catholics - Bancroft: in 1604 became Archbishop of Canterbury

DATE	1603
DEMONIAC	Mary Glover, daughter of a merchant on Thames St.
EXORCIST	Five clergymen attempted exorcism (Puritans proving their power over the devil); among them were: - Stephen Bradwell - John Swan (supposed triumph) Event "made considerable noise at the time" (Summers History 232)
PLACE	London
SYMPTOMS	Bewitched by Elizabeth Jackson (Old Mother Jackson)
POTENTIAL MOTIVE FOR COUNTERFEIT	After her deliverance, John Swan took her home to be his servant "least Satan should assault her again." (Summers History 232)
OUTCOME	Elizabeth Jackson, after her indictment, was committed by Sir John Crook, the Recorder of London, and sentenced: was pilloried four times and spent one year in prison BUT King James (suspicious) sent Dr. Edward Jorden, a physician, to examine her; he detected her imposture
POINTS OF INTEREST	This performance influenced Bancroft as he drew up article 72 of the 1604 Canons (Summers History 232)

DATE	1604
DEMONIAC	Anne Gunter and 7 members of her household
EXORCIST	- John Dee asked for advice, but refused to be involved - His curate, Matthew Palmer, questioned Hartley - Anne's father, a prominent gentleman, brought in Oxford physicians and experts in bewitchment
PLACE	Clayworth Hall, Leigh, Lancashire
SYMPTOMS	Medical diagnosis by Edward Jorden: - "falling sickness" (epilepsy) - "suffocation of the mother" (hysteria) Medical diagnosis failed to satisfy witnesses - many said her garters (unassisted) tied themselves in knots like chitterlings Symptoms: swellings of body, foaming at mouth, temporary blindness and deafness; vomited pins; sneezed, voided, and exuded simple domestic objects (during the fits, pins were taken out of her breast)
POTENTIAL MOTIVE FOR COUNTERFEIT	Anne forced three women to recite the same charm invented by the Throgmorton girls: "In the name of the Son and Holy Ghost, so be it. Amen. I, __ , charge thee white toad, to come out of thee, Anne Gunter"
BEWITCHERS' NAMES	Anne blamed three witches: Agnes and Mary Pepwell and Elizabeth Gregory (appeared to her spectrally)

OUTCOME	- April 1605, fraud revealed - Henry Cotton, Bishop of Salisbury, discovered fraud by marking the pins which she later vomited Also active in exposing fake: - Rev. Richard Neile - Richard Haydock, called the "Sleeping Preacher", at Oxford - Chief Justice of the King's Bench - August 27, 1605: King James examined her and sent her to Samuel Harsnett - She confessed to Harsnett and Jorden that her father had encouraged her faking
POINTS OF INTEREST	- Fits attracted widespread attention - King James paid 300 pounds for the proceedings - This case marked the first time a medical doctor was consulted in a case of possession

T. K. Oesterreich, in an essay on "The Nature of the State of Possession," distinguishes between "spontaneous" and "artificial and voluntary" possession. It is impossible to determine now, some 400 years later, which type of possession each demoniac at Denham, for instance, experienced.

It is possible, however, to speculate, and many scholars have categorized most of the Renaissance exorcisms as "artificial and voluntary." To understand how these possessions came about, it is necessary to explore the social authority invested in the exorcists and the influence they could exercise (no pun intended) to convince their 'patients' that their ailments had supernatural causes or that they had ailments at all. The Catholics were, after all, not the only ones who performed exorcisms. Many Anglican ministers, especially those with unorthodox inclinations, engaged in this practice as well. Hoeniger explains the trust placed in these self-appointed divine ambassadors as, in part, a function of pragmatism: "a critical shortage of educated people who could assist the sick developed in parts of the country. Concerned Protestant priests and ministers received strong encouragement from local bishops to step into the breach" (Hoeniger 24).

Shakespeare's knowledge of current events probably also extended beyond the confines of his own country. Michel Foucault discusses the proliferation of literature of "fools" and other mad protagonists in many European nations in the late Renaissance. The Dutchman of Maidstone's counterfeit was discovered, but his "miracles were imprinted and published" in London in 1572 with the following title:

> A verie wonderfull and strange miracle of God, shewed upon a Dutchman of the age of 23. yeares, which was possessed of ten diuels, and was by Gods mightie prouidence dispossessed of them againe, the 27. of Januarie last past (1572). (Scot 132)

The most pronounced influence on English popular culture at this time may well have come from France. But news of these sensational occurrences spread rapidly throughout the Continent, as Walker explains: "the Miracle of Laon . . . is the earliest of the large-scale anti-Huguenot exorcisms. . . . [A]ccounts, by three eye-witnesses of the exorcisms, were collected and published in 1578 by Jean Boulaese. . . . Boulaese was extraordinarily active in publicizing the Miracle of Laon. Soon after Charles IX's and Catherine's visit to Laon in August 1566, at which they gave royal approval to the exorcisms and at which Boulaese was present, he went to Spain to tell Philip II about the miracle and give him a copy of the pamphlet" (240). Such scandalous news most certainly would have reached England in a similar fashion. Even if such reports crossed the Channel in pamphlets such as the one mentioned here, Shakespeare's knowledge of French is apparent from two scenes in *Henry V* (3.4 and 5.2), and he would have been able thus to collect relevant details for future writing projects.

But his primary source for sensational gossip must have been the exorcisms being conducted near his own back yard. Assuming that Shakespeare was living in or around London when some of these events happened there (such as the Glover and Bridges/Pinder cases), he would have inadvertently picked up bits and snatches of

conversations about them. It must be remembered that these events were the talk of the town. Scot writes of the frauds which were uncovered, "[a] great manie other such miracles, have beene latelie printed, wherof diverse have béene bewraied: all the residue doubtles, if triall had béene made, would have béene found like unto these" (Scot 133). Whether he read the broadsides which New Historicists would compare to our tabloids, partook in the gossip at pubs and taverns he may have frequented, or simply kept his finger on the pulse of the talk of literary London, Shakespeare could not have escaped the reverberations of these incidents even if he had wanted to. It is reasonable to assume that he would not have wanted to, considering the fact that he was interested enough in the subject matter of Samuel Harsnett's treatise to peruse it carefully. But in the following section, I shall support my argument by demonstrating that *any* citizen not completely impervious to his or her surroundings would have absorbed a few details of these cases.

Part Two: Religious Climates (Textuality of History)
II. Political Implications of These Events for These Authors: The Inquisition and Cervantes

In 1500 the first *auto de fe* for books was ordered by Cisneros, and in it were destroyed over a million volumes. In 1558 another *auto de fe* for books was held in Valladolid. The books burned in this other type of *auto de fe* -- in which books, not people, were burned -- resulted in such a great loss to the academic and antiquarian worlds that we now have only rare examples of only a few of those books that were destroyed. The Index of Valdés made the possession of prohibited books a crime punishable by death and urged extreme caution upon the Inquisitors concerning books published in the vernacular Spanish, for the reason that they would reach a much larger audience (Olmos García 53); and in 1530, "el inquisidor general Alonso de Manrique ordena la visita de las bibliotecas públicas y privadas en busca de los libros sospechosos" (Olmos García 48). Denunciation to the Inquisition brought scandal to one's family. Neighbors turned each other in to the authorities, and it has been estimated that the Holy Office employed over 20,000 spies, called "familiares," among them Lope de Vega. Then in 1562 it was even announced that death would be the penalty for printers and book sellers who failed to obtain the required licenses (Olmos García 55).

The sixteenth Rule of the Council of Trent had prohibited the printing, sale, or ownership of books which attacked religious officials or orders -- in other words, as in England, all satire (Olmos

García 57). It instructed that literature should be produced for moral purposes, not subversive ones. Quevedo renounced authorship of the *Buscón* instead of taking responsibility for a book which the Inquisition condemned. The following passage describes the strange festivity accompanying a public announcement of the latest index of prohibited and expurged books:

> la publicación de los índices o catálogos se organizaba a manera de un espectáculo que se insertaba en los regocijos que se ofrecían al pueblo y a los que asistían todas las autoridades religiosas y civiles . . . Al frente del desfile, que recorría las calles, previo pregón con tambores y atabales, iba la música. En el sermón que acompañaba la lectura de las reglas del índice se incitaba al público a la denuncia en nombre de la fe.
> (Olmos García 101)

Such was the print culture in which Cervantes lived and worked. Cervantes has been regarded by many critics as an unorthodox social reformer, but his position on most religious matters -- probably tainted by fear of the Holy Inquisition -- is scrupulously orthodox. I do not agree with the extremist who sees Cervantes "participando en los combates de su tiempo" (Olmos García 13) and claims that he "está imbuido de ideas y aspiraciones reformadoras" (Olmos García 72). And I certainly do not agree that Cervantes tried to "juzgar con sinigual severidad el Tribunal de la Fe" (Olmos García 44). Even this same critic must admit that

> Cervantes, desde su más tierna infancia, que por lo demás ha transcurrido en la estrechez, si no en la mayor miseria, ha vivido la atmósfera de terror imperante, en particular en los años 1558-1570, en que se quema o persigue a ilustres humanistas acusados de luteranismo

> y aparecen los índices de libros prohibidos que más habían de influir en el rumbo que estaba tomando la vida espiritual española. (Olmos García 43)

And Cervantes had other, more personal reasons to fear the Inquisition, for he had been excommunicated from the Church and had suffered various years in prison. Cervantes himself tells us that the *Quijote* was born in prison.

With the more traditional scholars, I see Cervantes as fitting into "la absoluta conformidad de lo que describen poetas y novelistas con lo que arrojan las causas inquisitoriales y los libros de los teólogos" (Menéndez Pelayo 387). In questions of legitimacy and authority, "parece andar Cervantes con los mismos cuidados y miramientos que llevaba a todo lo que rozaba lo religioso" (Castro 165). Castro continues:

> cuanto en Cervantes roza de cerca o de lejos la materia religiosa debe ser considerado con cuidadosa atención. No para buscar misterios o sutilezas, sino justamente para aclarar esos hechos, relacionándolos con el complicado ambiente de la cerrazón inquisitorial, y por el cual Cervantes se muestra tan afectado. (166)

I think the critics who insist that Cervantes had a social agenda are straining to see more in the literature than is there to be found. They rationalize the stretch by claiming to explain contradictions they see in the Cervantes corpus. But to claim to divine Cervantes' religious beliefs from his literature written for publication is almost insulting to his genius, to his great capacity to hide his personal emotions when he engaged in professional activity.

Some critics, who insist on the heterodoxy of Cervantes, think that as he writes, he

> denuncia la violencia en todas sus formas, celebra la libertad, combate la corrupción y satiriza los abusos de las instituciones de represión civiles o religiosas. . . . [A] tener que escapar al escollo de la censura, le obligó a crear un lenguaje nuevo . . . valerse de artificios para no verse reducido, como tantos otros, al silencio. (Olmos García 13, 21)

These scholars garner examples from various works of Cervantes to support their less than plausible theories. In the *Persiles* (book 2, chapter 9), Zenotia gives a speech which appears to express fear toward the Inquisition. Doubtless, it does; but there is also a good dramatic reason for the inclusion of this speech, not necessarily a political one. Cervantes may seem to ridicule one facet of popular religious beliefs, again in *Persiles and Sigismunda*, in which a woman pilgrim progresses through an annual itinerary of shrines. Descouzis and others have made much of the famous sentence spoken by Don Quixote: "[c]on la iglesia hemos dado, Sancho" (II, 100). It is true that Don Quixote does not attend Catholic mass, and if he were to do so, he would come in contact with sacred objects. Actually, this detail fits rather well into the argument that he is a demoniac because possessed persons were notorious for avoiding sacred places or objects. The comment may also reflect Cervantes's own excommunicated status. But I do not think the comment is a code for a massive attack the knight and squire intend to launch on the Church.

There are actually numerous references to support the other side of the argument, the side which sees Cervantes as preeminently orthodox. After viewing maese Pedro's monkey, Don Quixote pronounces: "estoy maravillado cómo no le han acusado al Santo Oficio" (II, 237). In a similar instance, in the *cabeza encantada* episode, it is significant that Don Antonio reports the toy directly to the Inquisitors (*Quijote* II, 508). A blatantly orthodox position is taken by Sancho when he tells Ricote, "haría traición a mi rey en dar favor a sus enemigos" (II, 452). True, he does not turn him in, but he does not aid him either. Olmos García tries to twist this example to make Sancho into a heretic for not denouncing Ricote: "[e]n la época de Cervantes no sólo corre grave peligro el que es 'hereje', sino también el que lo defiende y hasta el que no lo denuncia" (86). But I think the primary meaning of the passage is clear enough. The barber, speaking of *Orlando Furioso*, a book receiving the disapproval of the Church, admits, "[p]ues yo le tengo en italiano, mas no le entiendo", and the priest responds orthodoxically, "[n]i aun fuera bien que vos le entendiérades" (I, 114). Whenever there may seem to the reader that there is an egregious omission -- of, say, a particular title in Cervantes's enumerations of the books in Don Quixote's library -- perhaps it is such "que el motivo no es otro sino que la Inquisición se había pronunciado sobre ese autor, lo que significa que en los medios literarios se hablaría de ello y Cervantes lo conocería" (Castro 165). But this is only conjecture. For another concrete example of Cervantes's orthodoxy, many critics refer to a passage in which he glibly repeats a standard dogma about works of charity: "las obras de caridad que se hacen tibia y flojamente no

tienen mérito ni valen nada" (II, 320). Cervantes's many Biblical references also show, at the very least, his orthodox religious background. Eduardo Urbina believes that Cervantes was orthodox in his approaches to most controversial topics (lecture notes). If Cervantes was at all heterodox, I believe the only traces to be found in his literature are those not of parody, but of terror and silence.

But in an atmosphere of so much terror, why did Cervantes want to specify the enemy of Don Quixote? And why did he choose a Biblical personage -- one which would be more closely scrutinized by the Inquisitors -- among so many other mythical figures and supernatural forces to play the role of the enemy of his protagonist? One obvious answer would be that he needed to demonstrate his orthodoxy by choosing the same adversary the Church would have chosen -- and, in fact, did choose -- to fight, through propagandistic exorcisms designed to enhance public support for its image. Another obvious response is that Cervantes, in the Catholic Spain of the Golden Age, was surrounded by reminders of hell and the king of hell. Carmelo Lisón Tolosana traces the roots of these reminders to the Middle Ages: "¿[a]trae a nuestros escritores el tema de la encarnación diabólica en el cuerpo humano? . . . ya antes había atraído a Berceo y Juan Manuel" (97). Juan Manuel had written in the Example XL of *El Conde Lucanor* (1335) about the *Siniscal* of Carcassona: "'[a]caesció que, dende a pocos días, que fue una mujer demoniada en la villa, et dizía muchas cosas maravillosas, porque el diablo, que fablava en ella, sabía todas las cosas fechas et aun las dichas'. . . . La endemoniada sirve al demonio, que casi todo lo sabe, de vehículo de comunicación" (Lisón Tolosana 97). Diego Pérez de

Valdivia, in his *Aviso de gente recogida* (1585), dedicated 26 chapters to analyzing the transformations of Satan.

Cervantes was probably fascinated with what Foucault would call the forbidden fruit of demonic wisdom. Cervantes's *Gitanilla* recited psalms resembling conjurations in their rhythmical forms and folk origins. The action of the *Persiles* occurs in the territory of enchantresses and werewolves. Incidentally, the description of these horrific apparitions uses the same word for "enchanter" which I argue is used similarly in the *Quijote*: "de entrambos géneros hay maléficos y encantadores. . . . lo que puedo alcanzar es, que todas estas transformaciones son ilusiones del demonio" (book I, chapter 8). The talking animals and the witch Cañizares in *Coloquio de los perros* certainly reside in the realm of the supernatural. As for the *cabeza encantada* episode (*Quijote* II, 508), Jones has argued that it had magical, oracular, or even diabolical resonance for contemporaneous readers.

Cervantes demonstrated an affinity for mad protagonists -- consider his novela *El licenciado Vidriera*, in which the protagonist believes himself to be made of glass -- but also a deliberate affinity for silence. His metacommentary often contains this recurring theme. Some critics have debated whether he chose the stylistic device of Cide Hamete Benengeli, the author of the discovered manuscript, as a way of affording himself some measure of protection by distancing himself and his personal opinions from his material. He would certainly have known that according to Ciruelo and other treatise writers presenting the official view, it was considered very dangerous for Christians to hear the ideas that

the devil revealed through the lips of a possessed person (Ciruelo 268). Cervantes probably followed the model of these earlier writers who had found ways of treating the same subject matter that interested Cervantes in a form that the authorities considered appropriate.

Américo Castro's assessment of Cervantes's attitude toward the Inquisition was that he was neither an informer, like Lope de Vega, nor a progressive liberal. Instead, he describes Don Quixote's creator as "el literato que hubo en España de carácter más abierto a las influencias universales" (255). Considering the frequency with which the words "peligro" (danger) and "temor" (fear) were used by humanists of his age (Olmos García 51), he may have presented madness in the official way or even parodied the exorcisms carefully. We do not know whether he might have satirized the institution of exorcism if he had not been restricted by the Inquisitorial Big Brother. The challenge he faced was to find a way to use exorcist motifs in ways which would not be interpreted as satirical. If he intended satire at all, I believe his overarching purpose was to produce laughter by exercising his skill as a professional writer. I do not think he appropriated the terminology of exorcism with an ulterior purpose of social reform. Reading occult literature condemned by the Inquisition was a way to become one of "los endemoniados o poseídos y atormentados del demonio" (Castañega 139). Cervantes as orthodox simply allowed Don Quixote's "sin" of reading heretical books -- those condemned by the Inquisition -- to produce its natural consequences: madness and possession.

Part Two: Religious Climates (Textuality of History)
II. Political Implications of These Events for These Authors: British Tavern Talk

Just as today, few American citizens could be found who could not provide a snippet of evidence from the Simpson murder trials, so during the peak of the exorcism years, few English citizens could have been found who could not have repeated the latest sensational detail of the exorcisms. Then as today, laws affecting all citizens -- as well as specific personal connections to issues or persons involved -- made it impossible for the common person (let alone the educated one) to ignore completely these highly-publicized trials. Obviously, this comparison is blatantly New Historicist in its insistence on the impossibility of viewing Renaissance cultures without seeing them through the lens of our own society. But we can always attempt to eliminate the barrier of this lens, even if we are confident at the outset that the attempt will never succeed entirely. A letter from Pilkington, the Bishop of Durham, to Archbishop Parker, written in 1564, gives us some idea of how an Elizabethan himself viewed the dawning of the exorcist era:

> among other things that be amiss here . . . in Blackburn there is a fantasticall (and as some say, lunatic) young man, which says that he has spoken with one of his neighbours that died four years since, or more. Divers times he says he has seen him, and talked with him, and took with him the curate, the schoolmaster, and other neighbours, who all affirm that they see him. These things be so common here, that none in authority will

> gainsay it, but rather believe and confirm it, that everybody believes it. If I had known how to examine with authority, I would have done it. (Spalding 54)[1]

The frustration expressed here gives us some notion of how politically charged the atmosphere was becoming, even as early as the date of this letter. The issues being foregrounded were nothing new for these ecclesiastical officials; ordinances against witchcraft were at least as old as Pope Innocent's bull of 1484, which affected English citizens in the days before the break with the Roman Catholic Church. This bull describes the modes and ceremonies it outlaws, and each one of these is declared a felony. The offender is also denied benefit of clergy. The effect of this papal bull was to widen the scope for enforcement because it also included a clause that demonstration of ulterior motive (i.e., to harm someone or his property) was no longer necessary for prosecution.

Henry VIII was suspicious and fearful of the supernatural,[2] but the new Anglican church under Edward VI gradually adopted a different stance on some of these issues to define itself in opposition to the Catholic authority from which it was separating. True, a statute of 1547 revoked a previous act of 1542, making witchcraft a felony. But during this same time period, "[i]n England baptismal exorcism was retained in the First Prayer Book of 1549,

---

[1] Spalding took this excerpt from the Parker Correspondence, number 222 (Parker Society).

[2] King James later claimed of this era that "moe Ghosts and spirites were seene, nor tongue can tell, in the time of blinde Papistrie in these Countries, where now by the contrarie, a man shall scarcely all his time here once of such things" (K. James 54).

but by 1552, owing to the authority of Martin Bucer, we find it entirely eliminated" (Summers 231).[3]

Eventually, though, the new Protestants did not find themselves so terribly far away from the Catholics on the issue of exorcism; Tyndale believed in actual possession of the human body by devils, and his opinion reflected that of the majority of those in power at the beginning of the English Reformation. Bullinger joined Tyndale in acting upon an identical belief, except that he limited the potential applicant pool for demoniacs to include only sinners and Epicures whom God wished to reprimand. From 1550 on, bishops included questions on sorcery in episcopal visitations. One of the Articles of Enquiry of 1559 asks church wardens and parishioners "[w]hether you know any that do use charms, sorcery, enchantments, invocations, circles, witchcrafts, soothsaying, or any like crafts or imaginations invented by the Devil?" (Robbins 156-57). In 1562 under Elizabeth, a formal statute was passed against sorcery as penal in itself, and the potential offenders included those who used enchantments.

It is essential to remember just how closely ecclesiastical and civil authorities were intertwined during this era. In a classic intersection of the two, around 1560 Bishop John Jewell preached a sermon before Queen Elizabeth at Oxford in which he informed her, "[i]t may please your grace to understand that witches and Sorceries, within these last four years, are marvellously increased

[3] "The first Prayer-book of Edward VI. contained the Catholic form of exorcism for driving devils out of children, which was expunged upon revision, the doctrine of obsession having . . . triumphed over the older belief" (Spalding 123).

within your Grace's realm." He said that her subjects "pine away even unto death, their color fadeth, their flesh rotteth, their speech is benumbed, their senses are bereft. Wherefore, your poor subjects' most humble petition unto your highness is that the laws touching such malefactors may be put in due execution."[4] By some counts, not less than thirty thousand persons were executed in England for crimes of sorcery and witchcraft, and among them were dukes and lords. Those who were not executed suffered an equivalent fate because "[i]n the fetid state of the common prisons, mere dens of misery and disease, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries . . . a lifelong incarceration was equivalent to a capital sentence" (Summers, introduction to Discouerie xx).

Such surprising statistics may be explained in part by the fact that around this time there was increased interest in the supernatural among Englishmen due to the return of 472 exiled Protestant leaders who had witnessed witch-burnings at Strasbourg, Frankfurt, Zurich, Geneva, and Basel.[5] When these recalcitrants exiled by Queen Mary returned upon Elizabeth's accession, they had had ample opportunity in exile both to escape the fate of the Marian martyrs and to observe the witch trials on the Continent. These men later became bishops or influenced state affairs. "It is natural that when they returned to England and had a large and influential share

---

[4] See Robbins 156, although this text is widely cited.

[5] These men, however, brought back from the Continent an anything-but-uniform set of opinions on the supernatural. For example, "[u]nder Elizabeth the ever-increasing influence of Zurich and Geneva, to which completest deference was paid, thoroughly discredited exorcisms of any kind, and this (misbelieving) attitude is repeatedly and amply made clear in the sundry 'Apologies' and 'Defences' of Jewel and his followers" (Summers Geography 231).

in the direction of the laws their thoughts should revert to the subject of sorcery, to them a very real and pressing danger" (Summers Geography 114). They saw supernaturally-interpreted circumstances -- now beginning to arise in earnest -- as such a danger because "[i]n England, sorcery flourished among all classes, the rich and poor, the ignorant and learned" (Robbins 180).

One example of a learned man who was interested in sorcery was John Dee, otherwise known as "Queen Elizabeth's Merlin." Although befriended by Elizabeth, he had been imprisoned under Queen Mary as a "caller and a conjurer of wicked damned spirits" (Robbins 120). His timing was fortunate, since death became the penalty for conjuring an evil spirit "to or for any purpose" under the act of 1563.[6] On March 19, 1563 "An Act against Conjurations, Enchantments, and Witchcrafts" was passed, following the wording of a previous act of Henry VIII. The new act passed by the Elizabethan government made death the penalty for all who "use, practice, or exercise invocations or conjurations of evil and wicked spirits to or for any intent or purpose" (Summers, introduction to Discouerie xviii-xix). The "any intent or purpose" could theoretically be construed by an unfavorably-disposed judge to cover exorcism.[7] To understand what interplay of forces must have produced such a piece of legislation, it is important to remember

---

[6] Some historians have noted that legally, this act made the devil an acknowledged factor in the laws of the state.

[7] This act does not mention possession, but it does cover enchantment -- and "[i]t is plain that the provisions of the Elizabethan law were strictly rigid and inflexible" (Summers, introduction to Discouerie xix).

that at this time, in the diocese of Essex, Bishop Edmund Grindal, a harsh Calvinist, said that this punishment was too slender for sorcery. The act was initiated in response to a resolution of the 1563 Convocation of the Church of England -- in effect a third house of Parliament -- "that there be some penal, sharp, yea, capital pains for witches, charmers, sorcerers, enchanters, and such like." The wishes of the church authorities were honored, and "the large number of presentments and indictments at sessions with the judgements recorded are ample evidence that the penalties were exacted to the uttermost" (Summers, introduction to Discouerie xix).[8]

But the penalties were only thus exacted by credulous authorities who thought they had sufficient evidence to condemn the accused parties. If a powerful skeptic happened to be present, the odds decreased dramatically that the accused would suffer. For example, Reginald Scot, an avowed skeptic, attended the trial of Margaret Symons of Brencheley at the Rochester assizes on July 3, 1581. He examined several witnesses and the accused woman, who was found not guilty. He later went on to write the Discouerie of Witchcraft, a book we know Shakespeare read and used for his appropriations. In his Epistle "To the Readers," Scot claims he doesn't deny there are witches; but 560 pages later, the reader wonders whether the author is an agnostic. He clearly did not bill himself as such; the disjunction or dissonance a reader may sense

[8] Deacon and Walker express surprise that Queen Elizabeth's commission for ecclesiastical persons and causes had not already silenced the pamphleteers by the time they wrote their book on exorcism.

only derives from the fact that he allows the existence of devils but maintains that they cannot affect mens' affairs. In other words, he denies their agency in events commonly associated with their power and insists that we can know nothing of their activites. Scot was trained in law, and for years he investigated alleged cases, attended trials, and questioned magistrates and church officials. But his real inspiration for publishing the book was the trial of the witches of Saint Osyth's, after which 13 witches are thought to have been executed.[9] This impetus clearly demonstrates the intricate relation between textuality and history at the time. In fact, Scot directed and dedicated his book to the judges of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Courts that were trying these cases. His purpose was to provide legal advice for judges, Justices of the Peace, and juries before they passed sentence on the accused, who were often poorly educated.

These poorly educated citizens often believed in demons with specific names, "the sources of terror to . . . ancestors of the Elizabethan age" (Scott 175), and Reginald Scot catalogued these in the Discouerie. Dekker's Hierarchie, providing an even more extensive catalogue of fiends, was also popularized in Elizabethan times.[10] Another venue for propagating superstition was the first English edition of the Catholic demonology handbook Malleus maleficarum.[11] Ironically enough, although it issued from the press

---

[9] One witch was Ursley Kemp, alias Gray. One witness was Grace Thurlow; Justice Brian Darcy presided.

[10] See Spalding 34.

[11] The English editions of the Malleus maleficarum were printed in 1584, 1595, and 1604.

in the same year as Scot's Protestant treatise (which also became a handbook on the subject), these books written from opposing viewpoints produced identical results -- insofar as they served as guide-books for the activities they were condemning.

But the potential effectiveness of the Malleus maleficarum (as a vehicle for spreading credulity concerning exorcism and other supernatural occurrences) was mitigated by anti-Catholic sentiment among its potential audience. Plotting England's overthrow -- according to popular belief -- were no fewer allies than Pope Sixtus in Rome, King Philip in Madrid, Mendoza and the English traitors in Paris, and Mary of Scotland in Chartley. It has already been stated that the Denham exorcisms were conducted in the company of individuals who later could not extricate themselves from involvement in the Babington Plot.[12] By 1586 even the Netherlands was growing cold towards England because of ambiguous treatment. And, of course, in 1588 England was driven to prove her supremacy over all these enemies threatening to overwhelm her when the Medina Sidonia vs. Drake battle was played out and the Spanish Armada was defeated.

But internal enemies were not so easily defeated. It has been estimated that at this time one third of the population was composed of malcontents. It did not help matters to have reports circulating (such as Richard Cosin's Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation, 1592) of the past antics of previous radicals. This

---

[12] The punishment for involvement in the plot was severe: about 15 March 1587 (Old Style, not the date as currently reckoned), "[a] graunt of the Lands of Anthony Babington to Sir Walter Raleigh" was recorded in the State Papers (Cecill 785).

account is the report of the trial of William Hackett, an Anabaptist who was hanged, disemboweled, and quartered after he had declared himself king of Europe. Cosin blamed Satan for the incident. And although it was illegal for Catholic priests to be physically present in England at this time, seminary priests were swarming to England from the Continent, sedulously preaching rebellion in rural districts. They were surreptitiously sheltered and protected by powerful nobles and gentry. The threat they posed to Anglican supremacy was what we would call a clear and present danger: they were preparing the way for Cardinal Allen, the would-be Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury.

The pertinence of these furtive Catholics cannot be underestimated as we trace the awakening stages of the exorcism craze. Among these seminary priests was William Weston, a Jesuit who enthusiatically admired Edmund Campion, the martyr-traitor. In fact, Weston even adopted the alias Edmonds to signify the connection he hoped to create in the mind of the public. Weston "was gifted with the power of casting out devils, and he exercised it in order to prove the divine origin of the Holy Catholic faith, and, by implication, the duty of all persons religiously inclined, to rebel against a sovereign who was ruthlessly treading it into the dust" (Spalding 68).

To fight against such an ominous opponent, Samuel Harsnett arrived on the scene to defend the Church of England from the propaganda of the Catholics. At Denham, they had discovered that exorcism was one of their most powerful public relations techniques. In a counter-technique, a 1599 Anglican ecclesiastical

order absolutely forbade satire writing. Whitgift and Bancroft issued the order and declared that even Nashe's and Harvey's books were to be burned. The government was so alarmed by the whole situation that Harsnett wrote his Declaration by order of the Privy Council. Like Reginald Scot, Harsnett came out looking almost agnostic in his attempt to discredit almost all forms of belief in the supernatural.

England might have turned the tide if these skeptics had remained in power, and thus avoided many of the later cases of exorcism, especially during the reign of the credulous King James. But even before James came to power, the antics of John Darrell and "such flying reports as ranne all abroad" (Deacon and Walker viii) had the nation so stirred up that a rise in the general hysteria level seemed inevitable. Darrell himself boasted at how widespread was his own story: "[a]nd this in effect not onely the streetes and Tavernes haue ronge off, but (as I haue bene informed) the very benches and seats of Justice haue sounded with the noyse of this Darrell" (Darrell A Detection i-ii). The Somers incident was "no lesse notoriously knowen throughout the whole land then diuersly entertayned, according to the variable & diuers affections of men" (Deacon and Walker vii). The exorcisms continued, to the "publike disgrace of publike persons" (Deacon and Walker ii), and "so scandalous [we]re the cankred mouths" of the exorcists (Deacon and Walker v) that the pamphlets they printed on secret presses maintained the height of the furor even between the times when they were actually handling their famous cases. These exorcists/ pamphlet writers were viewed by ecclesiastical officials as

"[a]postates, reuolters, backsliders, formalists" with "their Cabalisticall conceits and phantasticall fooleries" (Deacon and Walker v). The lines of social class were definitively drawn in this grand struggle between the "enlightened" wealthy and the "superstitious" poor. The Dedication to the 1601 Dialogicall Discourses of Spirits and Diuels of two ministers endorsed by church authorities, Deacon and Walker, traces a line in the sand and demands that a position be taken:

> To The Right Honorable and righteous Iudges, Sir Thomas Egerton knight, Lord Keeper of the great Seale of England: Sir Iohn Popham knight, Lord cheefe Iustice of England: Sir Edmund Anderson knight, Lord cheefe Iustice of the common Pleas: and Sir William Periam knight, Lord cheefe Baron of the Exchequer. . . . Right Honorable Lords, you may not possiblie be ignorant of the late-bred broyles not long since brewed & broached at Nottingham by meanes of Sommers his supposed possession and dispossession: especially, those selfesame broyles being eftsoones reuiued since, and now also so publikely reported in Print, as their flying rumours doe mightilie ouer-runne the whole Realme, yea, euen to the uttermost borders thereof.

This was the lay of the land when James took the throne in 1603. Everyone agrees that the apogee of English belief in the supernatural was reached during the beginning of the reign of King James. More than any other British sovereign, he was willing to acknowledge the forces of evil as powers within his realm. In order to understand fully his personal bias toward combatting devils, it is necessary to uncover several incidents in his past which had convinced him that these powers were out to get him.

During his childhood, "the Scottish legislation 'Anentis Witchcraft,' first passed by the ninth Parliament of Queen Mary in 1563, was eagerly and vehemently enforced and continuously urged by the clergy, whose pulpit denunciations of the accursed folk filled every heart with panic and dismay" (Summers introduction to Discouerie xxi). When he married, James believed the North Berwick Witches to be responsible for the tempest which tossed his ship as he sailed to Denmark to claim Anne, his bride. In 1590, at the ensuing witchcraft trial, James attended the criminals' examinations in person, questioning them and taking depositions, because their attempt had been on his life.[13] The following year the tract News from Scotland appeared, replete with illustrations of the events it described.[14]

Partially as a response to these events, King James VI of Scotland published his famous Daemonologie, which was printed first in Edinburgh in 1597.[15] It would later be re-issued in London in 1603. It echoed the opinions of the multitude -- fully embracing popular superstitions -- and obtained the tacit admissions of the first intellectuals of the day. It was explicitly directed against two skeptics, the German physician John Weyer and the afore-mentioned Reginald Scot, whose skeptical work nevertheless provided abundant advertisement for the continental superstitions he was refuting. In

---

[13] In 1599, Agnes Sympson confessed to King James that she was a healing medium and had endeavored to poison him by fashioning a wax mommet. Agnes' familiar, a dog named Elva, lived in a well.

[14] The unique copy is found in the Lambeth Palace Library.

[15] The treatise may have been ghostwritten by James, Bishop of Winton, in Winchester.

the Preface, King James stated his purpose: "to resolve the doubting harts of many . . . that such assaultes of Sathan are most certainly practized" (2) and because evidently "Scot an Englishman . . . so mainteines the old error of the Sadducees, in denying of spirits" (K. James 2). Because Reginald Scot held convictions opposed to the creed of the majority and was considered a skeptic, his book was publicly burned by the common hangman (an order of King James I in 1603). Because James ordered its destruction, early editions are now exceedingly rare. All copies found were burnt, along with other treatises, known and unknown. In those days, "[t]o doubt the devil was a blasphemy on a par with doubting God himself, and to deny acts of malefic witchcraft was to deny the devil" (Starkey 53).

Daemonologie rapidly rose in status to become a veritable handbook for court cases involving the supernatural. At a court in Dorset in 1602, it was reported that the accused woman had done "things worthy to be. . . punished for that the King's most excellent majesty in his book against witches intituled the Demonology hath set forth" (Robbins 278). Early on in the book, the devil is called "God's hang-man"; this concept is explained in the following terms:

> [f]or where the devilles intention in them is ever to perish either the soule or the body, or both of them, that he is so permitted to deale with; God . . . drawes ever out of that evill glorie to himselfe, either by the tryall of the patient, and amendment of the faithfull, being wakened up with that rod of correction. (K. James 5-6)

Ironically, in some of these court cases -- as James would acknowledge later, to his deep regret -- it was the king who became the hang-man by allowing some innocents to perish.

In 1603, as soon as he became king in England as well, the treatise began to be used as a handbook there also: "[i]t is natural that when King James came to England his *Daemonologie* should have been accepted by officials as a text-book whose authority was enhanced by the sovereignty of the author" (Summers Geography 129).[16] There is little doubt that his credulous opinions prevailed at the time because people gratified him by deferring to his scholarly image and his supposedly superior knowledge. In this same year there was a debate at Cambridge on whether the possession or dispossession of demons could occur (Walker 80). In 1604, the second year of his reign, a Convocation of the Church of England passed Canon 72, written by Bancroft. It provided that no minister should attempt to expel a devil without license of his bishop: "[n]o minister . . . shall . . . without the license or direction of the Bishop . . . attempt upon any pretence whatsoever either of possession or obsession, by fasting or prayer, to cast out any devil or devils, under pain of imposture or cozinage, and deposition from the ministry" (Summers 230-31). The express purpose of the canon was to stop impostures and exacerbations of cases of mental disease.

As was often the case during these years, the government followed the lead of the church, and secular laws appeared shortly

---

[16] "In England the work . . . was employed by many officials as a text-book of the subject. But it added nothing new either in exposition or in argument" (Summers, introduction to Discouerie xxii).

after ecclesiastical laws dealing with the same issues. In 1604 a Statute of King James I made it a felony "to consult, covenant with, entertain, employ, feed, or reward any evil and wicked spirit to or for any intent or purpose." The new bill committee had been composed of Sir Edmund Anderson (Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas), Sir Edward Coke (Attorney General), the Earl of Northumberland, twelve bishops, six earls, the Bishop of Lincoln, and the Chief Baron of the Exchequer. A similar policy had been followed under the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth.[17] But this time "[i]t is solemnly recorded in the Commons' Journals that during the discussion of the statute against witchcraft passed in the reign of James I, a young jackdaw flew into the house; which accident was generally regarded as *malum omen* to the Bill" (Spalding 31). Francis Stewart, Earl of Bothwell, reportedly thought the crown and life of King James were in danger from the devil.

The influence of James' opinions was so prevalent, and his paranoia so pervasive, that he even transformed what was to become the standard translation of the Bible into a document which justified his beliefs: "[i]ndeed the very word 'witchcraft' was hardly mentioned in earlier editions than the King James; its prominence there was largely a compliment to his majesty's known

---

[17] James I's law represented little increase in severity from previous statutes:

> "In the main tenor, even to its phraseology, the statute of James I follows that of Elizabeth. Death as before is the penalty for the invocation or conjuration of evil spirits, for any purpose of whatsoever kind; but a clause is added making it a capital offence to 'consult, covenant with, entertain, employ, feed, or reward' any such familiar" (Summers, introduction to Discouerie xix).

interest in demonology" (Starkey 52). A compiler of a witchcraft encyclopedia confirms this startling fact:

> The King's bias influenced the translation of the Bible; whenever the Septuagint had 'one that consulteth pythonic spirits,' the Authorized Version (1603) used James's definition of a witch in his Demonology, 'a consulter with familiar spirits.' The Bible was thus angled to justify conceptions completely unknown to it. (Robbins 278)

The demonologists won, in this era, greater influence than their opponents did over the public mind. Nine years after James' accession, at the well-known Lancashire trials, 19 persons were arraigned, while only 8 were acquitted. Of those condemned, 10 were hanged, and 1 was pilloried.

James would later change his views on the supernatural, as he became jaded from observing case after case of demonstrated fraud.[18] The frequency of the forged possessions brought such an alteration in the judgment of King James that he, retracting what he had written in his Daemonologie, denied most activities of witches and devils, declaring instead that the fits were poisonous falsehoods and that his people suffered from delusions. The skeptics who had worked assiduously to change his mind included courtiers like Francis Bacon and John Florio (the translator of Montaigne) as well as his personal physician, Dr. Harvey. His wider reading in the latter

---

[18] See his Counterblast of Tobacco, 1604, in which he published a retraction of former beliefs.

years of his reign also encouraged him to cease to be such a monomaniacal persecutor of the devil's representatives.

But the "damage" was already done. Certainly, some innocent persons had died. Perhaps some guilty ones had perished as well. And Shakespeare had already incorporated the salacious details from some of these exorcisms into the plays we still read today. But what details did he fail to incorporate -- or more pointedly, deliberately leave out? James' relationship to Shakespeare has long been established: he was the patron of the King's Men. But at least one of Shakespeare's other patrons, the Earl of Pembroke, was a protector of Puritans and other dissenting Protestants. And many scholars have speculated about Shakespeare's Catholic ancestry. With all these pressures and dangers weighing upon him, I will argue that Shakespeare could not afford to take sides. I do not believe he aligned himself with a particular political or religious faction. On March 15, 1604, the great day of the procession of King James through London, Shakespeare was in the procession following the King and for that purpose was presented with a piece of red cloth. I would speculate that the bard kept his eyes focused straight ahead, neither bowing to right or left nor yelling out cheers to anyone. There were too many good reasons for this author to remain silent.

Conclusions

I. Renaissance Self-Fashioning: Protestant Exorcism as a Failure of *Sprezzatura* in Elizabethan England

Let us look at the political and religious authorities of the time to search for a contrast between them and the literary artists who were working in the same period.

> [T]here are always selves -- a sense of personal order, a characteristic mode of address to the world, a structure of bounded desires -- and always some elements of deliberate shaping in the formation and expression of identity.
> (Greenblatt, Renaissance Self-Fashioning 1)

This section will examine two specific "selves" -- Protestant ecclesiastical authorities and exorcists during Elizabeth's reign -- and one specific element of identity-shaping which informed their relationship. This element was the Italianate concept of *sprezzatura*, filtered (of course) through the aristocratic lens of Elizabeth's court. The origin of this fundamental Renaissance concept may be traced to Baldassare Castiglione's The Book of the Courtier, which appeared in Hoby's English translation in 1561. While Castiglione's work may well have influenced the production of books like The Court of Civil Courtesy (1577), other works such as The Philosopher of the Court (1547) demonstrate that the same English intellectual currents which later produced Peacham's The Compleat Gentleman (1622) were already surging before Castiglione's contribution. Castiglione, however, still provides the

most succinct definition of *sprezzatura*, an Italian word which defies translation. His interlocutors agree that the aim of the courtier is

> to practice in all things a certain *sprezzatura* [nonchalance], so as to conceal all art and make whatever is done or said appear to be without effort and almost without any thought about it . . . . because everyone knows the difficulty of things that are rare and well done; wherefore facility in such things causes the greatest wonder; whereas, on the other hand, to labor and, as we say, drag forth by the hair of the head, shows an extreme want of grace, and causes everything, no matter how great it may be, to be held in little account. (Castiglione 43)

This concept provides both a context and an explanation for some heretofore puzzling dynamics between "courtly" Protestant ecclesiastical officials and Elizabethan exorcists.

These two specific "selves" fit rather neatly into Stephen Greenblatt's general New Historicist framework for self-fashioning:

> [s]elf-fashioning is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile. This threatening Other -- heretic . . . Antichrist -- must be discovered or invented in order to be attacked and destroyed. . . . consequently the alien is always constructed as a distorted image of the authority.
> (Greenblatt, Renaissance Self-Fashioning 9)

Within this model, the ecclesiastical officials shaped their own identity in opposition to the "aliens," the exorcists. For the aristocratic church authorities, closely allied with Elizabeth's court, the exorcists failed the *sprezzatura* test. They failed it because they did not conceal their labor, their public images were

consistently immodest, and their success rate was embarrassingly low. We will examine each of these factors in turn, but first let us hear from the bishops and archbishops what they thought of the upstart exorcists.

Samuel Harsnett began his ecclesiastical career as Domestic Chaplain to Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London. In later years, he became successively the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge (1606) and the Archbishop of York (1629). Harsnett described the exorcist John Darrell as

> some idle, adle, giddie, lymphaticall, illuminate dotrel, who being out of credite, learning, sobriety, honesty, and wit, wil take this holy advantage to raise the ruines of his desperate decayed name, and for his better glory will be-pray the jugling drab, and cast out *Mopp* the devil. (309)

John Deacon and John Walker, Anglican ministers, joined him in harsh invective against the exorcists within the same historical moment: "now at this present, when the fearefull infection of those their factious proceedings, so universally and so dangerously ouer spreadeth it selfe: not unlike to the fretting Gangrena, or incurable Canker" (iii). They denounced the exorcists as "those disordered persons, who seeke (in such a malcontented humour) to uphold, and maintaine those quaint matters in question" (Deacon and Walker v). Deacon and Walker also referred to the exorcists as "cogging companions" (208) and "clamorous companions: who . . . do purposely endeuour by their intoxicated and most slanderous reuilings" (Deacon and Walker v) to rebel against Anglican authority.

Unfortunately for the exorcists, official Anglican outrage at this manifestation of popular (*vs.* aristocratic) religion did not stop with pamphlets or polemics. In 1603, at the Convocation of the Church of England, Anglican bishops passed canon number 72 (effective beginning in 1604), which stated that no minister should attempt to expel a devil without the license of his bishop. This piece of ecclesiastical legislation was written by Bishop Bancroft:

> No minister . . . shall . . . without license or direction of the Bishop. . . attempt upon any pretence whatsoever either of possession or obsession, by fasting or prayer, to cast out any devil or devils, under pain of imposture or cozenage, and deposition from the ministry. (Summers 230-31)

This religious body was such a political force at the time that it has since been described by many historians of the period as, in effect, a third "house" of Parliament. Brownlow comments on the efficacy of this canon: "[t]he assumption behind the new canon was that no Anglican bishop would license a priest to cast out devils. To my knowledge, none ever has" (64).

The skepticism and outrage of the ecclesiastical authorities toward the exorcists may be observed in a series of letters written during 1574 between Archbishop Parker and Whitgift, his Calvinist successor. Whitgift was later consulted in the John Darrell case. Brownlow describes the onslaught of propaganda designed by these ecclesiastical authorities to suppress the bumbling exorcists. They made use of "the press, the medical profession . . . the Paul's Cross pulpit, the University of Cambridge, the Court of High Commission

. . . Bancroft thought that Darrell's movement was the most dangerous threat to the establishment since the classis movement of the eighties" (Brownlow 63). At times exorcists were imprisoned and treated worse than hardened criminals. In May 1599 the exorcist John Darrell was tried by the Ecclesiastical Court of High Commission. The questioning was conducted by Bancroft and Harsnett, who "used . . . the means they had to stop behavior they judged intolerable" (Brownlow 61). Not surprisingly, Darrel was deposed from the ministry and committed to prison for sentencing. The Anglican authorities' behavior here fits the general assumption that "[i]n early modern England rivalry among elites competing for the major share of authority was characteristically expressed . . . in bitter struggles over religious doctrine and practice" (Greenblatt, Shakespearean Negotiations 96).

The exorcists' response to all this upheaval was to cry religious oppression -- and then, surreptitiously if need be, to continue amassing more successful exorcisms. John Swan, an exorcist sympathizer, accused Harsnett and his consorts of religious persecution: "with an heavie hand, a partiall pen, and arguments of violence, to striue to ouer-beare both the men and the cause . . . they haue . . . euen shaken the land" (Swan 3). Swan recorded how the host of the after-feast celebrating Mary Glover's dispossession was reprimanded by the Bishop of London (47).

Why were the exorcists such a threat to the establishment? Why did the bishops and archbishops expend so much time and energy trying to destroy them? I suggest that the exorcists, lacking courtly *sprezzatura*, tarnished the church's carefully-guarded image

of sober piety. The exorcists violated three principles of *sprezzatura*: they did not conceal their labor, their public images were consistently immodest, and their success rate was embarrassingly low.

We have already seen how, according to Castiglione's definition of *sprezzatura*, "to labor and, as we say, drag forth by the hair of the head, shows an extreme want of grace" (43). This verbal image could just as well have been written to describe the exorcists, who did show "an extreme want of grace" according to this criterion. The exorcists viewed possession as a supernatural disease, while exorcism was the medicine to cure it (Darrell 29-30, 53). They claimed that exorcism was a procedure outlined explicitly by Christ to achieve the desired result through the "labors" of prayer and fasting. It must be remembered that the Anglican church, at this time, constantly defined its image by opposition -- by contrast to the Other, in this case Catholic, church. Catholic priests conducted exorcisms through only a word, by way of the same power bequeathed to the Apostles. They were also fond of achieving miraculous results by using relics and holy objects. According to Protestant (as opposed to Catholic) exorcists, possession was an ordinary sickness like deafness or blindness. As such, it would not be cured instantaneously. But it could be cured by "ordinary" means, i.e., fasting and prayer (Deacon and Walker 175), although sometimes one exorcist's efforts were not enough. Mary Glover was dispossessed by the fasting and prayer of no fewer than six ministers. John Swan, a supporter of the exorcists, described that dispossession as a result of preachers' prayers, or "dolfull ditties"

(29). Multiple accounts of the period describe the assiduous labors of the typical Protestant exorcist, who "worked" on the demoniac and "humbly kneeling dispossessed him by praier" (Lodge 10-11) or "by his praiers bound him" (Lodge 14). One exorcist even buckled on a harness (Swan 29) to symbolize the labor he was undertaking. It is telling that many Anglican critics of the exorcists objected more to the manner in which they conducted the dispossessions than to the fact that they conducted them at all: "[t]hese . . . exorcists . . . should not directlie in their conjurations call upon the divell (as they doo) with intreatie, but with authoritie and commandement" (Scot 439). There is an implication here that if the exorcists had only spoken with authority instead of entreaty, they would not have failed so badly in the realm of *sprezzatura.*

The grandiose claims of the exorcists were also too blatantly egotistical to fit within the confines of Anglican conceptions of *sprezzatura*. One of the exorcists, Arthur Hacket, declared himself the Messiah and King of Europe in 1591, "with casting out of devils, and other madnesses . . . getting himself believed by some, so long as he remained unhanged" (Spalding 30). One need only refer to Castiglione to see that "boldness seems greater when accompanied with modesty" (98). Deacon and Walker, critics of the exorcists, even condemned them with a comparison to the recently-defeated Spanish Armada: they attributed to the exorcists a "[t]hrasonicall brag, or that Spanish-like Bravado . . . they were both [the Spaniards as well as the exorcists] constrayned to get home by weeping crosse, with confusion and shame to themselves" (237).

It is no accident that this threat to Anglican honor is couched in a military analogy. Just as the courtier, "if ever in the least way . . . sullies himself through cowardice or other disgrace, always remains defiled before the world and covered with ignominy" (Castiglione 32), so too the courtly Anglican bishops saw their battle with the exorcists as a fight to salvage *sprezzatura.* The standard excuse given by an exorcist for an unsuccessful attempt at dispossession was that he had not labored hard enough; this excuse, of course, brought into play the first factor already discussed as a failure of *sprezzatura.* But the unsuccessful attempt itself, aside from the too-obvious labor involved, was enough to tarnish the Anglican official image. Exorcists gave up more often than not, and even their supporters admitted that "thogh the Lord oft in these daies, by the praiers of the faithful casts out divils, yet could he not assure them to cure him" (Bee 3). This inability to assure the customer of the reliability of the product violated another principle of *sprezzatura.* Castiglione advises the courtier, "let him consider well what he does or says . . . the end at which he aims, and the means by which he can reach it" (98). The exorcists' inability to "reach it" was not permissible within the Anglican concept of *sprezzatura.*

Clifford Geertz hypothesizes that "[t]here is no such thing as a human nature independent of culture," but rather "a set of control mechanisms -- plans, recipes, rules, instructions . . .-- for the governing of behavior" (49). Greenblatt applies this hypothesis to the English Renaissance:

> there is considerable empirical evidence that there may well have been less *autonomy* in self-fashioning in the sixteenth century than before, that family, state, and religious institutions impose a more rigid and far-reaching discipline upon their middle-class and aristocratic subjects.
> (Greenblatt, Renaissance Self-Fashioning 1)

Perhaps the exorcists were simply not 'noble' enough for Anglicans with courtly pretensions. One of their critics complained that "anie bodie, though he be . . . of none order at all . . . hath power to exercise the order of an exorcist or conjuror" (Scot 438). At any rate, it is certain that these Anglicans strove to limit the autonomy of these exorcists. In doing so, the Anglican bishops and other authorities were defining themselves by opposition and trying to preserve their image of *sprezzatura.* In this period in Elizabethan England,

> role-playing seems virtually inescapable, for both the concentration of power in the court and Protestant ideology lead to a heightened consciousness of identity . . . The fashioning of the self is raised to the status of a problem or a program. (Greenblatt, Renaissance Self-Fashioning 161)

For the aristocratic church authorities like Bancroft, Hooker and Whitgift, the "Lord Archbishop" of Canterbury -- all of whom were among the many aspiring "courtiers" in Elizabeth's court -- the exorcists tarnished the church's official "courtly" image. I must emphasize that it was only this upper echelon of clergymen who felt this way toward the exorcists. The issue was demarcated along lines of social class, and the lower-class clergymen doubtless identified with the exorcists or at least felt some sympathy for

them. But for the career clerics sitting in the highest seats of authority, the exorcists failed to exemplify *sprezzatura* because they did not dissimulate their labor, their public claims were consistently immodest, and their success rate was embarrassingly low. I must also emphasize that this categorization may have been entirely unconscious on the part of the frowning hierarchs. But viewed within the theoretical context of New Historicism, this unconscious but traceable classificatory phenomenon provides insight into the social dynamics of identity-shaping in Elizabethan England.

Conclusions

II. Renaissance Art-Fashioning: Writers and Literary Motives

Whatever the methods by which they collected data on possession and exorcism, it is clear that upon the foundation of this data, Cervantes and Shakespeare built linguistic structures to trigger the resurgence of images of madness or persecution in their protagonists. This technique was designed to play upon the preconceptions which existed in the Spanish Golden Age and Elizabethan mentalities. I do not mean to imply that these texts were cultural vacuum cleaners. The authors deliberately chose the appropriations they made and probably rejected countless other possibilities which would not have worked so well. My work with these deliberate appropriations begins to explain puzzling phraseology and word useage which scholars such as Gibson (Shakespeare's Use of the Supernatural) could identify but could not understand. As for methodology, I have proceeded expansively, not restrictively. With Donna Hamilton, I "take exception with those studies that seek to trace any single idiom to a single text. . . . Most of the language at issue comprises a continuous discourse that is available in many texts written over many years" (203).

An interesting corollary to this "continuous discourse" theory -- one which I would like to explore further -- is that in Spain, the stream of intertextuality between literary works and exorcist manuals may have been flowing in the opposite direction, so to speak. In other words, I have found exorcist manuals produced after

the *Quijote* which may have been influenced by this popular work. They are surprisingly literary in their use of colorful, lively metaphors at every turn. Kenneth Muir would probably have been shocked to see that someone followed his precedent in Shakespeare studies by working on Cervantes texts! The interdisciplinary nature of a comparative literature study such as this one provides applications of advances made in the field of English Renaissance studies to literature of the Spanish Golden Age.

But why is either study, or the aggregate, important? What really happened with the exorcisms, and what effect does the appropriation of this language by these authors produce in the literature they wrote? In answering these questions, I will dwell on several interpretations of the exorcism phenomenon and the attraction it held for Cervantes and Shakespeare. The New Historicists have pointed to the theatricality of exorcisms as the primary attraction. Their explanation probably works best when comic subject matter is at issue. I will propose three alternatives: the introduction of the exorcism material fulfills a social need, provides metacommentary on the power of language, and enhances tragic effect or dramatic tension. Finally, I will argue that these literary purposes were foregrounded as these professional authors made these appropriations; their intentions were not propagandistic or political in the narrow sense.

As for what really happened at the exorcisms, the ontological moment is no longer with us. Modern critics have usually concluded that

> [d]emoniacal possession is a convenient portmanteau term to describe one theory of deranged personality; exorcism, the means which sometimes restord the afflicted person to normal behavior. The function once exercised by priests -- curing disturbed persons -- is now performed by psychiatrists. . . . [S]ome modern critics have seen sound psychological justification in the contrast between encouragement and threatening. (Robbins 180,185)

But I must emphasize that ordinary Elizabethans and Spaniards of the Golden Age would not have seen the phenomenon happening in their midst in this same way at all.[1] The more erudite members of these societies dared to ridicule what they deemed to be superstition in the lower classes, but they acknowledged the common person's credulity. Reginald Scot, at heart, probably thought melancholy was the real reason for madness, but he unequivocally complains that popular belief attributes madness to demon possession:

> how manie stories and bookes are written of walking spirits and soules of men, contrarie to the word of God; a reasonable volume cannot conteine. Therefore no mervell, though the common simple sort of men . . . be deceived herein. . . . (Scot 461-62)

---

[1] "Elizabethan drama and poetry are informed and . . . saturated by the supernatural. The demonology and ghost-lore of the time are ever sensibly felt, not as a mere fantastical or mythical convention, but as a very real and deeply conceived spiritual background. The ghost, one of the most important figures of the Elizabethan theatre . . . became a vivid phantom, a thing of terror and awe, a spectre that might stand by the side of anyone of the audience in the lonely watches of the night, that might chill and fear any wayfarer upon his solitary path . . ." (Summers, introduction to Discouerie 13).

These skeptics verged on suggesting that the lower class were mad to believe in the supernatural: "who seeth not that they are witlesse, and madde fooles to mainteine it?" (Scot 479). Were they proposing that any belief in the supernatural leads to madness? The answer is, most certainly not. One opinion reported to be circulating at the time was that "[d]iuels are none other thing else, but those . . . euill motions in men, which doe maruellously . . . afflict their minds" (Deacon and Walker 18). A modern atheist would probably agree.[2] But even skeptics whose books were burned dared not question the theoretical possibility that demons could appear to and possess human beings. Reginald Scot pronounces in "A Discourse" that he believes demons exist and emphasizes his awareness of the seriousness of his topic: "[t]here is no question . . . so difficult to deal in, nor so noble an argument to dispute upon, as this of divels and spirits. For that being confessed or doubted of, the eternitie of the soule is either affirmed or denied" (489). When Cervantes and Shakespeare combined these popular notions to create models of madness, they were giving their audiences what to them seemed a rational justification for the mad characters' condition.[3] Whether or not these authors believed in God or demons or possession

---

[2] "[T]he elimination of the diabolic factor leaves the modern sceptical belief that such apparitions are nothing more than the result of disease, physical or mental" (Spalding 45).

[3] "The divines held that although the power of the Creator had in no wise been delegated to the devil, yet he was, in the course of providence, permitted to exercise a certain supernatural influence over the minds of men, whereby be could persuade them that they really saw a form that had no material objective existence . . . . [Devils] could appear in the likeness of an ordinary human being . . . and if this belief is borne in mind, the charge of being a devil, so freely made, in the times of which we write . . . loses much of its barbarous grotesqueness" (Spalding 45-46).

themselves, they undoubtedly knew that a large proportion of their audiences did.

There have been several studies recently about the composition of the audience at the Globe and other theaters. Eventually I hope to do a similar study on the readership of Cervantes. The question of consumer profile, if you will, is contested terrain because New Historicists try to use it to support their argument that these authors wrote with political purposes. For example, one critic has claimed, "in the theater Shakespeare could expect his burlesque to be appreciated by an audience not in sympathy with them [the Puritans and exorcists], especially because they denounced stage productions as wicked" (Hoeniger 205). But the attribution of political agendas to these authors depends on dubious assumptions about the political leanings of their audiences. For instance, not all believers in exorcism were Puritans. The exorcisms became a threat to the social order as much because of the class issues involved as for the obvious heterodox theology. Increasingly a lower-class phenomenon, the spectacle of exorcism attracted the masses in the same way that unusual murder trials become addictions for average Americans in 1995. The pamphlets circulated then were like our tabloids today. I disagree with Hoeniger and also with Schleiner, who recognizes the problem of "politico-religious and also class-specific assumptions of Shakespeare's audience" but insists that this audience "would not have included the marginal groups satirized" (51). I propose that a blanket assumption that none of these marginal groups was present in the theater is uninformed, even ludicrous: Ann Jennalie Cook and

Andrew Gurr, although disagreeing on many points about the audience composition for Shakespeare's plays, both state unequivocally that uneducated, lower-class audience members were ubiquitous. Cook states bluntly, "[w]ithout question, commoners came to the plays" (216).

Another argument of the New Historicists with which I disagree is that theatricality was the overriding attraction of the exorcisms for these professional writers. It is commonly known that the exorcist-basher Harsnett, for example, continually compared the tricks of the exorcists to a stage performance. He used 230 theatrical terms in the first 170 pages of his book. Whether or not he himself went to plays, he had to read plays because of his job of licensing books to be published. So the New Historicists argue that the theatrical metaphors used by treatise writers on exorcism attracted Shakespeare, for instance; I am sure they would see the same progression in the literary metaphors of Spanish exorcism manuals and the works of Cervantes. A basic premise of the New Historicists is that the exorcisms were fabrications, and their fictionality provided the major attraction for dramatists and novelists. As professional writers who also created fictions, they would have admired any new and convincing form of acting.

I think the situation was a little more complicated than this. I believe one literary motive for Shakespeare's and Cervantes's appropriations was the fascination of the common people with direct involvement in the supernatural. Thomas Lodge, whom Shakespeare probably knew, explains this fascination: "so

delightfull is the emperie ouer nature, the knowledge of the stars, the commanding of spirits, the manner of exorcisme, that in stéed of forsaking them, men rather earnestlie affect them" (The Divel Coniured 14). The same fascination has been attributed to Saint Teresa, who in her diaries described her battles with the devil:

> Y es de notar que Dios no figura en estas luchas. Ella sola, indefensa, tiene que defenderse. ¡Cuánto más activo y personal es este combate, alma contra demonios, que la pelea ajena, la de Dios contra el demonio, que el concepto primitivo sugiere al describir al hombre como campo de batalla entre otras fuerzas! (Moncy 152)

The exorcisms, particularly the unauthorized ones, also functioned socially in a way that was peculiarly democratic. The controversial exorcist John Darrell claims in his A Detection that any believer should be authorized to cast out devils, a message which would have sounded particularly liberating to commoners or clergymen of lower rank who were not receiving any power or social prestige in exchange for their labors. Darrell rebels against official policy by giving authority for exorcism to

> any priuate christian: shall we therfore ascribe such expulsió of the diuell to one perticular man, and therewithall I knowe not what speciall guift therein? What is this in effecte but to make the praiers of the rest of gods people presente as speeches spoken in the ayere, and beatinge it, and such as god regardeth not? (24-25)

The signs and wonders of exorcisms provided for the common people an assurance that their prayers, too, were being heard. Especially in the tragedies, I sense a certain wistfulness on the part of Shakespeare that a demon is not always a successful scapegoat. After all, demons are a convenient explanation for why bad things happen to good people.

They are also a convenient punishment for villains, such as Lady Macbeth. The model of madness derived from descriptions of demoniacs could function in various ways. For some characters already disposed to sinful ways of life, possession was nothing more than "enviar al pecador sus propias inclinaciones secretas. . . . De modo que la seducción diabólica no tiene más secreto que pervertir el soliloquio del hombre consigo mismo" (Molho 30). This model functions in a particularly effective manner because it takes into account the repressed desires that produce complex illusions.

But the scapegoating of demons works more effectively when the character in question is not simply a good person, but a tragic hero. Even Don Quixote has been seen by some critics as a tragic figure. In the medieval tradition, madness was sent by a divinity as punishment for hubris or sin. In this sense, a wild man symbolizes the untamed within us. He deserves to be locked away in dark rooms because he is blinded to the light of reason. Carmelo Lisón Tolosana, in Demonios y exorcismos en los siglos de oro, suggests that demons, like tragic heroes, represent both superpower and impotency. Every tragic hero is chained to a pleasurable and painful humanity, to a radical ambivalence and moral tension. Lisón Tolosana invokes the Baroque *topos* which points to the human-

divine duality of man, always a horse between good and evil, at the same time saint and sinner. Demon possession is the poetic expression of this necessary cohabitation, the synthetic fusion of these two interpretive extremes (89). Demon possession is an effective way for people to rationalize tragedy, to find a scapegoat to take the blame for all the sadness and outrage they feel.

Nevertheless, I would like to modify this interpretation. The appearance of demons in this literature could actually suggest a greater innocence on the part of the characters who combat them. This possibility becomes clear when we take into account the fact that many Renaissance treatise writers rationalized the absence of the supernatural in the boring daily lives of their readers by informing them that the world had become such a detestable place that the devil could use *human* beings to corrupt one another. He was no longer forced to take such extreme measures as sending representatives of his own army to wage war for the souls of men on earth. In the literary fictions where supernatural figures appeared, then, these audiences were offered for their entertainment and escapism a less complicated, more primal world in which demons were the source of corruption. The characters were so innocent that the only way to provoke their downfall was to send a demon to torment them.

In this way, the appearance of exorcist motifs in Renaissance literature fulfilled a social need of the audience. Critics such as Northrop Frye and C. L. Barber have long viewed comedy as a social ritual. Mahood's essay on *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as exorcism has nothing to do with exorcism but instead argues that the play

performs a dramatic ritual designed to chase away social evils.[4] Mahood suggests that in this comedy, the evils are the anxieties experienced before making the marriage commitment.[5] But whatever the topic of the play or story in which exorcism motifs appear, these motifs offer a release for the frustrations of the audience toward the topic. The social phenomenon of public exorcism in the Renaissance met the needs of the participants and witnesses by responding in some way to severe inner pressures. Whether we choose to see these pressures as caused by evil spirits (Christians see this as still a *potential*, although probably rare, event), there is no doubt that exorcism in literature helps to release them in the same way that public exorcisms did. Bettelheim's theories about the therapeutic value of children's fairy tales could apply to literature containing supernatural motifs or elements. While enjoying this literature, the readers or audience

> can achieve understanding, and with it the ability to cope, not through rational comprehension of the nature and content of his unconscious, but by becoming familiar with it through spinning out daydreams -- ruminating, rearranging, and fantasizing about suitable story elements in response to unconscious pressures. (7)

Renaissance authors would never have described the effects of their works in these modern terms. Yet some of the literary motives

---

[4] It is actually rather startling that Mahood does not realize or make the obvious connections with the exorcism events.

[5] The play was written on the occasion of Elizabeth Carey's wedding to Thomas, son of Lord Berkeley.

operating for them were the same: as professional writers, they possessed an awareness of the novelist's or playwright's art as magical and powerful enough to chase away evil. This self-awareness and sensitivity to their mission would have made them responsive to exorcist lore if only because it laid out a ritual which foregrounded the power of language. Indeed, Renaissance authors did make this connection: Thomas Lodge gives one of his characters the line, "my arguments against him were fatall exorcisms" (The Divel Coniured 13). In his essay "The Word Made Flesh: Magic and Mysticism in Erasmian Spain," Malcolm K. Read affirms that Renaissance authors were not only aware of but exploited the linguistic power inherent in liturgical ritual:

> language plays a key role in ritualized, magical behaviour . . . through which man may exert his magical dominance. . . . A belief in the supernatural power of the word pervaded Christian ideology in the Renaissance . . . God's word was so powerful that it . . . served to put the devil to flight. (101, 118)

It should not surprise us that this power of language would have proven attractive or even fascinating for both of our authors. It was their business to study the power of the word, in whatever form. But they would have been even more attracted to this form in particular, the use of language in exorcism, because they were "curioso[s] de los mecanismos y leyes ocultas que regulan el desorden del mundo" (Molho 32). Greenblatt is incorrect in his assessment that "*King Lear* is haunted by a sense of rituals and beliefs that are no longer efficacious, that have been emptied out"

(Shakespearean Negotiations 119). These rituals and beliefs may not carry today the stability they embodied for Renaissance readers, but the fact that Cervantes and Shakespeare incorporated them into their work confirms that in their original historical context, these rituals and beliefs were still effective purveyors of dramatic tension, emotion, and power.

New Historicists have tried to claim that even within their original context, the only power of these rituals and beliefs was political. They claim that Shakespeare attacks the Puritans in *Twelfth Night* and that they are parodied by Malvolio; these scholars refer to supposed rhetorical connections between madness and radical religious beliefs, or fanaticism. I believe Shakespeare's only purpose here, as in most of his other usages of the exorcist language, is to create dramatic tension stemming from either persecution or madness. I do not think he is allying himself with one particular religious group or attacking another one; as Schleiner admits of this play, "Shakespeare has it several ways: he invokes associations of Puritans and immediately has Maria deny that Puritans . . . are intended" (51). The attempt to pin one religious persuasion or another onto Shakespeare results in such confused thesis statements as the following: "Malvolio's comic possession parodies that case by superimposing the discourse of Darrell's defenders upon that of the investigating Church commission, and by alternating between the two" (Schleiner 52).

Role-playing was a constant element of the culture in which these writers lived. The methodology of New Historicism is useful when we try to understand the identity-shaping that did occur in

some segments of society. In my estimation, the New Historicist assessment of ecclesiastical back-stabbing is accurate. But the church officials were writing with clearly political purposes.

Role-playing was a constant element of the culture in which these writers lived, but they did not have to participate in it. The New Historicist critics insist that they did, thus becoming pawns or players in the game of "repression . . . controlling meaning . . . demonising anyone who does not co-operate" (Hamilton 88). The New Historicists ram Shakespeare into categories that do not fit him:

> Shakespeare focuses not on . . . madness or on exorcism, but on the extent to which authority will fabricate in order to protect itself, thus laying bare the strategies of containment, suppression, demonising, and scapegoating that the ecclesiastical officials had been using. . . . Shakespeare parodies the censored writing and print culture, the Darrell affair, and even his own situation as a dramatist. . . . (Hamilton 100, 102)

All of this role-playing which was, admittedly, going on in the Renaissance might have extended to these authors too, except for one crucial fact: a 1599 ecclesiastical order forbade satire writing, period. Hamilton even argues that the order came not exclusively as a reaction to the Harvey-Nashe controversy, but also in connection with the Darrell exorcism affair (92). At any rate, on 1 June 1599, Whitgift and Bancroft, to preserve the images they had so carefully fashioned, issued the order and declared that satirical books were to be burned. As I showed in the section "The Implications of These Events for These Authors" that dealt with the Spanish Inquisition

and its effect on Cervantes, it was too dangerous to take a position on these issues, even if these authors had wanted to. I argue that writers like Cervantes and Shakespeare, whose purposes were purely literary, did not look for opportunities to engage in political posturing on this narrow a level.

Writers of literature like Shakespeare and Cervantes wrote at least primarily for quite an apolitical purpose: to make a living as professional writers by creating popular fictions and fantasies. The demarcations of genre should not be ignored in any attempt to re-create the rhetorical moment of a specific text. New Historicists try to blur the boundaries of genre. Shakespeare was writing a play, not a position paper. Let us remember, please: THIS IS LITERATURE. If we do not -- if we take New Historicist assumptions to their ultimate consequences -- then we arrive at something as ridiculous as George Camamis's lengthy Beneath the Cloak of Cervantes: The Satanic Prose of Don Quixote de la Mancha, which proclaims that Cervantes was really a disciple of Giordano Bruno (who had been burned alive by the Inquisition) and that his entire masterpiece was written in revenge against the papacy. Why try to fit these authors into the Procrustean bed of firm political and religious affiliations? If Shakespeare had wanted to take a position, there were plenty of nobles housing religious refugees who would have supported him in high style if he had cast his lot with their cause. Cervantes was writing to feed himself, and had already spent enough time in prison. He wanted to write a funny book, a very funny book, which would become a bestseller and raise the social status of its author.

Placed under so many political restrictions as they were, these authors would have acquired a natural sympathy with those who were suffering. Since suffering is a key ingredient of tragedy, it could be argued that the persecution they felt contributed to their desire to write something enduring which is, in some way, tragic. There have been many pieces of viable scholarship written about Don Quixote as a tragic figure within a comical context; some critics have even gone so far as to see him as a Christ figure. But I will argue that as persecution texts, these literary works do not target specific perpetrators: that would infuse them with a political purpose, and for these authors, such a strategy would have deformed their works to make them too ephemeral. I believe if they wrote about suffering, they wrote about it as a general, universal phenomenon. That they did this successfully is corroborated by the fact that their works are still imbued with such enduring appeal. These authors, in contrast to the church authorities of their eras, were not engaged in the sort of position-taking that caused them to worry about image and *sprezzatura*.

New Historicists would argue in response, of course, that no writers can ever avoid taking a position on the political issues surrounding them: they would claim that by not aligning themselves with groups of any particular persuasion, Shakespeare and Cervantes were making a certain statement about their lack of connection to the world around them. While this assumption may hold true in a broad sense, it does not follow that these authors took a stand on all or even most political events of their day. Just because some ideologues of our time have decided to do so by using the scholarly

profession as a pulpit from which to instigate social reform does not mean that authors in the Renaissance did the same thing.

When modern scholars try to associate earlier literary authors with a political issue of their day, difficulties often emerge. Modern scholars' attempts to understand Petrarch's political views offer a parallel example:

> the choices are four: Petrarca favored a republican form of government, he favored an empire, he was basically indifferent toward politics, or his attitudes in some way embraced both republican and imperial sentiments. Unfortunately, all four possibilities have their modern defenders. Carlo Steiner, Thomas Bergin, and Alice Wilson believe that Petrarca considered the republic superior to the empire in ancient Rome and in his own day, while Bonaventura Zumbini, Giulio Augusto Levi, and Rodolfo De Mattei argue that like Dante, Petrarca was an ardent believer in the empire and admirer of its founder, Julius Caesar. Janet Smarr has suggested that Petrarca was basically indifferent to politics, that as far as he was concerned '[e]mpire or republic does not matter.' The most eloquent defender of the fourth possibility has been Hans Baron, who has claimed that Petrarca's political position evolved over time . . . . Petrarca seldom takes a clear stand on anything, and it has proved surprisingly difficult to isolate the political sentiments that colored both his scholarly study and his reactions to contemporary events. (Kallendorf 53)

Literary authors do not have to adopt political positions, and our attempts to make them do so can produce chaos.

To say that these works of literature merely reflect the world in which they were created would mean relegating the authors to the status of window-washers. According to "the Windex theory of

literature,"[6] literary creations function merely as cultural artifacts which transparently reflect the society of the time. This theory leaves the authors devoid of any right of ownership to their finished products. What if they deliberately choose to muddy the windows, making it difficult for us to invade their privacy across the centuries? If the themes they chose did manage to escape the entanglements of ephemeral political alliances, perhaps it was because they had exercised their freedom to create fictions instead of documentaries. This freedom has traditionally been known as artistic neutrality, and I believe it is a concept that should still retain meaning. Perhaps, in the process of canonization, this neutrality was transformed into universality. Some might even argue that there still is such a thing as a timeless classic.

---

[6] I am indebted to John Kronik for the phrase. He heard it in a lecture given by John Barthes at Hamilton College.

Bibliography

* * Theoretical Sources * *

Bourguignon, E. "Spirit Possession, Belief, and Social Structure." The Realm of the Extra-Human: Ideas and Actions. Ed. A. Bharati. Mouton: 1976. 17-26.

Bouyer, Louis. Erasmus and His Times. Westminster, Great Britain: The Newman Press, 1959.

Cox, Jeffrey N., and Larry J. Reynolds, eds. Introduction. New Historical Literary Study: Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993. 3-38.

Foucault, Michel. Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason. London: Random House, 1965.

Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Greenblatt, Stephen. Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Hanson, E.F. Demonology or Spiritualism, Ancient and Modern. Belfast, ME: Published by the author, 1884.

Howard, Jean E. "The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies." Renaissance Historicism: Selections from *English Literary Renaissance*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney and Dan S. Collins. Amherst: Massachusetts UP, 1987. 3-33.

Kaiser, Walter. Praisers of Folly. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1963.

Kallendorf, Craig. "Virgil, Dante and Empire in Italian Thought, 1300-1500." Vergilius 34(1988): 44-70.

Levack, Brian P. Articles on Witchcraft, Magic and Demonology. Vol. 9: Possession and Exorcism. New York: Garland Publishing, 1992.

Contains the following essays of interest:

Goddu, André. "The Failure of Exorcism in the Middle Ages."
Freud, Sigmund. "A Seventeenth-Century Demonological Neurosis."
Lewis, I. M. "Spirit Possession and Deprivation Cults."
Nischan, Bodo. "The Exorcism Controversy and Baptism in the Late Reformation."
Pattison, E. Mansell. "Psychosocial Interpretations of Exorcism."
Spanos, Nicholas P., and Gottlieb, Jack. "Demonic Possession, Mesmerism, and Hysteria: A Social Psychological Perspective on Their Historical Interrelations."
Walker, D. P. "Demonic Possession Used as Propaganda in the Later 16th Century."

Midelfort, H. C. Erik. "Madness and the Problems of Psychological History in the Sixteenth Century." *Sixteenth Century Journal* XII No. 1(1981): 5-12.

Oesterreich, T. K. *Possession, Demoniacal & Other: Among Primitive Races, in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and Modern Times.* New York: University Books, 1966.

Scott, Sir Walter, Bart. *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*. Addressed to J. G. Lockhart, Esq. 2nd ed. London: John Murray, 1831.

Starkey, Marion L. *The Devil in Massachusetts*. New York: Anchor, 1989.

Summers, Montague. *The Geography of Witchcraft*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.

Summers, Montague. *The History of Witchcraft and Demonology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926.

Witches, Devils, and Doctors in the Renaissance: Johann Weyer, De praestigiis daemonum. Ed. George Mora *et al.* Trans. John Shea. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies vol. 73. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1991.

* * Primary Sources: Shakespeare and * * English Renaissance

Bancroft, Richard. Daungerous Positions and Proceedings, Published and Practised within this Iland of Brytaine. London: 1593.

Bee, Jesse. The Most Wonderfull and True Storie of a Certain Witch named Alse Gooderige of Stapen Hill . . . As also a True Report of the Strange Torments of Thomas Darling, a Boy of Thirteene Yeres of Age, that was Possessed by the Devill. London: 1597.

A Booke Declaringe the Fearfull Vexasion of one Alexander Nyndge. Being moste Horriblye tormented wyth an euyll Spirit. London: Thomas Colwell, 1573.

Castiglione, Baldassare. The Book of the Courtier. New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Cecill, William, Lord Burghley. "Notes of Elizabeth's Reign by Lord Burghley" in A collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, From The Year 1571 to 1596. (1598). Ed. William Murdin, B.D. London: William Boyer, 1759.

[Darrell, John]. A Briefe Apologie Proving the Possession of William Sommers. [Middelburg]: 1599.

[Darrell, John]. A Briefe Narration of the possession, dispossession, and repossession of William Sommers. [Middelburg]: 1598.

Darrell, John. A Detection of that Sinnful Shamful, Lying, and Ridiculous Discours of Samuel Harshnet. [English secret press?]: 1600.

Darrell, John. The Replie of John Darrell to the Answer of John Deacon, and John Walker. [English secret press?]: 1602.

Darrell, John. A Survey of Certain Dialogical Discourses . . . Concerning the Doctrine of Possession and Dispossession of Divels. [English secret press]: 1601.

Darrell, John. A True Narration of the strange and grevous Vexation

by the Devil, of seven persons in Lancashire, and William Somers of Nottingham. Wherein the Doctrine of Possession and Dispossession of Demoniakes Out of the word of God is particularly applyed unto Somers, and the rest of the persons controurted: together with the use we are to make of these workes of God. London: 1600.

Darrell, John. *A True Relation of The grievous handling of William Sommers of Nottingham, Being possessed with a Devill, Shewing How he was first taken, and how lamentably from time to time he was tormented and afflicted*. London: Tho. Harper, 1641.

Deacon, Iohn and Iohn Walker. *Dialogicall Discourses of Spirits and Divels. Declaring their proper essence, natures, and dispositions: with other the appendantes, peculiarly appertaining to those speciall points. Verie conducent, and pertinent to the timely procuring of some Christian conformitie in iudgement: for the peaceable compounding of the late sprong controuersies concerning all such intricate and difficult doubts*. Londini: Impensis Geor. Bishop, 1601.

Deacon, Iohn and Iohn Walker. *A Summarie Answere to al the material points in any of Master Darel his bookes*. London: George Bishop, 1601.

[Denison, John]. *The most wonderfull and true storie of a certain Witch named Alse Gooderidge of Stapenhill, who was arraigned and convicted at Darbie . . . As also a true Report of the Strange Torments of Thomas Darling, a boy of thirteen years of age, that was possessed by the Devill, with his horrible Fittes and terrible apparitions by him uttered at Burton upon Trent, in the county of Stafford, and of his marvellous deliverance*. London: 1597.

Erasmus of Rotterdam. "Exorcismus, sive spectrum" (1524). *The Colloquies of Erasmus*. Trans. Craig R. Thompson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1965.

Gifford, George. *A Dialogue Concerning Witches and Witchcraftes* (1593). Shakespeare Association 1. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1931.

Gifford, George. *A Discourse of the Subtill Practises of Devilles* (1587). The English Experience 871. Norwood, New Jersey: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1977.

Harsnett, Samuel. *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*. *Shakespeare, Harsnett, and the Devils of Denham* by F. W. Brownlow. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1993. 191-416.

Harsnett, Samuel. *A Discovery of the Fraudulent Practices of One John Darrel Bachelor of Arts*. London: 1599.

Hartwell, Abraham. *A true discourse, upon the matter of Martha Brossier of Romorantin, pretended to be possessed by a deuill. Translated out of French into English by Abraham Hartwell*. London: John Wolfe, 1599.

Hawarde, John. *Les reportes del cases in Camera Stellata 1593 to 1609*. Manuscript copy, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, Austin, Texas. Pforzheimer MS.36.

Hawarde, John. *Les reportes del cases in Camera Stellata 1593 to 1609*. Ed. William Paley Baildon. *Proceedings in the Star Chamber 1593-1609*. London: Privately printed for Alfred Morrison, 1894.

James VI. of Scotland and I. of England. *Daemonologie, in Forme of a Dialogue*. First Edition. Edinburgh: Robert Walde-graue, 1597.

Jorden, Edward. *A Briefe Discourse of a Disease Called the Suffocation of the Mother. Written uppon occasion which hath beene of late taken thereby, to suspect possession of an euill spirit, or some such like supernaturall power. Wherin is declared that diuers strange actions and passions of the body of man, which in the common opinion are imputed to the Diuell, haue their true naturall causes, and do accompanie this disease*. London: Iohn Windet, 1603.

Krämer, Henry and James Sprenger. *Malleus maleficarum*. Trans. Montague Summers. Bungay, Suffolk, Great Britain: John Rodker, 1928.

Lavater, Lewis. Of Ghostes and Spirites Walking by Nyght. Trans. R. H. London: 1572.

Lodge, Thomas. The Diuel Coniured. London: Adam Islip for William Mats, 1596.

Lodge, Thomas. Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madnesse: Discouering the Deuils Incarnat of this Age (1596). The English Experience 198. New York: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1969.

More, George. A True Discourse concerning the certaine possession and dispossession of 7 persons in one familie in Lancashire, which also may serve as part of an Answere to a fayned and false Discoverie which speaketh very much evill, as well of this, as of the rest of those great and mightie workes of God which be of the like excellent nature. By George More, Minister and Preacher of the Worde of God, and now (for bearing Witnesse unto this, and for justifying the rest) a prisoner in the Clinke, where he hath continued almost for the space of two yeares. Middelburg: 1600.

The most strange and admirable discoverie of the three Witches of Warboys, arraigned, convicted and executed at the last assizes at Huntington. London: 1593.

Scot, Reginald. The Discouerie of Witchcraft. With A Discourse upon divels and spirits, and first of philosophers opinions, also the maner of their reasoning hereupon; and the same confuted. London: William Brome, 1584.

Scot, Reginald. The Discouerie of Witchcraft. Ed. Rev. Montague Summers. Bungay, Suffolk, Great Britain: John Rodker, 1930.

Shakespeare, William. Works. The Riverside Shakespeare. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Sommers, William. A briefe narration of the possession of William Sommers: and of some proceedings against Iohn Dorrell. 1598.

Swan, John. A true and breife report, of Mary Glovers vexation, and of her deliuerance by the meanes of fastinge and prayer. London: 1603.

The Triall of Maist. Dorrell, or A Collection of Defences against Allegations not yet suffered to receiue convenient answere. [Middelburg]: 1599.

* * Secondary Sources: Shakespeare and English Renaissance * *

Anders, Henry R. D. *Shakespeare's Books*. New York: AMS Press, 1965.

Bradbrook, Muriel C. "The Kingdom of Fools." *Shakespeare: The Poet in His World.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1978. 188-201.

Brownlow, F. W. "Book Review. *Darkness and Devils: Exorcism and* King Lear." *Philological Quarterly* 65(1986): 131-33.

Brownlow, F. W. "John Shakespeare's Recusancy: New Light on an Old Document." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40(1989): 186-91.

Brownlow, F. W. "Samuel Harsnett and the Meaning of Othello's 'Suffocating Streams.'" *Philological Quarterly* 58(1979): 107-15.

Brownlow, F. W. *Shakespeare, Harsnett, and the Devils of Denham*. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1993.

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. VII. Major Tragedies: Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth.* New York: Columbia UP, 1973.

Cauthen, I. B. "Another Chaucer Allusion in Harsnet." *Notes and Queries*, n. s. 5(1958): 248.

Cauthen, I. B. "The Foule Flibbertigibbet." *Notes and Queries*, n. s. 5(1958): 98.

Coddon, Karin S. "'Suche Strange Desygns': Madness, Subjectivity, and Treason in *Hamlet* and Elizabethan Culture." *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 20(1989): 51-75.

Cook, Ann Jennalie. The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London, 1576-1642. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.

Craig, Terry Ann. "Petruchio as an Exorcist: Shakespeare and Elizabethan Demonology." Selected Papers from the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association 2.3(1978): 1-7.

Elton, William R. *King Lear* and the Gods. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1988.

Gibson, J. Paul S. R. Shakespeare's Use of the Supernatural (1907). New York: AMS Press, 1974.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Shakespeare and the Exorcists." Shakespeare and the Question of Theory. Ed. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. New York: Methuen, 1985. 163-87.

Greenblatt, Stephen. Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.

Gurr, Andrew. Playgoing in Shakespeare's London. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Hamilton, Donna B. Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1992.

Hoeniger, F. David. Medicine and Shakespeare in the English Renaissance. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1992.

Kail, Aubrey C. The Medical Mind of Shakespeare. Balgowlah, NSW: Williams & Wilkins, 1986.

Kaula, David. Studies in English Literature. Vol. LXXXV. Shakespeare and the Archpriest Controversy: A Study of Some New Sources. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Latham, Jacqueline E. M. "*The Tempest* and King James's *Daemonologie*." Shakespeare Survey 28(1975): 117-23.

Law, T. G. "Devil-Hunting in Elizabethan England." The Nineteenth Century 35(1894): 397-411.

Lidz, Theodore. Hamlet's Enemy: Madness and Myth in Hamlet. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Märtin, Doris. Shakespeares "Fiend-like Queens". Charakterisierung, Kontext und dramatische Funktion der destruktiven Frauenfiguren in 'Henry VI', 'Richard III', 'King Lear' und 'Macbeth'. Dissertation, Erlangen (Prof. Erwin Wolff). Forum Anglistik, (New Series) 10. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1992.

Merchant, W. Moelwyn. "His Fiend-Like Queen." Shakespeare Survey 19(1966): 75-81.

Milward, Peter. "Shakespeare and Elizabethan Exorcism." Sophia University: Studies in English Literature and Language 17 (1981): 33-45.

Milward, Peter. Shakespeare's Religious Background. London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1973.

Muir, Kenneth. "Appendix 7: Samuel Harsnett and *King Lear*." *King Lear*. Ed. Kenneth Muir. The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare. London: Methuen, 1975.

Muir, Kenneth. "Samuel Harsnett and *King Lear*." Review of English Studies 2(1951): 11-21.

Muir, Kenneth. The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays. New Haven: Yale UP, 1978.

Murphy, John L. Darkness and Devils: Exorcism and *King Lear*. London: Ohio UP, 1984.

Neely, Carol Thomas. "'Documents in Madness': Reading Madness and Gender in Shakespeare's Tragedies and Early Modern Culture." Shakespeare Quarterly 42.3(1991): 315-38.

Oxford Shakespeare Concordances. *King Lear*: A Concordance to the Text of the First Folio. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Pollen, J. H. "Supposed Cases of Diabolical Possession in 1585-86." The Month 117(1911): 449-64.

Rickert, Corinne. The Case of John Darrell, Minister and Exorcist. Gainesville: U of Florida P, 1962.

Salingar, Leo. "*King Lear*, Montaigne, and Harsnett." Aligarh Journal of English Studies 8(1983): 124-66.

Salkeld, Duncan. Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993.

Schleiner, Winfried. "The Feste-Malvolio Scene in *Twelfth Night* Against the Background of Renaissance Ideas About Madness and Possession." Deutsche Shakespeare Gesellschaft West: Jahrbuch 1990: 48-57.

Siegel, P. N. "Discerning the Ghost in *Hamlet*." PMLA 78(1963): 148.

Soens, A. L. "*King Lear* III.iv.62-65: A Fencing Pun and Staging." English Language Notes (September 1968): 19-24.

Spalding, Thomas Alfred. Elizabethan Demonology: In Illustration of the Belief in the Existence of Devils, and the Powers Possessed by Them, As It Was Generally Held During the Period of the Reformation, and the Times Immediately Succeeding; With Special Reference to Shakspere and His Works. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly, 1880.

Stevenson, Robert. "Shakespeare's Interest in Harsnett's Declaration." PMLA 67: 898-902.

Thomas, Keith. Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England. London: Penguin Books, 1971.

Walker, D. P. Unclean Spirits: Possession and Exorcism in France and England in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries. London: Scolar Press, 1981.

Warren, Michael. "General Introduction." The Parallel *King Lear* 1608-1623. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.

* * Primary Sources: Cervantes and Spanish Golden Age * *

Castañega, Martín de. Tratado muy sotil y bien fundado dlas supersticiones y hechicerías y vanos conjuros y abusiones: y otras cosas al caso tocates y dela posibilidad y remedio dellas. Logroño: 1529. Ed. Agustín G. de Amezúa. Madrid: Sociedad de Bibliófilos Españoles, 1946.

Cervantes, Miguel de. "El casamiento engañoso" y "El coloquio de los perros." Novelas ejemplares II. Ed. Harry Sieber. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1992.

Cervantes, Miguel de. El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha. 2 vols. Ed. Luis Andrés Murillo. Madrid: Clásicos Castalia, 1987.

Cervantes, Miguel de. "La endemoniada de amor." Persiles y Sigismunda. Book III, chapts. XX, XXI. Madrid: Clásicos Castalia, 1989.

Cervantes, Miguel de. "El viejo celoso." Novelas ejemplares I. Ed. Harry Sieber. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1992.

Ciruelo, Pedro. Tratado en el qual se repruevan todas las supersticiones y hechicerías: muy util y necessario a todos los buenos Christianos zelosos de su saluación. Barcelona: 1530. 9 editions, 1539 to 1557. Seville: Andrés de Burgos, 1547. Trans. Eugene A. Maio and D'Orsay W. Pearson. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1977.

Erasmus of Rotterdam. "Exorcismus, sive spectrum" (1524). The Colloquies of Erasmus. Trans. Craig R. Thompson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1965.

Krämer, Henry and James Sprenger. Malleus maleficarum. Trans. Montague Summers. Bungay, Suffolk, Great Britain: John Rodker, 1928.

Navarro, Gaspar. Tribunal de superstición ladina, Explorador del saber, austucia y poder del Demonio; en que se condena lo que suele correr por bueno en Hechizos, Agüeros, Ensalmos, vanos Saludadores, Maleficios, Conjuros, Arte notaria, Caualistica, y

Paulina, y semejantes acciones vulgares. Ed. Pedro Bluson. Huesca: 1631. Madrid: 1899. Metropolitana: 1926. Roque Pidal: 1931. Dolphin Books: 1950. Porter: 1951.

Padilla, Luisa de (Condesa de Aranda). "De los magos, hechiceros y supersticiosos, familiares amigos de Mentira." Elogios de la verdad e invectiva contra la mentira. Zaragoza: 1640.

Remigio Noydens, Benito. Practica de exorcistas y ministros de la Iglesia. En que con mucha erudicion, y singular claridad, se trata de la instruccion de los Exorcismos para lançar, y ahuyentar los demonios, y curar espiritualmente todo genero de maleficio, y hechizos (1660). Ed. 1688. Barcelona: Por Antonio la Cavalleria, en la calle de los Libreros, 1688.

Vélez de Guevara, Luis. El diablo cojuelo (1641). Ed. Enrique Rodriguez Cepeda. Madrid: Cátedra, 1984.

* * Secondary Sources: Cervantes and * * Spanish Golden Age

Amezúa, Agustín G. de. "Prólogo" to Martín de Castañega, Tratado muy sotil y bien fundado de las supersticiones y hechicerías y vanos conjuros y abusiones: y otras cosas al caso tocates y dela posibilidad y remedio dellas. Madrid: Sociedad de Bibliófilos Españoles, 1946.

Ardura, Ernesto. "Shakespeare and Cervantes." Americas 7(Nov. 1955): 14-18.

Avalle-Arce, Juan Bautista. "Don Quijote, o la vida como obra de arte." Caudernos Hispano-Americanos 242(1970): 247-80.

Bataillon, Marcel. Erasmo y el Erasmismo. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1977.

Bataillon, Marcel. Erasmo y España. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1966.

Batllori, Miguel. Humanismo y renacimiento. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, S. A., 1987.

Bergúa, José. "Indice analítico" de El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha por Miguel de Cervantes. Prólogo y Esquema Biográfico por Américo Castro. México: Editorial Porrua, 1977.

Bettelheim, Bruno. The Uses of Enchantment. New York: Vintage Books, 1975.

Caro Baroja, Julio. "El *Quijote* y la concepción mágica del mundo." Vidas mágicas e Inquisición. Madrid: Taurus, 1967. I: 167-83.

Caro Baroja, Julio. Las brujas y su mundo. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1966.

Castro, Américo. "Cervantes y la Inquisición." Hacia Cervantes. II.36(1930): 213-21.

Christian, W. A. Local Religion in Sixteenth-Century Spain. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.

Cirac Estopañán, D. Sebastián. Los procesos de hechicerías en la Inquisición de Castilla la Nueva. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1942.

Crocker, Lester G. "*Hamlet, Don Quijote, La vida es sueño,* the quest for values." PMLA 69(1954): 278-313.

De Armas, Frederick A. "Literature's Occult Art in the Spanish Golden Age: A Preface." Crítica Hispánica 15.1(1993): 5-16.

De la Pinta Llorente, Miguel, O. S. A. Aspectos históricos del sentimiento religioso en España. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1961.

Descouzis, Paul. Cervantes, a nueva luz.

I: El "Quijote" y el Concilio de Trento. Analecta Romanica, Heft 19. Frankfurt: V. Klostermann, 1966.

II: Con la Iglesia hemos dado, Sancho. Madrid: Ediciones Iberoamericanas, 1973.

El Saffar, Ruth. Beyond Fiction: The Recovery of the Feminine in the Novels of Cervantes. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1984.

Flores Arroyuelo, Francisco J. El diablo y los españoles. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1976.

Flores Arroyuelo, Francisco J. El diablo en España. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1985.

Gillespie, Ruth C. "Don Quijote and the '*pecados mortales*.'" Hispania, 42(1959): 40-41.

González Ruiz, Nicolás. Dos genios contemporáneos, Cervantes y Shakespeare. Barcelona: Ed. Cervantes, 1945.

Granjel, L. S. La medicina española del siglo XVII. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1978.

Green, Otis H. "El 'Ingenioso' Hidalgo." Hispanic Review 25 (1957): 175-93. --The Literary Mind of Medieval and Renaissance Spain. UP of Kentucky, 1970.

Hasbrouck, Michael D. "Posesión demoníaca, locura y exorcismo en el *Quijote*." Cervantes 12.2(1992): 117-26.

Heiple, Daniel L. "Renaissance medical psychology in *Don Quijote*." Ideologies & Literature (U of Minnesota), 2(1979): 65-72.

Johnson, Carroll B. Madness and Lust: A Psychoanalytical Approach to Don Quixote. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Jones, Joseph R. "Historical materials for the study of the '*Cabeza encantada*' episode in *Don Quijote*." Hispanic Review 47 (1979): 87-103.

Kelly, James Fitzmaurice. "Cervantes and Shakespeare." Proceedings of the British Academy 7(1916): 297-317.

Lisón Tolosana, Carmelo. Antropología social y hermenéutica. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura, 1983.

Lisón Tolosana, Carmelo. La España mental I: Demonios y

exorcismos en los siglos de oro. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 1990.

Madariaga, Salvador de. "Hamlet and Don Quixote." Shakespeare Quarterly (London) 1(1948): 22-25.

Márquez Villanueva, Francisco. "Planteamiento de la literatura del 'loco' en España." Sin Nombre 10.4(1980): 7-25.

Menéndez-Pelayo, M. Historia de los heterodoxos españoles. Vol. IV. Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1947.

Mitchell, Timothy J. Violence and Piety in Spanish Folklore. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1988.

Molho, Mauricio. "'El sagaz perturbador del género humano': Brujas, perros embrujados y otras demonomanías cervantinas." Cervantes 12.2(1992): 21-32.

Moncy, A. "Santa Teresa y sus demonios." Papeles de Son Armadáns, XXXVI, 1965. 149-66.

Nencioni, Enrico. "Le tre pazzie (Orlando, Lear, Don Quijote)" (1881). Saggi critici di letteratura italiana. Firenze: Suc. de Le Monnier, 1898. 143-73.

Olmos García, Francisco. "La Inquisición en la época y en la obra de Cervantes." Cervantes en su época. Madrid: Ricardo Aguilera, 1968. 11-117.

Parker, A. A. The Theology of the Devil in the Drama of Calderón. London: Blackfriars, 1958.

Pearson, D'Orsay W. "Introduction" to Pedro Ciruelo, Tratado en el qual se repruevan todas las supersticiones y hechicerías: muy util y necessario a todos los buenos Christianos zelosos de su saluación. Trans. Eugene A. Maio and D'Orsay W. Pearson. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1977.

Read, Malcolm K. "The Word Made Flesh: Magic and Mysticism in Erasmian Spain." The Birth and Death of Language. Madrid: Porrúa-Studia Humanitatis, 1983. 97-135.

Sullivan, Henry W. "The Beyond in the Here-and-Now: Passing Through Purgatory in *Don Quixote*, Part Two." Crítica Hispánica 15.1(1993): 63-84.

Verbitsky, Bernardo. Hamlet y Don Quijote, ensayo. Buenos Aires: Ed. Jamcana, 1964.

Walsh, James J. "Cervantes, Shakespeare, and some historical backgrounds." Catholic World 103(1916): 38-42.

Zamora Vicente, Alonso. "El cautiverio en la obra de Cervantes." Homenaje a Cervantes. Ed. Francisco Sánchez-Castañer. Valencia: Editorial Mediterráneo, 1950. II: 237-56.

Bibliographical guide:

Palau y Dulcet, Antonio. Manual del librero hispano-americano; bibliografía general española e hispano-americana desde la invención de la imprenta hasta nuestros tiempos, con el valor comercial de los impresos descritos. Barcelona: Librería Palau, 1948-77.