SHAKESPEARE LECTURE

A World Elsewhere: Shakespeare's Sense of an Exit

RICHARD WILSON
University of Lancaster

SHAKESPEARE, IT HAS BEEN CLAIMED, was the first to translate into English words the laws of vanishing-point perspective.[1] So, according to art historians, Edgar's projection in *King Lear* of the view of the Channel from 'the extreme verge' of Dover Cliff was unprecedented in its analysis of how the planes of space diminish in proportion to distance, until 'crows and choughs that wing the midway air / Show scarce so gross as beetles,' while 'Halfway down / Hangs one that gathers sampire,' who 'seems no bigger than his head'.[2] Decades before other writers conceptualised space as a continuum, Shakespeare had internalised the scale which determines how from a distance 'fishermen, that walk upon the beach, / Appear like mice,' enough to define such a reductive way of seeing as 'deficient sight'. By staging 'the question of its own limits' with this paradox of vision as a form of blindness, his play seems, that is to say, to sense something terrifying in the great unseen space which would soon surround the theatre of the baroque, and into which, as Roland Barthes

Read at the Academy 25 April 2001.

---

[1] Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The making of Typographic Man* (1962), pp. 11–17. For a recent Lacanian analysis, see Christopher Pye, *The Vanishing: Shakespeare, the Subject, and Early Modern Culture* (Durham, 2000), esp. pp. 86–104. See also Stephen Orgel, 'Shakespeare Imagines a Theater', *Poetics Today*, 5 (1984), pp. 549–61, esp. pp. 556–7.

[2] All quotations of Shakespeare are from the *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, *et al.* (New York, 1997), based on the Oxford Edition, and quotations of *King Lear* are from the conflated text. For an account of the relation of this perspective to the emerging illusionistic theatre, see Jonathan Goldberg, 'Perspectives: Dover Cliff and the Conditions of Representation', in *Shakespeare and Deconstruction*, ed. G. Douglas Adams & David Bergeron (New York, 1988), pp. 245–65.

Proceedings of the British Academy, **117**, 165–199. © The British Academy 2002.

remarked, an exit would be the equivalent of a sentence of death.[3] Off-stage space requires a leap of faith in a way that on-stage space does not; so, it may be no accident that whenever three-dimensional space is envisioned in his work the vanishing-point is located where some 'tall anchoring bark' is 'Diminished to her cock; her cock, a buoy / Almost too small for sight' [*4. 6. 11–26*], and the loss is like the grief suffered by 'one on shore / Gazing upon a late-embarked friend / Till the wild waves will have him seen no more, / Whose ridges with the meeting clouds contend'. For what is striking about the vertiginous sense of space in these texts is that the vanishing-point, where distance will 'Fold in the object that did feed' the sight, as Adonis 'glides in the night from Venus' eye' [*Venus, 815–22*], is associated so often with the disappearance of a boat over the horizon, and that the passage of that tall ship across the waves, which in *King Lear* proves a cruel deceit, should be fraught with such doubt and disorientation. To Edgar, the theoretical space that yawns beyond the precipice of Dover Cliff is so 'fearful / And dizzy,' he vows to 'look no more,' lest his 'brain turn, and the deficient sight / Topple down headlong' [*4. 6. 23*]; and the prospect he disallows is one scanned to the end of Shakespeare's career with the same anguish Imogen invests in the departure of Posthumus, when he waves farewell to Britain and appears on the horizon 'As little as a crow, or less':

> I would have broke mine eye-strings, cracked them, but
> To look upon him till the diminution
> Of space had pointed him sharp as my needle;
> Nay, followed him till he had melted from
> The smallness of a gnat to air, and then
> Have turned mine eye and wept. [*Cymbeline, 1. 3. 15–22*]

A space of illusion that denounces real space, by being as rational as reality is chaotic, a ship is not just a means of economic exchange, but, as Michel Foucault insists, 'the greatest reservoir' of the utopian imagination.[4] Yet, in *Cymbeline*, Posthumus clings to the deck for as long as he can be seen, 'with glove or hat or handkerchief / Still waving, as the fits and stirs of's mind / Could best express how slow his soul sailed on, / How swift his ship' [*8–14*]; and this leavetaking seems so overwrought it reminds us how frequently Shakespearian drama is organised around a similar exit, but also how often its plot hinges on the attempt to 'descry a sail' on the vitual threshold ''twixt the heaven and the main' [*Othello, 2. 1. 3*], returning from a world elsewhere. For all his familiarity with nautical terms, Shakespeare did not love ships, it seems, as much as we might expect of a writer we like to blame for imperialism. In fact, there is a trajectory implicit in these texts that describes the experience of setting sail from the point of view not of those who cross the line between the seen and unseen, but of those they leave behind; and in his *Life* of the dramatist, Park Honan has connected the images of sea and coast that punctuate the early plays with Shakespeare's possible journey to Lancashire at the age of sixteen, when under protection of the Hoghton, Hesketh, and Stanley families, and in the circle of the Jesuit Edmund Campion, he may have graduated through a chain of Catholic mansions operating as secret clearing-houses in the two-way traffic of emigres bound for the continent and priests returning on their fatal 'Enterprise' to reconvert England. Honan notices how even when a scene is on the east coast, Shakespeare's has the sun sink in the sea [*2 Henry VI. 4. 1. 1*]; but he implies that this western horizon—here identified with the Ribble Estuary—constitutes the symbolic barrier between alternative worlds, which the writer himself confronts as 'upon a promontory', where the sheer 'effort of crossing tidal waters against wind and tide' acts as a deterrent, and the ocean seems so impassable to those who 'Come daily to the banks, that when they see / Return of love, more blessed may be the view' [*Sonnet 56*].[5] So, in the great choice of his young life, Shakespeare seems to have thought France a bridge too far; and on the sands where Thomas Hoghton set sail to join Cardinal Allen in the college they founded at Douai in the Ardennes—determined, in the words of a contemporary ballad, to preserve his 'blessed conscience'[6]—the future dramatist stood on the brink of embarkation, yet rather than cross that Rubicon, preferred to 'dream on sovereignty':

---

[3] Roland Barthes, *Sur Racine* (Paris, 1963), p. 17; Pye, op. cit. (see above, n. 1), p. 97.

[4] 'Different Spaces', trans. Robert Hurley, in Michel Foucault, *Essential Works of Foucault: 1954–1984, III: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. James D. Faubion, pp. 184–5; originally published in *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité*, 5 (Oct. 1984), pp. 46–9.

> Like one that stands upon a promontory
> And spies a far-off shore where he would tread,
> Wishing his foot were equal with his eye,
> And chides the sea that sunders him from thence . . . [*3 Henry VI, 3. 2. 134–9*]

---

[5] Park Honan, *Shakespeare: A Life* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 62–3 & 68–9.

[6] 'The Blessed Conscience', attributed to the Hoghton steward, Roger Anderton, quoted in Ernst Honigmann, *Shakespeare: The Lost Years* (Manchester, 1985), p. 10. For the political context, see Thomas H. Clancy, *The Allen-Parsons Party and the Political Thought of the Counter-Reformation in England, 1572–1615* (Chicago, 1964), pp. 142–7.

Research on the Lancashire Shakespeare by Ernst Honigmann and others has helped to situate the dramatist in relation to the great neglected literary theme, revisited by Alison Shell, of Elizabethan Catholic exile. For Shell's report on a literature irrigated by rivers of blood and tears, symbolising England weeping in the sea, is richly evocative of a text like *The Rape of Lucrece*; as is her study of Catholic investment in the romance of return, for which exile ends, as in the poem, with the tyrant of the 'late-sack'd island' himself condemned 'to everlasting banishment' [*1740;1855*]. Likewise, in light of this lost literature of the Catholic diaspora, the self-pitying Venus who wails when Adonis flees her love, as 'a bright star shooteth from the sky' [*815*], looks very like the old queen of crocodile tears shed for stars like Campion, when they chose exile rather than her Oath of Allegiance.[7] Only a criticism superbly oblivious to work by a generation of social historians could continue to dismiss analysis of Shakespeare's religious contexts as 'fruitless speculation.'[8] Yet the rediscovery of his Catholic patronage networks, in Warwickshire, Lancashire, and London, means not only that we are beginning to feel more confident about where, geographically and ideologically, Shakespeare was coming from with works like these. It also means that we are starting to grasp more of where he was going, in contrast to the itinerary that might have been expected. As Gary Taylor summarises it, all the evidence suggests that 'for much of his life Shakespeare was a church papist'—or 'occasional conformist' to the state religion—that 'once he began dividing his life between Stratford and London, he might have become a recusant'—absenting from the Church of England—but that, 'like a majority of English Catholics, he had no appetite for martyrdom.'[9] Taylor finds this half-way house insufficiently confrontational, in contrast to a Puritan like Thomas Middleton. This may, however, be to mistake the form of Shakespeare's opposition. For it underrates the extent to which, in an age split between rival confessional extremes, his resistance could have been as much to Rome as London; and it ignores the process by which this youth, who must have dismayed his controllers when he did *not* sail to France, exchanged a 'blessed conscience' in the unseen world across the waves for creative freedom in the world he knew: dreaming on that absent off-stage space of violent faith and martyrdom from within the circle of his wooden 'promontory' of theatre [*Hamlet, 2. 2. 290*].

---

[7] Alison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 175–80, 188–9. See also Richard Wilson, 'A Bloody Question: The Politics of *Venus and Adonis*', *Religion and the Arts*, 5 (2001), pp. 297–313.

[8] Jonathan Bate, 'No other purgatory but a play', *Sunday Telegraph*, 8 April 2001, Review, p. 14.

[9] Gary Taylor, 'Forms of Opposition: Shakespeare and Middleton', *English Literary Renaissance*, 24: 2 (1994), p. 298. See also the pathbreaking study by Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (1993). Apart from the indispensable work by Honigmann (see above, n. 6), the most important accounts of Shakespeare and Catholicism are Henry Bowden, *The Religion of Shakespeare: chiefly from the writings of the late Richard Simpson* (1899); John Henry de Groot, *The Shakespeares and "the Old Faith"* (New York, 1946); Robert Stevenson, *Shakespeare's Religious Frontier* (The Hague, 1958); H. Mutschmann and K. Wentersdorf, *Shakespeare and Catholicism* (New York, 1969); Peter Milward, *Shakespeare's Religious Background* (Chicago, 1973); Richard Wilson, 'Shakespeare and the Jesuits: New connections supporting the theory of the lost Catholic years in Lancashire', *Times Literary Supplement*, 19 Dec. 1997, pp. 11–13; and Carol Enos, *Shakespeare and the Catholic Religion* (Pittsburgh, 2000).

Just before dawn on 25 June 1580 Campion landed on the beach beneath Dover Cliff, and climbing the rocks, 'fell upon his knees to commend to God his cause and his coming' to restore the faith to England. The night before, he wrote from Calais that the wind was set fair for his mission by 'the incredible comfort' he had received in Milan from Carlo Borromeo, so 'I think we are now safe, unless we are betrayed in these seaside places.' The grand narrative of Catholic return seemed about to be fulfilled. In fact, we know Campion's movements had been relayed to Lord Burghley, from the day he arrived in Italy from Prague in the Emperor's coach, by a ring of spies, who included the double-agent Anthony Munday. But disguised as a merchant, who had for sale 'a pearl of great price',[10] the Jesuit was waved on by the Mayor of Dover, to join his partner Robert Parsons, before setting out on the first stage of their crusade, that took them from the London home of Sir William Catesby to his house at Lapworth Park, near Stratford.[11] There, during September, the priests distributed copies of the Testament of faith they had been given by Borromeo; and as one of the first to sign, we think, was John Shakespeare, it seems important to consider what this mission from Milan might have meant to his son, whose career would start, in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, with a broken journey to the city, and end, in *The Tempest*, with hope of finally arriving there, where 'Every third thought' shall be a grave [*5. 1. 314*]. Borromeo was ready to receive the recruits sent him; and Campion had written from Prague to Robert Arden, the Warwickshire Jesuit thought to be a relative of Mary Arden, that his 'abundant harvest' of converts should also be prepared for the welcome waiting on 'the pleasant and blessed shore' of Bohemia.[12] Yet in what may have been his first play, Shakespeare—who does send his characters (though by sea, as if from England) towards both Milan and 'the Emperor's court' in Prague [*Two Gentlemen, 1. 3. 38*]—confuses editors by never definitely locating them anywhere, until they exit through a 'postern by the abbey wall', promising to confess later 'at Friar Patrick's cell' [*5. 1. 3–10*]. 'Friar' or 'Mr Patrick' was, in fact, the alias of Campion, adopted at Lough Derg in Ulster, where St Patrick had supposedly discovered the mouth of Purgatory. As Stephen Greenblatt reminds us, the 'vast unreal space' of Purgatory, invoked in Borromeo's Testament and by Hamlet as a cellar below stage where ghosts are bound to walk, was one of the most horrifying inventions of the Catholic imagination, so mere mention of 'confession / At Patrick's cell' [*5. 3. 39*] opens a gaping chasm beneath Shakespeare's text.[13] But, tellingly, the lovers of *The Two Gentlemen* never do meet up at Patrick's cell, preferring to return home instead with outlaws, who look reassuringly like actors. Evidently, that secret tunnel from the abbey provided a bolt-hole not only from the Duke's spies, but also from sectarian commitment, as Shakespeare groped in this prototype of all his works for a way out of his dangerous liaison with those real—Jesuit—outlaws who followed 'Friar Patrick' from Milan.

---

[10] *Matthew*, 23: 45–6.

[11] Richard Simpson, *Edmund Campion: A Biography* (1896), pp. 171, 176, 224 & 251–2.

[12] Ibid., pp. 120–1 & 157.

Some time after 'Friar Patrick' left Stratford, and though he had sworn to carry it with him to the grave, Shakespeare's father hid his copy of the Borromeo Testament between the rafters and tiles of their roof, where, despite Robert Cecil's orders that 'if there be any loft, it must be looked into, for these be ordinary places' of hiding, it remained a dusty secret until 1757.[14] Its survival in that dark place might hearten contemporary critics, themselves trapped by a fear that there is no escaping the eye of power in Shakespeare.[15] For the organisation of different places on his stage suggests the dramatist knew there is no power without resistance. And for most of the twentieth century, pockets of resistance were indeed found in the dispersed localities of Shakespeare's geographical imagination. Critics had not then forgotten how his topography consisted of literal *topoi*: enclosed *places* (to use Louis Marin's distinction) rather than exposed *spaces*; and his drama was seen as a system of localisation, with power diffused or contested in locations such as forests.[16] But this localised 'green world' could not survive New Historicism, with its account of Shakespeare's forest as open to market forces. As Anne Barton reported in her 1991 British Academy Lecture, if Shakespeare was 'haunted by the ghost of the Forest of Arden', the real Warwickshire forest had long been 'felled, cleared and cultivated. . . . And Shakespeare faithfully reflects it.'[17] So, the deforestation of Arden can be seen as a cue for the deconstruction of every last corner of resistance in Shakespeare studies, where the spatial dialectics of the 'green world' have been abolished in obedience to the stark maxim that if power is everywhere, there may be 'subversion, but not for us'.[18] Prospero set his slaves logging, but by 2001 there was no place safe from loggers in all of Shakespeare, because the disenchantment of his stage had proceeded according to a logic which made the Globe playhouse itself a *theatrum mundi* 'for *seeing*' the profits of empire, in the phrase of John Gillies.[19] 'Long overdue', Walter Cohen asserts, this indictment of the plays as collusive with globalisation has obliterated the binary alternations—between Venice and Belmont, Westminster and Eastcheap, or Rome and Egypt—that enabled earlier critics to reserve in the differential relations of 'a split world' some polar opposite to power;[20] with the result that if Windsor Park is now 'hedged' by patriarchy, even the Bohemian festival of *The Winter's Tale* is revealed to be 'fully integrated into the international economy', with its exchange of wool for commodities like raisins, sugar, and spices.[21] And if the 'rehearsal of strange cultures' at the Globe is revealed to be a brand of consumerism, then that confirms a suspicion that 'the place of the stage' was merely 'licensed' in Tudor London: removed to the Liberties on the periphery of the City the better to be *observed* by authority, so that, as Steven Mullaney bleakly concludes, 'The horizon of the community was thereby made visible . . . seen and apprehended', by being 'set on stage.'[22] Shakespeare's spymaster, Ulysses likes to imagine 'all the commerce' in society under police surveillance, and with such 'global criticism' it is as if his panoptic dream—of a homogenised transparent space endlessly accessible to power—has indeed been realised:

---

[13] Richard Simpson, *Edmund Campion: A Biography* (1896), pp. 58–9 & 153: 'They wanted to call Campion Petre; but he, remembering how well he had escaped from Ireland under St Patrick's patronage, would take no name but his old one of Patrick'; Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton, 2001), p. 50.

[14] Robert Cecil, quoted, Michael Hodgetts, 'Elizabethan Priest-Holes: I: Dating and Chronology', *Recusant History*, 15 (1981), p. 290.

[15] See, in particular, the hugely influential essay by Stephen Greenblatt, 'Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and Its Subversion, *Henry IV* and *Henry V*', in *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*, ed. Richard Dutton & Richard Wilson (Harlow, 1992), pp. 83–108.

---

[16] Louis Marin, *Utopiques: Jeux d-espace* (Paris, 1973); Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton, 1957), p. 182; John Holloway, *The Story of the Night* (1961), p. 66. For the recent reengagement with the power of place, see J. Hillis Miller, *Topographies* (Stanford, 1995); Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Thought* (1989); and Cynthia Wall, *The Literary and Cultural Spaces of Restoration London* (Cambridge, 1998). On *topoi* as linguistic places, see Marion Trousdale, *Shakespeare and the Rhetoricians* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1982).

[17] Anne Barton, 'Parks and Ardens: 1991 Shakespeare Lecture', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 80, p. 51.

[18] Greenblatt, op. cit. (see above, n. 15), p. 108.

[19] John Gillies, *Shakespeare and the geography of difference* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 94–8.

[20] Clifford Leech, 'The Function of Locality in the Plays of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries', in *The Elizabethan Theatre*, ed. David Galloway (Waterloo, Ontario, 1969) p. 108.

[21] Walter Cohen, 'The Undiscovered Country: Shakespeare and mercantile geography', in *Marxist Shakespeares*, ed. Jean Howard & Scott Cutler Shershow (2001), pp. 128, 143–4 & 156; Jeane Addison Roberts, *The Shakespearian Wild: Geography, Genus, and Gender* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1991), p. 47.

> The providence that's in a watchful state
> Knows almost every grain of Pluto's gold,
> Finds bottom in th'uncomprehensive deeps,
> Keeps place with aught, and almost like the gods
> Do infant thoughts unveil in their dumb cradles. [*Troilus, 3. 3. 189–93*]

One objection to a young Catholic or Lancastrian Shakespeare has been a dearth of evidence, considering how Elizabethan informers aimed to 'unveil' infant thoughts 'in their dumb cradles'. And the fantasy of Ulysses is certainly of an intelligence operation so vigilant every communication 'breath or pen can give expression to' [*196*] is intercepted. That was also the aim of Burghley, as he sat in his map-room pondering the survey of England ordered from Christopher Saxton, or plotting on his chart of the 'dark corners' of Lancashire routes of escape or invasion—but at Hoghton Tower, the absence of the dissident thought to have been Shakespeare's benefactor: marked with a cross as 'Thomas Hoghton: the fugitive'.[23] And it is the flight of such resisters from a Protestant empire which might give pause to the idea that Shakespeare leaves no traces, and prompt instead the question why so many of his plays are centred on similar absences, or have as a termination some 'undiscovered country' [*Hamlet, 3. 1. 81*] beyond the horizon. For if it is true that Arden, Birnam, Bohemia, or Troy are now as discredited as the Greek trenches, Sicily, Glamis, or the Duke's palace; that the Athenian woods give no more shelter to lovers than Timon; that Olivia's Illyria is as sick as Orsino's; Belmont no more an antidote to Venice than Cyprus, nor Egypt than Antium to Rome; that the Goths' camp, Welsh hills, or English court offer no respite from tyranny in Scotland, Britain, or Italy; that the Boar's Head is bugged, and Vienna's brothels a state monopoly; Norway as much a prison as Denmark, Florence as sexist as Rousillon, Ephesus as incestuous as

---

[22] Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Chicago, 1988), p. 22.

[23] Joseph Gillow, *Lord Burghley's Map of Lancashire in 1590* (1907), p. 4.

Antioch, and Prospero's island as bitterly contested as the Neapolitan ship; if, in short, a hermeneutic of suspicion is right to exclude from the circumference of Shakespeare's globe any possibility of escape from empire, nonetheless, the fact remains that so many of these plays contain *aporia*, blind-spots, or liminal places which give them meaning, and retain the potential for resistant readings to the extent that, though under the very eye of power, they are never in its sight: worlds within- rather than off-stage, like that mysterious shadowland of wayside shrines and 'holy crosses' near Belmont, where it is reported that Portia 'doth stray about', and 'kneels and prays', before the final act of *The Merchant of Venice*, accompanied by no one but her maid and 'a holy hermit', who has not appeared before and is never once seen or heard of again [*5. 1. 30–4*].

In a contemporary satire the church papist was defined as one who 'kneels with the congregation but prays by himself. He would make a bad martyr . . . and in Constantinople would be circumcised with a reservation.'[24] Yet it is the discovery of the large numbers in this category of deniability that produces a context for debate over one of Shakespeare's persistent themes, which is the clash between the secret self and security state, personified by Hamlet in his 'inky cloak', refusing to reveal 'that within which passes show', or let spies 'pluck out the heart' of his mystery [*Hamlet, 1. 2. 77–85; 3. 2. 336*].[25] Church papism might be why these plots problematise the reluctance of *refusniks* like Cordelia to heave heart in mouth and answer the ruler's loyalty test, by swearing 'Which of you shall we say doth love us most?' [*King Lear, 1. 1. 49*]. For the possibility that

---

[24] John Earle, *Microcosmographie* (1628), quoted in Elliot Rose, *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives open to Recusants and Puritans under Elizabeth I and James I* (Cambridge, 1975), p. 111. For Catholic ambivalence towards the English Crown, see also J. H. C. Aveling, *The Handle and the Axe: The Catholic Recusants in England from Reformation to Emancipation* (1976); Clancy, op. cit. (see above, n. 6); Peter Holmes, *Resistance and Compromise: The Political Thought of the Elizabethan Catholics* (Cambridge, 1982); David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, NY, 1999); Arnold Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England* (1979); Michael Questier, 'Loyalty, Religion, and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance', *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997), pp. 311–30; and William Trimble, *The Catholic Laity in England, 1558–1603* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

[25] For the important debate about subjectivity or 'inwardness' in Shakespearian theatre, see Francis Barker, *The Tremulous Private Body* (1984), pp. 31–5 & 58; Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy* (1985), p. 48; Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago, 1991), pp. 109 & 130; Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature* (Baltimore, 1983), p. 83; Elizabeth Hanson *Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 1–19; Jean Howard, 'The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies', *English Literary Renaissance*, 16 (1985), p. 15; and Katharine Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago,) 1995, passim.

Shakespeare was himself *repelled* by Jesuit extremism, at the time of Campion's mission, could explain why absolute solutions are pushed over the horizon of his texts, in favour of holding-positions, like that sad 'mourning house' where the Queen of France vows to shut up her 'woeful self', at the end of *Love's Labour's Lost*, in a promise that lends a final integrity to this comedy of oaths betrayed [*5. 2. 790*]. In fact, Shakespeare's entire dramatic economy can be keyed to the displacement effected in this plot, when rival sectarian extremes, of the academy of Navarre and court of Paris, are shelved, and a decision deferred by retreat into that house of grief, or 'some forlorn and naked hermitage / Remote from all the pleasures of the world' [*777*]. So, if *Love's Labour's Lost* is attuned to politics in France and England—where the author's patron, Ferdinando Stanley, mirrored Henri of Navarre, in being a petty King (of the Isle of Man) and a Catholic convert and royal heir—what is crucial is how its ending suspends any 'world-without-end bargain' [*771*] to buy Paris with a Mass, when its courtiers pledge to don a 'black gown' or 'jest a twelvemonth in a hospital' [*811;846*]. Thus, the only one of Shakespeare's works with characters named after living personalities allows them to adjourn their Wars of Religion with a moratorium, by choosing to wait upon events in the intermediate no-man's land of some nunnery, hospital, or hermitage.

'A plague o'both your houses' [*Romeo, 3. 1. 101*]: research on the 'Catholic loyalist who serves two masters as each makes it impossible to serve the other',[26] offers new insight into what Clifford Leech noted was a defining tic of Shakespearian drama, which is to defer the ending to a locale we never see, but that retains importance so long as it remains implicit. Leech related such unseen places to the two-storeyed playhouse, with its 'world above', and so to Shakespeare's awareness of 'what his stage could not communicate', but its effect, he thought, was always to subsume the action in 'some larger world within which the characters have their total being'.[27] With Shakespeare's attic in mind, we might say that, rather than the unconscious of the text, such a 'world above' would be its super-ego. There is an affinity, in other words, between his doubtful religious position and his preference for private places over public spaces. For like recesses in the tiring-house, the turning-points of Shakespearian drama seem neither quite present nor absent. They belong to the enigmatic *locus* of the inner-stage that Robert Weimann differentiates from the realism of the down-stage *platea.* And as theatre historians point out, though rear curtains gave him power to cut scenes abruptly, Shakespeare never did so, clinging instead to 'soft' endings of withdrawal, which suggest that 'What's to come is still unsure' [*Twelfth Night, 2. 3. 50*].[28] So, compared to the perspective backdrops of baroque theatre, with its rigid split between the seen and unseen, Shakespeare's tiring-house facade brackets the boundary of the stage in ambiguity: like the uncertain corridors and stairs of mannerist painting, or the Escher-like hiding-places inserted behind walls by his Catholic patrons to confuse the priest-hunters.[29] Less sure of transcendence than its limits, there is an anxiety about exposure to off-stage space in these plays, in short, that corresponds to nostalgia for enclosure; and this ambivalence 'toward the roaring sea' [*King Lear, 3. 4. 10*] can be likened to the 'terror of infinite spaces' confided by Pascal, which Lucien Goldmann related to the self-sequestration of the Jansenists, and to the 'tragic refusal' of Racine's heroines to submit to the searching eye of power. Goldmann associated this refusal with the alienation of the *noblesse de robe* from the absolutist state; and his reading resonates with speculation on Shakespeare's Catholic affiliations, which similarly aligns the English dramatist with the nobility of an *ancien regime*, trapped in a double-bind of dependence on two titanic systems, 'which they disliked intensely, but could neither alter nor destroy'.[30] As the sociologist John Orr remarks, recent research on Shakespeare's Catholic universe gives an enhanced validity to Goldmann's interpretation of baroque tragedy as a drama of seclusion and evasion:

---

[26] Ronald Corthell, '"The Secrecy of Man": Recusant Discourse and the Elizabethan Subject', *English Literary Renaissance*, 19 (1989), p. 289.

[27] Clifford Leech, op. cit. (see above, n. 20), pp. 103–16; 'Ephesus, Troy, Athens: Shakespeare's Use of Locality', *Stratford Papers on Shakespeare: 1963* (Toronto, 1964), pp. 151–69; *"Twelfth Night" and Shakespearian Comedy* (Toronto, 1965), pp. 4–7; and the Introduction to the New Arden edition of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1972), pp. lvi–lviii.

> Heresy becomes a vantage-point for glossing the complex relations of perfidy and power. Where Racine's poetics are those of refusal and finality, Shakespeare's hidden agenda contains disguise, banishment, exile, the trading of identities, and, in *Hamlet*, the active powers of indecision. The tragic repudiation of the game had, as it were, already been superseded by new dramatic forms of tragic game-playing, positing the choice of relationship to the field of

---

[28] Robert Weimann, *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function* (Baltimore, 1978), pp. 208–15; James G. McManaway, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and Its Design* (New York, 1964), pp. 347–8.

[29] For priest-holes as Mannerist perspective tricks, see Michael Hodgetts, *Secret Hiding-Places* (Dublin, 1989), pp. 214–15; op. cit. (see above, n. 14), p. 290; and 'A Topographical Index of Hiding Places', *Recusant History*, 16 (1982), pp. 146–207.

[30] Lucien Goldmann, *The Hidden God: A Study of Tragic Vision in the 'Pensees' of Pascal and the Tragedies of Racine*, trans. Philip Thody (1964), pp. 119–21 & 231–3.

> power in post-classical tragedy. Either you played to lose, or you did not play at all.[31]

At the end of *Titus Andronicus*, after Titus fails to distract Virgo (or Elizabeth) from her Puritan meditation, when he shoots arrows in her lap, a final judgement is referred instead to the 'ruinous monastery' on which even the Goths (whom Jonathan Bate identifies with the Lutheran 'Reformers of the decadent Roman religion') 'earnestly fix' their eyes, assessing 'the wasted building' [*5. 1. 21–3*], though it remains only a rumour to us.[32] If Shakespeare was haunted by the Forest of Arden, that was evidently because, as Eamonn Duffy contends, he could never forget the debris there of 'Bare ruined choirs where late the sweet birds sang' [*Sonnet 73*]. It is not necessary to identify the Isabella and Joan Shakespeare who were among the last prioresses of Wroxall Abbey, near Stratford, as the writer's aunts,[33] to see how relics of monasteries would have affirmed alternative places to those of the Tudor state, where, as Rosalind yawns, the 'pulpiter' so wearied his parishioners with the 'tedious homily' [*As You Like It, 3. 2. 143*]. So, while the 'green world' may be eroded in these texts, Linda Woodbridge is surely right to think that Shakespeare's space is never totally desacralised, and that even as 'magic is starting to bleach out of the landscape', his forests are contested by the guardians of 'a ghostly organic society'.[34] It would be possible to trace the origins of English Gothic, with its dark woods and silent convents, to this Shakespearian dereliction, like 'Ovid . . . among the Goths' [*3. 3. 6*], amid the haunted ruins of medieval Catholicism. For as Father Peter Milward insists, it cannot be chance that nostalgia for the 'well-noted face / Of plain old form' [*John, 4. 2. 21*], 'constant service of the antique world' [*As You Like, 2. 3. 58*], 'better days' [*2. 7. 119*], 'old custom' [*2. 1. 2*], and 'old fashions', by those who refuse 'To change true rules for odd inventions' [*Shrew, 3. 1. 78–9*], is projected so often onto the 'holy edifice of stone' [*Merchant, 1. 1. 30*] pre-dating the Reformation.[35] What is most pointed, however, about this lament over 'ruin's wasteful entrance' [*Macbeth, 2. 3. 111*], is how it aligns these plays with the cult of pre-Reformation relics which historians term Catholic *survivalism*, as distinct from the *revivalism* of the missionary priests.[36] Greenblatt has noted how the clerical vestments, 'the copes, albs, amices and stoles that were the glories of the medieval church', were sold off to the players, which he thinks analogous to theatre's appropriation of Catholic rituals, such as 'the anointing of the marriage bed', recycled in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. For the New Historicist critic, this is a process of disenchantment whereby 'a sacred sign is emptied';[37] but it can be argued that what we in fact witness in these exchanges are classic acts of *survivalism*, as a writer who omits the looting of the monasteries from *King John*,[38] imitates his own father, when John Shakespeare whitewashed the Gild Chapel in Stratford, not to empty it of medieval images, but rather to conserve them 'for a better day', as Patrick Collinson has now claimed, after the iconoclasts 'broke ope / The Lord's anointed temple, and stole hence / The life o'the building' [*Macbeth, 2. 3. 63–5*]—by literally suspending them under erasure.[39]

---

[31] John Orr, 'The Hidden Agenda: Pierre Bourdieu and Terry Eagleton', in Bridget Fowler, *Reading Bourdieu on Society and Culture* (Oxford, 2000), p. 128.

[32] Jonathan Bate, '"*Lucius*, the Severely Flawed Redeemer of *Titus Andronicus*": A Reply', *Connotations*, 63 (1996/97), p. 332.

[33] Eamonn Duffy, 'Bare Ruined Choirs', in Richard Dutton, Alison Findlay, and Richard Wilson (eds.), *Lancastrian Shakespeare* (Manchester, 2002). The identity of Joan Shakespeare is discussed in John Henry de Groot, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), pp. 103–4; and that of Isabella in Peter Milward, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), p. 22.

[34] Linda Woodbridge, *The Scythe of Saturn: Shakespeare and Magical Thinking* (Urbana, IL, 1994), pp. 163, 192–3, & 199; Carlo Ginzburg, *Night Battles: Witchcraft and Agrarian Cults in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, trans. John Tedeschi and Anne Tedeschi (1983).

When Theseus condemns Hermia either to be executed or 'in shady cloister mewed' [*Dream, 1. 1. 65–71*] he seems to concede that power does meet its terminus in Shakespearian drama, in the shadows 'underneath that consecrated roof' [*Twelfth Night, 4. 3. 25*] which is the sanctum of those who forsake 'the full stream of the world to live in a nook merely monastic' [*As You Like It, 3. 2. 375*]: where Romeo is 'hid at Friar Laurence' cell', Juliet helped by Friar John [*Romeo, 3. 2. 141; 5. 2*], Hero 'secretly kept' by Friar Francis [*Much Ado, 4. 1. 202*], Olivia married by an unnamed friar [*Twelfth Night, 5. 1. 149*]; and the Duke, as Friar Lodowick, given 'secret harbour' by Friar Thomas, before returning with Friar Peter [*Measure, 1. 3. 4; 5. 1. 151*]. As Jean Howard wryly notes of the incident in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* when, instead of waiting 'At Friar Patrick's cell', Silvia meets yet another Friar Laurence, 'As he in penance wandered through the forest', who may or may not be the friar 'in the cloister' who started the action by urging Proteus to emigrate [*1. 3. 2; 4. 3. 43; 5. 3. 35–40*], the headache for the editor is that at any one time in Shakespeare there may always be 'more than one friar in the forest',[40] about to emerge from some priest-hole or mere monastic nook. But these cowled figures are subject to a trappist law which distinguishes most of them from seminary priests, and obeys Shakespeare's topographical rule. This is that the less they appear the more they achieve. So, Friar Lodowick, for example, lives up to his Jesuitical name and Counter-Reformation milieu, as an 'old fantastical' Duke of Vienna, by the gamesmanship that makes him so problematic, and is least convincing when quoting (Milward claims) the Jesuit poet Robert Southwell, by coldly urging Claudio to 'Be absolute for death' [*Measure, 4. 4. 147; 3. 1. 5*].[41] In contrast, Friar Laurence seems a dangerous innocent who sabotages Romeo's exile, and may be a satire on the Montague chaplain Alban Langdale, 'a learned and pious man . . . but too fearful', who also hoped to turn two 'households' rancour to pure love' [*Romeo, 2. 2. 92*], by naively advising Catholics 'not to be busy exasperating their adversaries' with qualms about taking Anglican communion.[42] He talks too much, but like other Shakespearian friars, harks back to those Franciscans who pre-dated the Jesuits. By Elizabethan standards, 'the treatment of all these Catholic religious is exceptionally sympathetic'.[43] But as Petruchio sings, it is the 'friar of orders gray, / As he forth walked on his way' [*Shrew, 4. 1. 126–7*], rather than the 'black-robe' Jesuit, who earns most respect in these plays; and his aura has nothing to do with eloquence, but is in direct proportion to the inaccessibility of whatever 'close cell' [*Romeo, 2. 1. 233*], dark 'chantry' [*Twelfth Night, 4. 3. 24*], or 'shady cloister' he happens to occupy; so that the dramaturgical economy of the order of Saint Clare, to which Isabella belongs, actually does seem to determine his impact on the plot:

---

[35] Peter Milward, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), pp. 78, 176, & 180–1. For the antecedents of the Gothic in lamentation over the destruction of the monasteries, see Margaret Aston, 'English Ruins and English History: the Dissolution and the Sense of the Past', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 36 (1973), pp. 232–55.

[36] Catholic 'survivalism' has been the subject of an important debate among historians. See in particular John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community* (1975); and Christopher Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire* (Cambridge, 1975).

[37] Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearian Negotiations* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 10–11 & 112.

[38] See De Groot, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), pp. 203–9.

[39] Patrick Collinson, 'William Shakespeare's Religious Inheritance and Environment', in *Elizabethan Essays* (1994), p. 250.

---

[40] Jean Howard (ed.), *'Two Gentlemen of Verona', The Norton Shakespeare* (New York, 1997), p. 126.

[41] Milward, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), pp. 75–6; Robert Southwell, *Epistle of Comfort* (Douai, 1606 edn.), pp. 228–9.

[42] 'A discourse delivered to Mr Sheldon to persuade him to conform. Arguments to prove it lawful for a Roman Catholic to attend the Protestant service', *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1547–1580*, p. 691. For Langdale, see Walsham, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), pp. 50–5; and Roger B. Manning, *Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex, 1558–1603* (Leicester, 1969), pp. 160–1, here quoting Bishop Richard Smith.

[43] David Beauregard, 'Shakespeare on Monastic Life: Nuns and Friars in *Measure for Measure, Religion and the Arts*, 5 (2001), pp. 249–72, esp. pp. 249–50; see also Stevenson, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), pp. 25–52.

> . . . if you speak, you must not show your face,
> Or, if you show your face, you must not speak. [*Measure, 1. 4. 12–13*]

Silent, occluded and sequestered, it is 'a reclusive and religious life / Out of all eyes, tongues, minds, and injuries' [*Much Ado, 4. 1. 241–2*], which delimits power in these plots, and explains why so many of them turn back at the penumbral threshold of 'chantries, where sad and solemn priests / Still sing' [*Henry V, 283*]. So, between the bright exposure of the court and the dark enclosure of the cave, Shakespearian drama comes to be organised between two poles which correspond to goals available in the social space in which the author was himself situated. To paraphrase Pierre Bourdieu, it is the author's own construction of his universe of possibilities which makes Shakespeare 'the best socioanalyst' of Shakespeare.[44] There is, for instance, a plausible theory that the 'old religious uncle' who taught 'Ganymede' his oratory, by lecturing on the 'monstrous evil' of 'a woman' [*As You Like It, 3. 2. 312–23*], is identifiable with Shakespeare's kinsman, Edward Arden, whose house at Park Hall in the Forest of Arden, was a secret academy where the disaffected ex-Sheriff of Warwickshire indoctrinated a cadre of Catholic hotheads to detest Elizabeth. It was Arden's manic diatribes about her 'monstrous evil' that incited his young son-in-law, John Somerville, to set off to shoot the Queen in 1583, leading to his own execution, the assailant's strangling, and ruin for Mary Arden's family; but what is significant is how, in the fictional forest such fanaticism is nullified, when the false Duke abdicates, on meeting with 'an old religious man' and changing his religion [*5. 4. 145*]. Rosalind had begun the play by fleeing 'To liberty, and not to banishment' [*1. 3. 132*], in an Arden that Catholic critics locate—*via* Amiens, who sings in praise of exile—in the Ardennes of the seminaries (where Lucentio has reportedly been 'long studying' in *The Taming of the Shrew* [*2. 1. 79*]).[45] There the refugees are tutored in 'the uses of adversity' [*2. 1. 12*] by Duke Senior in terms which echo the Jesuit zeal for martyrdom as a 'pearl of great price'. Thus, from Orlando's 'mutiny' [*1. 1. 19*] to

---

[44] Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. Susan Emanuel (Cambridge, 1996), p. 4.

[45] For Park Hall as a secret Catholic school, see Christopher Devlin, *The Life of Robert Southwell, Poet and Martyr* (1956), pp. 18 & 263; and for the identification of Arden with the Ardennes of the seminaries, see in particular, Carol Enos, op. cit. (see above, n. 9).

Jacques' railing, *As You Like It* rehearses the range of options open to English Catholics; yet, instead of recusancy, regicide, or revolt, this comedy is content to wait upon an aged hermit who is never seen, but whose silent aura reverses the entire plot. Far from being a prospectus for the martyrdom preached by those 'brothers in exile', therefore, this is a story which expressly rejects that 'precious jewel' [*2. 1. 1–14*], and that ends by specifically separating the obscurity of 'a religious life' from the brilliance of the court, when Jacques follows the new 'convertites' into the darkness of the former brothers' now 'abandoned cave' [*5. 4. 151; 170–85*].

'They have their exits and their entrances', but as Jacques' exit to what might well be the seminary at Douai shows, the parts played by a Shakespearian character are determined by the religious choices and political possibilities available 'in his time' [*2. 7. 140–1*]. So, if *As You Like It* is like a paradigm of Shakespeare's theatre—with paradise in a world elsewhere postponed for safety in a world within—that could be because war in Arden was so close to home. For the Somerville plot was reputedly the occasion of Shakespeare's own most traumatic exit, when the twenty year-old fled Stratford, after being beaten for poaching in the deerpark of Sir Thomas Lucy, Arden's puritan usurper as High Sheriff. The park in question, research suggests, was Fulbrook, near Warwick, entrusted to the Ardens after its owner, 'the blind' Sir Francis Englefield, had emigrated to France, in protest at the coronation of a heretic queen.[46] In the Ardennes and then Madrid, Englefield became a rabid agitator for the Armada; so Lucy had royal warrant when he seized Fulbrook from the Ardens, acting on a certificate of 'the death of Francis Englefield overseas' (in fact, he had twenty years to live).[47] In the aftermath of the Somerville tragedy, a deer-poaching raid on this lost domain would have carried not just the colour of a rustic *charivari*, therefore, but the force of a symbolic invasion: typical of Arden's brother-in-law, Edward Grant, one of the evicted trustees, and a listed 'adversary' of the state, whose home would later become the armoury of the Gunpowder Plot.[48] So, though trivialised by biographers, Shakespeare's possible participation in this religious riot looks more ominous in light of Catholic resistance. Touchstone may voice the player's hindsight, when the clown regrets, 'Ay, now am I in Ardenne, the more fool I' [*2. 4. 12*]; for the season of deer-poaching was also when, we think, Shakespeare's father hid his Testament of Catholic faith in their rafters, panicked by Lucy's hunt for evidence of Somerville's accomplices. In the event, the searchers had to admit defeat, reporting that 'the papists of this country greatly work upon the advantage of clearing their houses of all show of suspicion'; and it may be that Shakespeare's 'survivalism' dates from this crisis, when, rather than take up 'arms against a sea of troubles' [*Hamlet, 3. 1. 61*], like their suicidal cousins, his family learned to hide a 'blessed conscience' in that dark and secret place that made cowards of them all.[49]

---

[46] The most detailed account is in Peter Razell, *William Shakespeare: The anatomy of an enigma* (1990), pp. 85–137. For the colourful story of Sir Francis Englefield, see Albert J. Loomie, *The Spanish Elizabethans: English Exiles at the Court of Philip II* (1963), pp. 14–51.

[47] Quoted Razell, op. cit. (see above, n. 46), p. 99.

[48] For Edward Grant and his grandson John, the Gunpowder conspirator, see the *Victoria County History: Warwickshire* (1945), vol. 3, p. 92;

When Hamlet poses what he calls *the question*—and the one that dominated the minds of Elizabethan Catholics—of whether to suffer an outrageous fortune, or take arms in suicidal resistance, it is revealing that he imagines this gesture as a Canute-like defiance of the waves. For most of Shakespeare's life the problem of their 'blessed conscience' was indeed presented to English Catholics in terms of the sea, in the form of the infamous 'Bloody Question', first put to Campion in 1581: 'If the Pope or any other do invade this realm, which part would you take?'[50] What is notable, then, in view of Hamlet's—and Campion's—question, is how crucial to Shakespeare's representation of English history is the possibility of invasion from overseas. To recent critics, this focus on the ocean, and John of Gaunt's foreboding for 'this precious stone set in a silver sea' [*Richard II, 2. 1. 46*], combines Shakespeare's paranoid 'fear of Jesuit infiltrators penetrating every national orifice', with his excitement over 'women raped'; but the difficulty with this reading is its assumption that the dramatist shared the phobias of 'a Protestant country obsessed with the threat of papal takeover'. The New Historicist idea that in Shakespeare 'the enemy is always without',[51] cannot accommodate the fact, therefore, that in play after play it is an invader from the off-stage, unseen space who promises respite from an enemy within, and that even Gaunt's eulogy to England as 'This other Eden' [*42*] enlists the audience, as Phyllis Rackin admits, 'on the side of rebels who will set sail from France'.[52] But research on his Catholic origins underlines how Shakespeare's sense of a world elsewhere was more complex than that of any Tudor imperialist. Thus, the moment when panic about an invasion was strongest was also when English

---

[49] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic: 1581–90*, p. 129.

[50] See, in particular, Patrick McGrath, 'The Bloody Question Reconsidered', *Recusant History*, 20: 3 (1991), pp. 305–19.

[51] Woodbridge, op. cit. (see above, n. 34), pp. 56–60.

[52] Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (1990), pp. 123–4.

Catholics had most to fear from its defeat, and in his only plausible allusion to the 1588 Armada, the writer may register just such a divided loyalty. For among things seen off-stage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*—'with parted eye, / When everything seems double', or 'small and undistinguishable, / Like far-off mountains turned to cloud' [*4. 1. 184–7*] —is the violent seascape Oberon recalls, when he too 'sat upon a promontory' as in a theatre, spectating while the son of War 'loos'd' his arrows 'smartly from his bow', and the 'certain aim' taken by this invader on 'a fair vestal, throned in the west', looked from a distance very like the supposedly invincible Spanish attack on England's Queen:

> But I might see young Cupid's fiery shaft
> Quenched in the chaste beams of the watery moon;
> And the imperial votress passed on,
> In maiden meditation, fancy free.
> Yet marked I where the bolt of Cupid fell:
> It fell upon a little western flower,
> Before milk-white, now purple with love's wound,
> And maidens call it 'love-in-idleness.' [*Dream, 2. 1. 149–67*]

Ever since William Warburton deduced that, when Oberon recalls how this invasion-force was tempted onto the 'rude sea' by 'a mermaid on a dolphin's back' [*150*], the siren may be Mary Queen of Scots, critics have decoded this mythological perspective as a political allegory. And though the Arden editor thinks 'Elizabeth was far too sensitive for a dramatist to refer with safety to Mary and those who with her connivance plunged to treason,'[53] the memory of how 'certain stars shot madly from their spheres / To hear the sea-maid's music' [*153–4*] does seem to echo the lament for the Catholic traitor as 'a bright star' shot from the sky detectable in *Venus and Adonis* [*815*]. Certainly, it is events preceding the Armada—when the Scottish Queen lured so many to disaster on the back of her marriage to a Dauphin—that best match Oberon's scenario. Moreover, the estimate of how Cupid aimed to split 'a hundred thousand hearts' seems too specific not to point to the hundred thousand papists expected to rise up in support of the 'Enterprise of England'. Oberon's inset has been tied to the Elvetham Entertainment, which, Philippa Berry has shown, certainly celebrated the Armada's defeat.[54] So, when the 'arm'd' god misfires on the 'little western flower', 'love's wound' might signify the stigmata of England's Catholic community, penalised for its innocent part in international conspiracy. For it was, of course, their pragmatic calculation that 'Not all the water in the rough rude sea / Can wash the balm from an anointed king' [*Richard II, 3. 2. 50*] that actually determined the stance of most Catholics towards the prospect of a maritime invasion; and if Shakespeare articulated this 'split heart', he was doing no more than a Jesuit like Southwell, who answered the burning question whether Catholics would take up arms against their troubles, by swearing that they would 'be broached on their country's swords' before they would bring rebellion from abroad.[55] So, considering how suicidal the 'Bloody Question' was deliberately designed to be, what is remarkable is how close the dramatist came to endorsing the thought of the outside as an extreme solution on his stage. As the critic Richard Simpson observed in 1874, far from being panic-striken by foreign intervention, Shakespeare seems to have amplified the ambivalence of his contemporaries towards the possibility of salvation from a world elsewhere, 'and it is only wonderful that allusions so plain should have been tolerated':

---

[53] Harold Brooks (ed.), *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1979), p. lxvii.

[54] Philippa Berry, *Of Chastity and Power: Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen* (1989), pp. 108–9.

> All the changes [by Shakespeare to the Chronicles] seem made with a view to the controversy on the title to the crown. This was the standing trouble of Elizabeth's reign. Her own title was controverted, first because she was illegitimate, next because she was excommunicate. And all the parties—those who opposed her, those who maintained her, those who advocated the succession of the Scottish King, or Arabella Stuart, or the Spanish Infanta, or Derby, or Huntingdon, or Essex—all appealed to foreign arbitration . . .. Foreign arbitration was no strange idea in Elizabethan politics. The English Queen helped the French. She assisted the Netherlanders. She interfered in Scotland, imprisoned the Queen, and finally beheaded her; she set up James VI against his mother, Francis of Valois and Antonio of Portugal against Philip of Spain, and supported Henry of Navarre as heir and king of France. The example of the government taught the English to intrigue with foreign princes . . .. And amidst these seething anxieties, before the youthful heirs of the very families on whom the foreigner counted, Shakespeare made the example more apposite, and the allusions more telling, by altering history.[56]

Contrary to modern critics, who automatically presume he shared the outside/inside xenophobia of a later Protestant nationalism, Shakespeare structured his Histories around the thought of the outside as a consummation devoutly wished. 'Walls, enclosures and facades serve to define both a *scene*', commented the philosopher of space, Henri Lefebvre, 'and the *obscene* area to which everything that cannot happen on scene is referred: whatever is inadmissable thus has its own hidden space on the near or far side of a frontier.'[57] So, when we are told that 'Richmond is on the seas' [*Richard III, 4. 4. 462*], we register the proximity of this counter-space, beyond the horizon of Shakespeare's text, as a reserve which retains its subversive potential to the extent that it is never completely realised. If, for example, Imogen finds it difficult to reach Milford Haven to reunite with Posthumus, despite having the place in view 'from the mountain-top' [*Cymbeline, 3. 6. 5*], that must be because the Welsh port had always been identified as the most suitable landing-point for a papal army; a likelihood to which Shakespeare responds from the moment in *Richard III* when Henry Richmond 'with a mighty power . . . landed at Milford' to 'reap the harvest' (in Campion's loaded metaphor) 'of perpetual peace' [*4. 4. 464; 5. 2. 15*]. What Imogen is told, when she asks 'how Wales was made so happy as / T'inherit such a haven' [*Cymbeline, 3. 2. 60*], can never therefore quite be spoken in her play—because that is another story about Tudor politics—but the question is a reminder that the Pembrokeshire harbour is a gateway not only for those, such as her husband, bound innocently for Rome, but also for those 'legions now in Gallia' [*2. 4. 18*], from which, as a loyal *Roman Briton*, he detaches himself. So, in *Richard III*, Milford Haven is the landfall for the 'valiant crew' of Tudor emigres 'long kept in Britanny' [*4. 5. 16; 5. 6. 54*], and their French hideway, though it is never seen, polarises the Elizabethan History. On 'the extreme verge' of the text, Britanny has the same violent and terminal status here, therefore, as it does in *Richard II*, where it becomes a covert refuge of the banished Bolingbroke, who, far from serving 'long apprenticehood / To foreign passages', on a grand tour of 'All the places that the eye of heaven visits' [*1. 3. 256; 4–8*], as declared, dedicates himself at Port le Blanc to equipping 'eight tall ships' to transport three thousand commandos to Humberside [*2. 1. 288*]. Waving 'his bonnet to an oysterwench', Bolingbroke embarks for his French redoubt in 1597 with precisely the calculated political intention, that is to say, that is so strenuously denied, a dozen years later, in the tear-jerking farewell of the Jacobean Posthumus:

---

[55] Robert Southwell, *An Humble Supplication to Her Majesty*, ed. R. C. Bald (Cambridge, 1953), p. 11. See also Gillian E. Brennan, 'Papists and Patriotism in Elizabethan England', *Recusant History*, 19 (1988), pp. 1–15.

[56] Richard Simpson, 'The Politics of Shakespeare's Historical Plays', *The New Shakespeare Society's Transactions*, 1874, pp. 402–5.

> What reverence he did throw away on slaves
> Wooing poor craftsmen with the craft of smiles

---

[57] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford, 1991), p. 36.

> And patient underbearing of his fortune,
> As 'twere to banish their effects with him. [*Richard II, 1. 4. 26–31*]

In his classic study of Shakespeare's art, Wolfgang Clemen noticed how leavetaking is vital to the sense of futurity which makes the Histories different from other Elizabethan plays, for by 'combining retrospect with hopes and fears' the departure of an exile like Bolingbroke suggests that 'an inescapable line of development arises from the pressure of the past upon the future. The future is linked to the past by workings of necessity, but also by clear planning and purposeful intention.'[58] Thus, with the collusion of its Duke, the Britanny of the Histories becomes a base for guerilla forces that glorify sedition in scrolls of honour: Talbot, Herbert, Brandon, 'And many other of great names and worth' [*Richard III, 4. 5. 17*]. As this roster unfolds, it forms a roll-call, in fact, of the *fronde* of army officers and provincial peers that mustered during the 1590s in hatred of the hunchback Cecil. This was England's 'nobility of the sword', and it drew its leadership, as Shakespeare records, from the Catholic heartland of the Borders and Wales. Recusant names that recur in Richmond's expedition, for instance, are those of the Worcestershire Blunts and Lancashire Stanleys, both linked to the author; and when Bosworth Field turns on the defection of 'Stanley's regiment' [*5. 4. 12*] a flag may be flying for both Ferdinando and his kinsman Sir William Stanley. In 1587 this war-hero had turned coat by surrendering the Flemish port of Deventer to Spain, and so made 'Stanley's regiment' by-words for treachery; but by the time Shakespeare awarded 'Stanley's regiment' the same pivotal role in *Richard III*, the colonel's troop of papist veterans had been reinforced by 'diverse captains from the Earl of Essex' into a crack force, poised to invade England from France.[59] Whatever Shakespeare knew of these expatriate plotters, their switch of loyalty was justified by Cardinal Allen in a notorious book, *Concerning the Yielding up of Daventry*, that appears to be quoted by the soldier in *Henry V*, who likewise enquires on behalf of 'those whom the matter touches in conscience, how they ought to carry themselves', and who is given the surname of Stanley's brother-in-arms, Roger Williams: himself an apologist, with his *Brief Discourses of War*, for 'poor gentlemen' of Catholic faith compelled by change of heart to cross to enemy lines:

> In these wars, and all others that may at any time fall for religion against heretics, or other infidels, every Catholic man is bound in conscience to inform

---

[58] Wolfgang Clemen, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art* (1972), pp. 127–33.

[59] See Loomie, op. cit. (see above, n. 46), pp. 147–57.

> himself for the justice of the cause, the which when it is doubtful or toucheth religion, as is said, he ought to employ his person and forces by direction of such as are virtuous.[60]

On misty fields and beaches of Shakespeare's France the troubled faces of Elizabethan émigrés are almost visible. Yet there is an elision in the list of Bolingbroke's defectors which betrays the limit of that visibility, and this is the name, cut from texts of *Richard II*, of 'Thomas son and heir to the Earl of Arundel' [*2. 1. 281*]. In 1597 this might be deciphered as glancing at the martyred Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, and his crypto-papist son Thomas, whose London mansion was a headquarters for Catholic intrigue. That someone found this salute risky enough to push it out of sight raises the question why Shakespeare came so near to advertising the schemes of Catholics who had sponsored him, like the Hoghtons, whose ancestor escorted Bolingbroke to Europe.[61] The answer is critical to the dramatist's hopes of redemption from the world off-stage. For from the day in 1597 when Raleigh reported Essex 'wonderful merry' that Robert Cecil had the 'conceit' that *Richard II* alluded to his plans, Shakespeare's History has been entangled in rumours that it encodes the ambitions of those with most to gain from his rebellion, and that the Earl's 'great applause' at performances of the play were 'actions to confirm his intent' of treason.[62] Shakespeare, it is inferred, was far more implicated in the 1601 fiasco than even the calamitous involvement of his own patron, the Earl of Southampton, might imply, as Essex's brother was another son-in-law of Edward Arden. Certainly, one reason why so many of the rebels, such as Robert Catesby, came from the Midlands was that Essex's 'promise of liberty of conscience' was irresistible to the gentry of such a Catholic region.[63] In fact, if the uprising could be painted by Attorney General Coke as a 'popish plot' that was because its ringleaders were indeed, we learn, mainly 'Catholics, both converts and recusants', fired by Essex's policy of religious toleration.[64] And it is expressly as a harbinger of reconciliation, rather than rebellion, that the Earl is welcomed home in the most indiscreet of all returns of history on the horizon of Shakespeare's stage:

---

[60] Chetham Society, vol. 25, p. 27; quoted ibid., p. 142.

[61] Norton (Oxford) edition, based on Malone's conjecture, also adopted by the Riverside Shakespeare, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston, 1974); the Arden edition, ed. Peter Ure (1956), has 'The son of Richard Earl of Arundel.' For the story of Henry Hoghton's exile with Bolingbroke in Lithuania, where they enrolled together in the Teutonic Knights, see George Miller, *Hoghton Tower: The History of the Manor, the Hereditary Lords and the ancient Manor-house in Lancashire* (Preston, 1948), pp. 144–5.

[62] Quoted in Evelyn Albright, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Essex Conspiracy', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association of America (PMLA)*, 42 (1927), pp. 698–701.

[63] Carol Enos, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), pp. 80–1; Mervyn James, *Society, Politics and Culture: studies in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 426–7.

> Were now the General of our gracious Empress—
> As in good time he may—from Ireland coming,
> Bringing rebellion broached on his sword,
> How many would the peaceful city quit
> To welcome him! [*Henry V*, 5. 0. 29–34]

Of all topical irruptions into the Shakespearian text, Alan Sinfield observes, the 1599 allusion to Essex's impending return to England in *Henry V* is the least susceptible to the New Historicist reduction of Elizabethan culture to a phobia about invasion, since the lines reveal a fault-line in authority, at the instant when the challenger rivalled the Queen. For Sinfield, the indeterminacy of *Henry V* arises, in fact, from the instability of this moment, when dissidents such as Catholics belied the myth of English unity, as the state confronted the possibility that the ruler was no longer supreme. This is a reading which concludes, however, that the Essex threat is contained in the play, because Henry is identified with the Tudors; whereas it is more likely that he prefigures the Stuart claimant, James I, for whom the Earl was, the Chorus hints, a 'lower' representative [*29*]. Shakespeare may have been closer to treason than Cultural Materialism allows.[65] The possibility that *Henry V* was written as the reveille for a coup links the text, that is to say, to the optimism of papists who saw the Scottish ruler as a peacemaker like Octavius, and rallied around Essex, 'Like to the senators of th'antique Rome', as a means to 'fetch their conqu'ring Caesar in' [*26–8*]. Typical of these 'premature Jacobeans' was the Midland magnate Sir Thomas Tresham, whose flattery of 'our gracious Empress' [*30*], mixed up with 'veiled expressions of passive disobedience', supplies an exact discursive context for Shakespeare's tactical ambivalence, in the 'defensive resistance' of his recusant neighbours.[66] Along with William Catesby, Tresham suffered years of imprisonment for hiding Campion; but in March 1603 it was this 'most affectionate servant of the glorious and blessed Queen of Scots' who hurried into Northampton to proclaim her son King of England, in face of jeering from the Puritan town.[67] His enthusiasm for James as the Catholic deliverer was shared by Southampton, who broke from gaol to secure the Tower for the new dynasty. And it seems to have been briefly entertained by the poet himself, judging by the one euphoric text in which he trumpets his patron's new freedom; laughs at his own worries over the succession; insults those 'dull and speechless tribes' who mourned the passing of the Tudors; and even dares to dance upon the 'tyrants' . . . tombs':

---

[64] Ibid., pp. 435–6; and Robert Cecil quoted in Mutschmann & Wentersdorf, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), p. 123.

[65] Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 'History and Ideology: the instance of *Henry V*', in John Drakakis (ed.), *Alternative Shakespeares* (1985), pp. 217–20.

[66] Sandeep Kaushik, 'Resistance, Loyalty and Recusant Politics: Sir Thomas Tresham and the Elizabethan State', *Midland History*, 21 (1996), pp. 37–72, esp. pp. 63–4.

> The mortal moon hath her eclipse endured,
> And the sad augurers mock their own presage,
> Incertainties now crown themselves assured,
> And peace proclaims olives of endless age. [Sonnet 107]

'Men must endure / Their going hence', moralises Edgar in *King Lear*, 'even as their coming hither' [*5. 2. 9–10*]; but, as John Kerrigan glosses the Sonnet, relief at the final exit of Elizabeth and entry of James was tinged with anxiety, as Catholics 'feared the accession of a ruler even less sympathetic to religious liberty' than the Protestant Queen, and 'anticipated an invasion from abroad' as a return to civil war.[68] That foreboding had been hovering in *Julius Caesar*, where no sooner has Octavius landed than the plotters are made to ride 'like madmen through the gates of Rome' [*Julius Caesar, 3. 2. 271*]. The advent of the long-awaited Emperor might be followed, this play foretold, by the betrayal James confirmed, when he smirked, 'Na, na, we's not need the papists noo.'[69] So, if Shakespeare's texts had been shaped in the 1590s by the fantasy of the wanderer's return, it may be telling that, as Clemen noted, *Hamlet* is the last play, until *The Tempest*, in which 'an unfulfilled past calls for future fulfilment'.[70] When the Prince of Denmark is 'set naked on [the] kingdom' [*4. 7. 43*] his suicide mission to avenge his father spells an end, therefore, to the thought of the outside as deliverance in these works. Jacobean Shakespeare would be overcast, instead, by the disillusion of a decade when, in the words of Father Gerard, 'all hopes were foiled on which Catholics did build their comforts', while 'the King protested he would take it as an insult if anyone imagined he had entertained the slightest intention of tolerating their religion'.[71] As Antonia Fraser summarises it, the grim reality for Catholics was that 'By the time the truth was known—that James did not intend to keep his promises—it was too late. Any hope from abroad vanished even before the death of Elizabeth . . . when the son of Mary Queen of Scots bamboozled two sets of Catholics: English recusants and foreign potentates, including the Pope.'[72] Small wonder, then, that Shakespeare wrote no more plays, after 1601, with homecoming as a complete solution, devising instead a sequence in which the Puritan Malvolio exits to be revenged; Bertram returns only sullenly from Italy; the Greeks never sail home; Desdemona is killed on Cyprus; the restored Duke terrorises Vienna; Cordelia disembarks to be hanged; Malcolm's pledge to recall his friends is unfulfilled; Antony, Coriolanus, Timon, and Pericles all die in exile; and when a Roman army does finally invade Britain, even the persecuted subjects of King Cymbeline fight to defeat it. Rather than look for respite in a world elsewhere, Shakespearian drama of the 1600s seems to stage, in fact, the predicament of a captive community, confined by coercive penal laws to the desperate remedies of an inner exile:

---

[67] Sir Thomas Tresham quoted, ibid., p. 61.

[68] John Kerrigan, *The Sonnets and 'A Lover's Complaint'* (Harmondsworth, 1986), p. 315.

[69] Quoted in Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985), p. 184, n. 64.

[70] Clemen, op. cit. (see above, n. 58), p. 126.

> No port is free; no place
> That guard, and most unusual vigilance,
> Does not attend my taking. Whiles I may 'scape,
> I will preserve myself; and am bethought
> To take the basest and most poorest shape
> That ever penury, in contempt of man,
> Brought near to beast . . ., [*King Lear, 2. 3. 3–9*]

In *King Lear* 'all ports' are barred [*2. 1. 79*], and the expensive ship, which might have carried evacuees to safety—if it ever existed—has somewhere to get to and sails calmly away. Nothing could be further from this disappointment, then, than the idea that because 'Dover is the point of entry, the aperture through which domination can enter . . . Britain is the female body' in this play, which thus slavishly repeats the patriotic myth of the White Cliffs.[73] For it is by despairing of *rescue* from France that Edgar comes to typify Shakespeare's survivors, having 'escap'd the hunt' concealed 'in the happy hollow of a tree', and hidden in 'low farms / Poor pelting villages, sheep-cotes, and mills' [*2. 3. 17*]. Lear's hovel could be interpreted, therefore, as symbolic of all those priest-holes and safe-houses that were vital to undercover operations by Jacobean Catholics. It is an ultimate refuge, like the hut or cottage that Gaston Bachelard does indeed associate, in *The Poetics of Space*, with 'the principle of Resistance', as 'faced with the bestial hostility of the storm . . . it braces itself to receive the downpour'.[74] But while 'the wrathful skies / Gallow the very wanderers of the dark, / And make them keep their caves' [*3. 2. 43–5*], this shelter, which Edgar imagines as the 'dark tower' where 'Child Rowland' was given away by the smell of his blood [*3. 4. 179–81*], affords none of the security that earlier fugitives discovered in ruined monasteries or hermits' cells. Its precariousness is suggestive, instead, of the mystical lodges erected across his estates by Thomas Tresham in the days before the Gunpowder Plot: architectural representations of the Passion and Cross, designed, historians infer, to symbolise the defiance of a faith *in extremis*. As Sir Thomas lay on his deathbed, in September 1605, the Plotters made one final pilgrimage on his behalf, from Stratford to St Winifrid's shrine in Wales, forming a procession that was an analogue of Lear's.[75] The autumn of *King Lear* was the last instant when it was possible to finesse the 'Bloody Question' by retreating, in this way, into the sanctuary of some sacred place; and in the tragedy, the power sent from France 'into this scattered kingdom' [*3. 1. 31*] foreshadows the fate about to overtake Shakespeare's neighbours, 'Who, with best meaning . . . incurr'd the worst' [*5. 3. 4*]. It is possible that Timon's cave beside the sea, from where he incites the exiled Alcibiades 'i'th'cause against the city' [*Timon, 5. 2. 12*], figures both the ruin, therefore, of the recusant gentry, and the dead-end of their politics of self-exclusion. In the wake of the Plot, Donna Hamilton agrees, the question of allegiance would be staged in *Cymbeline* as just such a choice between the cave and the court: in the dilemma of Belarius—'a sympathetic portrait of the English Catholic'—of whether to retreat 'higher to the mountains' of Wales, or submit, as he does, 'To the king's party' [*4. 4. 8*], by abandoning the 'cave in the woods' he occupies because it 'Instructs you how t'adore the heavens, and bows you / To a morning's holy office' [*3. 3. SD; 1–4*].[76] But the dream of these late plays (acted at the zenith of the Catholic Howards) is also that, in an act of toleration, the court will accept the exile's invitation to his 'poor cell' and there 'look in' [*The Tempest, 5. 1. 166; 301*]. Thus, the impasse of *King Lear* will finally be resolved, not by invasion from a world elsewhere, but the court's admission to the hidden world within:

---

[71] Quoted, Antonia Fraser, *The Gunpowder Plot: Treason and Faith in 1605* (1996), p. 89.

[72] Ibid., p. 287.

[73] Graham Holderness, '"What Ish My Nation?": Shakespeare and National Identities', in *Materialist Shakespeare: A History*, ed. Ivo Kamps (1995), pp. 224–5.

---

[74] Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, trans. Maria Jolas (Boston, 1994), pp. 44–6.

[75] For a symbolic interpretation of Tresham's buildings in terms of Catholic resistance, see Kaushik, op. cit. (see above, n. 66), pp. 47–9; and for the 1605 pilgrimage, see Fraser, op. cit. (see above, n. 71), pp. 134–9.

[76] Donna Hamilton, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Protestant England* (Lexington, 1992), pp. 129–30 & 156–7.

> . . . the Princess, hearing of her mother's statue. . . . Thither with all greediness of affection are they gone, and there they intend to sup . . .. Who would be thence that has the benefit of access? [*The Winter's Tale, 5. 2. 92–109*]

'Our absence makes us unthrifty' [*109*]: the invitation, in *The Winter's Tale*, to take 'benefit of access' to Paulina's chapel contrasts achingly with the real absence of the courtier Antigonus, whose destiny was to '*Exit, pursued by a bear*' [*SD, 3. 3. 57*]. And Shakespeare's notorious stage direction gains historical resonance if, as Simpson maintained, the 'bloody-minded bear' was invariably a symbol (as Thomas Nashe, for one, intended) of the Puritan Earl of Leicester: the 'savage blood-hunter' who wore it is as his crest. Then, the fate of the old lord would figure the nemesis of all those who fled, pursued by that 'hungry usurper', to European shores, and never survived to see the spring that is romanced in these texts: the Irish 'wild geese', for example, and the Lancashire mercenaries of 'Stanley's regiment', who died, after placing their daughters in the city's convents, at Antwerp, the Catholic haven which had indeed been founded by a ferryman named Antigonus.[77] 'A goodly city is this Antium', notes Coriolanus hopefully, of the 'enemy town' which seems another image of the Antwerp of the Archdukes [*Coriolanus, 4. 4. 1; 24*]; but what is so dismaying about these destinations, or the Antioch to which Pericles sails, is how violently they disrupt the Renaissance convention of 'the borderlands and otherwheres of exile' as a ground of reconciliation.[78] Their frustration of all utopian solutions speaks instead of the actual continental experience of English Catholics, who more often than not, Shell records, 'came over only to die'.[79] In the end, 'the moral of the dramatist', as Simpson concludes, 'amounts to this—"Whatever you think about the justice of your cause, or the crimes of your opponents, whatever outrages you have to endure, whatever the merits of the losers or demerits of the winners",' despair of foreign intervention.[80] But that Shakespeare did clarify the impossibility of such utopian locations shows how, by contrast, all those other darkened alcoves, remote caves and safe havens functioned in his plays as the type of emplacement—secreted *within* society rather than projected onto some other world—which Foucault terms a *heterotopia*, the purpose of which, unlike that of a utopia, is precisely to suspend reality, by placing events under the sign of an indefinite erasure:

---

[77] Richard Simpson, 'The Political Use of the Stage in Shakespeare's Time', *The New Shakespere Society's Transactions*, 1874, p. 378; Thomas Nashe, 'Pierce Penniless', *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*, ed. J. B. Steane (Harmondsworth, 1972), pp. 124–7. For the most informed account of the Catholic émigré community in Antwerp, see Grainne Henry, *The Irish Military Community in Spanish Flanders, 1586–1621* (Dublin, 1992), pp. 53–7 & 74–9; and for the ferryman named Antigonus as legendary founder of Antwerp, see Jervis Wegg, *Antwerp, 1477–1559* (1916), p. 1.

[78] Randolph Starn, *Contrary Commonwealth: The Theme of Exile in Medieval and Renaissance Italy* (Berkeley, Calif., 1982), esp. p. 7. See also A. Bartlett Giamatti, *Exile and Change in Renaissance Literature* (New Haven, 1984); and Dolora Wojciehowski, 'Petrarch's Temporal Exile and the Wounds of History', in James Whitlark and Wendell Aycock (eds.), *The Literature of Emigration and Exile* (Lubbock, Texas, 1992), pp. 11–21.

[79] Shell, op. cit. (see above, n. 7), p. 172.

> All these emplacements have the curious property of being connected to all the other emplacements, but in such a way that they suspend, neutralize, or reverse the set of relations that are designated, reflected, or represented by them . . .. Utopias have no real space . . . [but] these heterotopias are real places, actual places, places that are designed into the very institutions of society, in which all the other emplacements within the culture are represented, contested and reversed . . . they are sacred or forbidden spaces, reserved for individuals who are in a state of crisis with respect to the society and the milieu in which they live.[81]

'I thought she had some great matter there at hand,' comments a courtier when told of Paulina's vigil at 'the statue of our Queen,' 'for she hath privately twice or thrice a day ever since the death of Hermione visited that removed house' [*The Winter's Tale, 5. 3. 10; 5. 2. 94*]. If this finale was added at the Blackfriars theatre in 1613,[82] then, when 'the kings and princes' [*156*] kneel in the last of Shakespeare's half-way houses, they vindicate his tactics of survival. For from the point when Aemilia steps from the Abbey in *The Comedy of Errors*, the ultimate resort of Shakespearian romance is always in some curtained recess of the stage, with 'a lady richly left' [*Merchant, 1. 1. 161*]; princess cooking in a cave [*Cymbeline, 4. 2. 49*]; or 'nun' of Diana's temple [*Pericles, 14. 11*]. So, like Mariana pining at Saint Luke's [*Measure, 3. 1. 265*]; Hero hiding in a chapel of the 'goddess of the night' [*Much Ado, 5. 3. 12*]; or Helena proposing to travel to Compostella [*All's Well, 3. 4. 4–7*], the pious widow who prays to the statue of her 'Lady' in *The Winter's Tale* [*5. 3. 44*] has retreated to one of the enclosures of repose on which power in these plays attends. In *Measure for Measure*, for instance, even the Duke's marriage offer to Isabella will depend on her 'vocation' to 'the votarists of Saint Clare' [*1. 4. 4*]. Recent studies confirm how rare such claustral places were in a theatre devoted to open public spaces and 'scenes of stunning revelation', and where even the papist Ben Jonson was committed to a telos of visibility and knowability to 'dissociate from double-dealing'.[83] So, it is no surprise that editors gloss Paulina's name as alluding to Pauline faith in 'things not seen',[84] since the role of these virgins and widows is one historians assign to 'Catholic matriarchalism', which was to keep the faith behind the scenes, at a time when, because men faced harsher penalties, male compromise was the façade for female resistance.[85] Shakespeare's daughter, Susanna, listed as a recusant in 1606, may have acted as such a 'votress' [*Pericles, 15. 4*]; but a real-life parallel to Paulina was the dowager Lady Magdalen Montague, the grandmother of his patron, Southampton, whose estate was called a 'little Rome' for its chapel, where Mass, with choir, priests and musicians, was celebrated before 'a very fair stone altar'. And if even her chaplain thought this unique 'in all England',[86] the immunity was Shakespearian: Lady Montague claimed that within a radius of 7920 feet around her domain at Battle Abbey, an enclave was 'entirely free from all exaction and subjection . . . and from the domination and customs of earthly service of all other persons whatsoever', as one of the last religious sanctuaries in England.[87]

---

[80] Simpson, op. cit. (see above, n. 56), p. 406.

[81] Foucault, op. cit. (see above, n. 4), pp. 178–9.

[82] See David Bergeron, *Shakespeare's Romances and the Royal Family* (Lawrence, Kan., 1985), p. 160.

'This is St Martin's and yonder dwells . . . many outlandish fugitives. Shall these enjoy more privilege than we?' In *Thomas More* the question that prompted Shakespeare's additions is posed by rioters, and the answer he gives the Catholic hero underlines the importance of the idea of sanctuary for both his politics and topography.[88] For nowhere in France or Flanders, or any Catholic country, More insists, would 'wretched strangers, / Their babes at their back', be refused asylum [*82;139*]. And it is the location that makes this contrast with England pointed. For the setting is St Martin le Grand, the Abbey (named after the saint who cut his coat for a beggar) that, with Westminster, was one of two last sanctuaries in London.[89] Shortly after this incident, Henry VIII would abolish sanctuary in one of the first Acts of the Reformation. Yet it is this sanctum that offers Shakespeare a model for all the sacred shelters in his plays, since he uses the London abbeys as locations for key episodes in two of his earliest works, where sanctuary is presented as precisely the refuge he has the author of *Utopia* defend. Thus, his More halts the rioters by recalling their fate had 'such fellows lived when you were babes' [*74*]. His speech evokes the tale that St Martin's was so inviolate that, even after Buckingham cajoled the clergy into giving up the 'babes' in the Tower, by jesting how he had 'heard of sanctuary-men but never sanctuary children', their strangler, Miles Forest, was still allowed to 'rot' there.[90] In *Richard III*, Shakespeare repeats More's version of this story exactly; and the intertexuality hints how he was intrigued by such an enclosed and numinous place, sacralised by the murder of Beckett in sanctuary, and by Edward the Confessor's doom of sanctuary-breakers to 'everlasting fire'.[91] At Westminster, Edward's tomb was itself the sanctuary-site, so when Malcolm and Macduff take refuge there, near the king, there may be an echo of the princes in the Tower. In *Richard III*, at least, nemesis soon stalks Buckingham, as sanctuary-breakers were burned.[92] So, while Benedick mocks sanctuary as a holiday from Beatrice [*Much Ado, 2. 1. 225*]; Claudius protests that no place 'indeed should murder sanctuarize' [*Hamlet, 4. 7. 99*]; and Angelo threatens 'to raze the sanctuary' [*Measure, 2. 3. 175*]; by taking sanctuary so seriously as an oasis from royal power, Shakespearian drama turns the cultural clock back to the 1550s, when the privilege had been reinstated under Mary, and sanctuary-seekers had even escorted their Abbot, in a madcap procession of murderers and monks across the city:

---

[83] William Slights, *Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy* (Toronto, 1994), p. 21; Ian Donaldson, *Jonson's Magic Houses* (Oxford, 1997), p. 48; Paul Yachnin, *Stage Wrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and the Making of Theatrical Value* (Philadelphia, 1997), p. 114.

[84] Stephen Orgel (ed.), *The Winter's Tale* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 59–60.

[85] See Bossy, op. cit. (see above, n. 36), pp. 153–60; and Walsham, op. cit. (see above, n. 9), p. 78.

[86] Bishop Richard Smith, quoted in Manning, op. cit. (see above, n. 42), p. 159.

[87] Charles J. Cox, *The Sanctuaries and Sanctuary Seekers of Medieval England* (1911), pp. 195–7. The other great sanctuary in southern England was, not coincidentally, the seat of the Earl of Southampton at Beaulieu.

[88] A.W. Pollard and J. Dover Wilson, *Shakespeare Problems: Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and Shakespeare's Hand in "Sir Thomas More"* (Cambridge, 1920), p. 203.

> Before him went all the sanctuary-men with cross keys upon their garments, and after went three for murder: one was Lord Dacre's son . . . [who] was whipped with a sheet about him for killing of one Master West; and a thief that did kill Richard Eccleston, the Controller's tailor, in Long Acre; and a boy that

---

[89] Cox, op. cit. (see above, n. 87), p. 85.

[90] Ibid., pp. 67–8.

[91] Isobel Thornley, 'Sanctuary in Medieval London', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* (2nd Series), vol. 38 (1932), pp. 293–315, esp. pp. 298–9; John Stow, *Survey of London*, ed. Charles Kingsford (2 vols., Oxford, 1908), vol. 2, p. 112.

[92] Thornley, op. cit., 1932 (see above, n. 91), pp. 297–8.

> is a hossier's son, that killed a big boy that sold papers and printed books, with the hurling of a stone, and hit him under the ear in Westminster Hall.[93]

'Run, master, run! For God's sake take a house. This is some priory—in, or we are spoiled': in *The Comedy of Errors* the Syracusian interlopers escape the citizens as they reach the Abbey doors [*5. 1. 36*]; and at Durham and other cathedrals bronze knockers and freestools clutched by fugitives testify to the atavism sustaining such a right long after the Reformation. For as 'nothing was done to reduce the privilege during Elizabeth's reign', sanctuary survived until 1624 at St Martin's, and 1727 at Westminster.[94] One reason was that sanctuary rights were 'most secretly kept' from lawyers, and only produced (in forged charters) before Star Chamber.[95] Thus, in 1598 John Stow demarcated the district of St Martin's as 'good sanctuary proved by divers witnesses'. Like More's rioters he thought this scandalous, considering the precinct now consisted of gift shops and 'a large wine tavern', run by immigrants claiming 'privileges granted to the Canons to serve God day and night' by staying open, 'for so be the words in the Charter of William the Conqueror'.[96] Stow alleged the Abbey was full of debtors who 'bid creditors go whistle', stolen-goods dealers and 'wives run there with their husband's plate';[97] but, if so, their suspension from power may itself have given Shakespeare inspiration, as an exemption from reality as arbitrary and inscrutable as that of any of the chapels in his plays. So, while the mob bays for Antipholus, the Abbess who blocks the way proclaims his asylum as a fact: 'He took his place for sanctuary, / And it shall privilege him from your hands. . . . Be patient for I will not let him stir. . . . Therefore depart and leave him here with me. . . . Be quiet and depart. Thou shalt not have him' [*Errors, 5. 1. 95–113*]. Her impunity, she says, is sanctioned by her order [*108*]; and it is true that control of the sanctuaries was not like that of other Liberties, which were deliberately ungoverned.[98] Amalgamated by the 1590s, the London Abbeys were havens for 'rogues, ruffians, thieves and felons' not for police purposes but church profit.[99] Even in the Elizabethan city, that is to say, sanctuary remained the frontier between the church and state. So, it is much to the point that in the only one of Shakespeare's plays to obey the law of the unity of place associated with the transparent urban spaces of the baroque, the appearance of the Abbess from her forgotten alcove behind the stage is followed by Shakespeare's most explicit reference to a Catholic martyrdom:

---

[93] Machyn's *Diary*, quoted in Cox, op. cit. (see above, n. 87), pp. 74–5.

[94] Isobel Thornley, 'The Destruction of Sanctuary', in *Tudor Studies*, ed. R. W. Seton-Watson (1928), pp. 204–7.

[95] BL. Lansdowne MSS. 170, ff. 52, Sir Julius Caesar's annotation: 'All such liberties of St Martin's Le Grand London which heretofore have been most secretly kept from knowledge of the City'.

[96] Cox, op. cit. (see above, n. 87), p. 95.

[97] Quoted, Walter Clifford Meller, *Old Times: Relics, Talismans, and Forgotten Customs and Beliefs of the Past* (1924), p. 64.

[98] Mullaney, op. cit. (see above, n. 22), p. 21.

> Anon, I'm sure, the Duke by himself in person
> Comes this way to the melancholy vale,
> The place of death and sorry execution,
> Behind the ditches of the abbey here . . .
> To see a reverend Syracusian merchant,
> Who put unluckily into this bay
> Against the laws and statutes of this town,
> Beheaded publicly for his offence. [*Errors, 5. 1. 120–8*]

Shakespeare might or might not have witnessed the horror 'Behind the ditches of the Abbey' in Shoreditch, as William Hartley—one of the priests 'trading' as a *reverend recusant merchant*—was executed in 1588, on the occasion thought to have inspired this allusion;[100] just as he may or may not have been at Tyburn, a year after the Stratford mission, when Campion 'traded' his 'pearl of great price'. But if Catholic critics are right, he came close enough to the martyrs to salute them as 'fools of time', [*Sonnet 124*]; and it is shock at their *untimeliness* that seems to shape *The Comedy of Errors*, where, in a miracle of timing, both sides discover their likeness, and beside the 'place of death' a place of preservation. Two histories coincide, in other words, in this story which indicates what Gilles Deleuze meant when he said baroque space was folded double, with 'on each side a different system'.[101] Each alternative points, however, to the bay where Egeon landed so unlucky. For were the Abbess to force Antipholus from sanctuary, the law required him to abjure the realm, then walk naked but for sackcloth, and carrying a cross 'as if he were to be hanged, continue on a straight road to the port, and cross the sea as soon as he shall find a ship, never to return'.[102] Abjuration, then, was a means by which fugitives paid for exit with exposure; and

---

[99] Peter Ackroyd, *London: The Biography* (2000), p. 263; Stow, op. cit. (see above, n. 91), vol. 2, p. 343.

[100] T. W. Baldwin, 'Shakespeare Adapts a Hanging' (Princeton, 1931); and *On the Compositional Genetics of "The Comedy of Errors"* (Urbana, IL, 1965).

[101] Gilles Deleuze, *Le Pli: Leibniz et le baroque* (Paris, 1988), p. 41.

[102] Cox, op. cit. (see above, n. 87), pp. 14 & 24; Meller, op. cit. (see above, n. 97), p. 63.

Shakespeare, who has Olivia abjure men [*Twelfth Night, 1. 2. 40*]; Malcolm machiavellianism [*Macbeth, 4. 3. 123*]; Prospero magic [*Tempest, 5. 1. 51*]; and Lear 'all roofs' [*Lear, 2. 4. 204*], might even have imagined himself 'As Ovid . . . an outcast quite abjured' [*Shrew, 1. 1. 33*], because in 1593 the statutes requiring those who left sanctuary to abjure were updated to permit Catholics to emigrate, on condition they swore to 'tarry at the port but one tide, and go into the sea up to the knees' to board the ship, as a token that their exit was for good. This rite of passage was a last act, then, in the ordeal by which the abjurer was stripped of shelter, and historians calculate the average time taken to reach the sea at twelve days, or a punishing thirty miles a day.[103] The reason they can do so adds a sadistic twist to the story of Shakespeare and that 'tall bark' on the vanishing-point of his text, which begins with the anchorage of a 'Merchant of Syracusa' [*Errors, 1. 1. 3*], and ends in the calvary of another outlaw, clad only in sackcloth [*Lear, 2. 3. 10*], when Edgar leads a party of escapees to the same bay but from the opposite direction. The reason historians can be so definite about the travel of those who abjured, and perhaps provide one answer to the question 'Wherefore to Dover?' which echoes in *King Lear* [*3. 7. 52–6*], is that 'even when it involved a journey of many days', as an additional test of endurance, Dover was always designated the port of embarkation.[104]

'When will we come to the top of that same hill?': that we never do reach the 'chalky bourn' of Dover [*4. 6. 1; 57*] confirms how darkness shields Shakespeare's characters from 'the extreme verge' of their own ends. In *King Lear*, where there is no exit and, as Frank Kermode says, 'everything tends to an ending that does not occur';[105] Gloucester's blindness is a means by which the 'drive towards Dover' [*3. 6. 84*] is put under indefinite erasure. Intriguingly, one Catholic who did follow the blind Englefield into exile at the time of this play cried how 'Better it were for me to have been blind / Than with sad eyes gaze upon the shore / Of my dear country.' Toby Matthew's 1608 poem *Upon the Sight of Dover Cliffs from Calais* records the anguish of being 'thrust out of sight' into a space of total exposure where nothing can be seen, in a way to confirm that Shakespeare staged the disenchantment of a generation which crossed the sea from Dover, when he had such emigres as Coriolanus discover in 'a world elsewhere' 'nor sanctuary . . . nor prayers of priests' [*Coriolanus,*

---

[103] Ibid., p. 58; Cox, op. cit. (see above, n. 87), pp. 26–8.

[104] Ibid., pp. 25 & 28.

[105] Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (Oxford, 1966), p. 82.

3. 3. 139; 1. 11. 19].[106] In *King Lear*, however, 'the army of France is landed' no sooner than it is destroyed [*3. 7. 2*]; and when he falls flat on his face, the blind man is disabused of Edgar's 'popish imposture' of violent deliverance [*4. 1. 74*], enough to blame it as 'the fiend' which 'led me to that place' [*4. 6. 79*]. For if his disguise as Poor Tom is, as editors suppose, based on hunted priests, then the abyss Edgar creates for Dover Cliff can be seen as Shakespeare's disavowal of the exit promised by those missionaries a quarter century before. To call this simply an 'exorcism' of sacred space is to miss its tragic historical point.[107] For half way down, we now grasp, it is the 'dreadful trade' of the 'one that gathers sampire' which explains why he is condemned to 'hang' and then shrink to nothing but his disembodied head. Rock samphire was once Saint-Pierre: St Peter's Herb, a marine plant used in pickling, whose salty leaf was an emblem of martyrdom, as the agent in which bodies were preserved. Perilously, then, St Peter's emissary harvests the leaves of his sanctity, for though he is, of course, praying for safety on his rock, that samphire will be the bed for his 'shivered' remains [*51*]; while those 'fishermen' who follow Peter on the beach will die like mice, when their tall ship lifts anchor and sails off. A 'peter-boat' was a fishing vessel, and therefore 'St Peter's Bark' was the Church of Rome. So, though this 'bark cannot be lost, / Yet it shall be tempest-tossed', and its 'pilot' racked 'as homeward he did come' [*Macbeth, 1. 3. 23–8*], Shakespeare knows all too well . . .

> What if it tempt you toward the flood, . . .
> Or to the dreadful summit of the cliff
> That beetles o'er his base into the sea,
> And there assume some other horrible form,
> Which might deprive your sovereignty of reason,
> And draw you into madness? think of it:
> The very place puts toys of desperation,
> Without more motive, into every brain,
> That looks so many fathoms to the sea,
> And hears it roar beneath. [*Hamlet, 1. 4. 50–9*]

But Edgar is right: the very thought of Edmund Campion on Dover Cliff, and of his doomed disciples down below, is too fearful to contemplate, when even the long withdrawing roar of faith 'cannot be heard so high'. References to an invasion from France were therefore 'consistently eliminated' from the Folio of *King Lear*, in a revision which would have been imperative if Dover did indeed point, as the Quarto prints it, across the Channel to 'Douer'—or Douai.[108] So though the torturers in his play repeat the question of 'Wherefore to Douai?' with which the interrogators had hammered Campion, Shakespeare's playhouse recoils from the utopian 'enterprise' of 'the old hermit of Prague' [*Twelfth Night, 4. 2. 11*], sensing that the world which seemed to lie before him like a land of dreams, had really neither certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain. Belief in empty space, the art historians agree, was for Shakespeare's generation, truly a leap of faith. Better to turn back, upon a promontory, from such a terrifying off-stage void, and postponing the voyage to Milan, troop yet again into the darkness of that 'poor cell, where you shall take your rest / For this one night' [*Tempest, 5. 1. 302*]: the one night that is the endlessly extended moment of the play, for ever on the eve of a day of embarkation which never comes, but that promises

---

[106] Toby Matthew, 'Upon the Sight of Dover Cliffs from Calais', in Anthony G. Petti, 'Unknown Sonnets by Sir Toby Matthew' (a transcription from Huntington Library MSS 198, Part II), *Recusant History*, 9: 3 (1967), pp. 123–58, esp. p. 153; commentary pp. 130–1.

[107] Pye, op. cit. (see above, n. 1), p. 87; and see Stephen Greenblatt, '*King Lear* and the Exorcists', op. cit. (see above, n. 37), pp. 94–128.

> calm seas, auspicious gales,
> And sail so expeditious, that shall catch
> Your royal fleet far off. [*5. 1. 315–17*]

---

[108] Gary Taylor, '*King Lear* and Censorship', in *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of 'King Lear'*, ed. Gary Taylor & Michael Warren (Oxford, 1983), p. 80. Taylor thinks it 'most implausible' that references to France were censored from the Folio; but for the argument that Shakespeare found himself in a 'a patriotic dilemma' over Cordelia's army, see W. W. Greg, 'Time, Place, and Politics in *King Lear*', in *Collected Papers*, ed. J. C. Maxwell (Oxford, 1966), p. 333; and Madeleine Doran, *The Text of 'King Lear'* (Stanford, 1931), pp. 73–6. I am grateful to Gerard Kilroy of Lancaster University for drawing my attention to the Quarto spelling.