
In medieval belief, there were many ways a demon could enter the body, sometimes via so seemingly innocuous a vehicle as an unblessed lettuce leaf eaten by a careless nun. In a world of such perils, when the body and mind—and thus the very integrity of the individual—were so at risk of preemption by demonic powers, it is little wonder that mechanisms for expelling those powers achieved a high degree of importance. Of these perils and these mechanisms we learn much from Hilaire Kallendorf’s book, but the author’s concern is not, finally, possession and its cure. Instead, Kallendorf addresses the manifestations of this medieval theme in early modern literature, taking issue along the way with recent scholarship, particularly that of the New Historicists, that desacralizes the early modern period and its art. The author discusses a lengthy catalogue of early modern Spanish and English literary works (works, that is, from both a Roman Catholic and a Protestant culture) that incorporate demonology and argues that the authors of those works still viewed demons as real beings, possession as a real phenomenon, and exorcism as a legitimate and efficacious cure.

Kallendorf’s primarily structuralist approach identifies eleven “theologemes” of literary possession and exorcism (e.g., “the demon’s entrance into the body,” “symptoms of possession,” “demonic polyglossia”) and sets up a paradigm, printed as a chart at the beginning of the book, to show the various configurations in which they appear in the works under consideration. Thus, Jonson’s *Volpone* incorporates “symptoms of possession,” “the coach,” and “exorcism as a synecdoche for curing the body politic,” while *Don Quixote* employs “the demon’s entrance into the body,” “symptoms of possession,” “the exorcist,” and “the successful exorcism.” The chart, essentially a checklist, is a useful guide to the rest of the book, which is organized by genre.

Chapter I initiates the generic approach by dealing with comic drama. At the same time, it provides a more thorough analysis of the theologemes already introduced, taking them up one by one and illustrating the way each is manifested in a particular text. Works under discussion and their respective theologemes (which I list here in full for the purpose of providing the complete catalogue) include Alonso de la Vega’s *La duquesa de la rosa* (the demon enters the body), Jonson’s *The Devil is an Ass* (symptoms of possession), Ruggle’s *Ignoramus* (demonic polyglossia), Jonson’s *Volpone* (the coach), Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (the exorcist), *The Bugbears* (the lovers’ ruse), Shakespeare’s *Comedy of Errors* (the [mock] exorcism), Timoneda’s *Los menemnos* (binding the body), Shadwell’s *The Lancashire Witches* (relics, holy water, and
other props), the multi-authored *El pleito que tuvo el diablo con el cura de Madrilejos* (the successful exorcism), and Zamora’s *El hechizado por fuerza* and Middleton’s *The Phoenix* (exorcizing the body politic).

The remaining chapters take up the remaining genres to be discussed: satire and the picaresque, romance, the interlude, hagiographical drama, tragedy, and the novel, analyzing representative examples and the clusters of theologemes that appear in them. Along the way Kallendorf offers extensive information concerning the details of demonology and provides, simultaneously, some valuable literary insights.

The second chapter, addressing the picaresque and satire, introduces a paradoxically beneficial aspect of possession, the devil as a source of truth and demonic possession as a means of access to knowledge. Even though the church condemned the practice, exorcists sometimes attempted to interrogate the devil through the demoniac they were treating. The fifth *tratado* of the anonymous *La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes* provides the illustrative text for the picaresque, Quevedo’s *Discurso del alguacil endemoniado* for satire. The author speculates on possible parallels, in Quevedo’s view, between poetic furor and demonic possession, the muse, like demons, serving as a source of knowledge not normally accessible to the human intellect.

Romance and the interlude, addressed in Chapter 3, make particularly frequent use of the lovers’-ruse theologeme. Inclusion as a theologeme of the lovers’ ruse, obviously a literary rather than a theological concept, is a reminder that the eleven-part paradigm Kallendorf constructs is not drawn entirely from ecclesiastical tradition and a reminder, as well, that the book is, in fact, more a literary study than a disquisition on demonology. In the third chapter, appropriately enough, Kallendorf introduces the concept of the “humanizing” of the exorcism ritual, that is, artistic representation of the experience in a manner that makes it more accessible to modern sensibilities. In Cervantes and others two extremes may be found side by side, a light-hearted view of possession, for example, that metaphorically links demonic and sexual possession—love madness—as well as hagiographical seriousness. Examples of the former are found in Cervantes’ *Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda* and Lope de Vega’s *La endemoniada*, of the latter in Cervantes’ *El rufián dichoso*, Calderón’s *Las cadenas del demonio*, and Lope’s *El divino africano*, in which Saint Augustine is shown performing an exorcism as one of the proofs of his saintliness. Two particular modes of humanized exorcism emerge from these and other examples, one whereby the possessing demon is transferred from the possessed into a self-sacrificing “exorcist” who takes on, as it were, the sins of another, the second whereby the exorcist—Saint Augustine, for example—defeats the demon rhetorically.

Chapter 4, “Tragedy As the Absence or Failure of Exorcism,” turns from what has been predominantly discussion of Spanish literature to the English
stage, discussing *King Lear* at length as well as *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, *Othello*, *Macbeth*, and *Hamlet*. In tragedy, Kallendorf argues, either demonic possession is not exorcized at all, or attempted exorcism fails. Shakespeare’s borrowings from Samuel Harsnett’s *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* have been well documented, and Kallendorf confronts the challenge of reconciling Shakespeare’s undeniable use of a skeptical source with her conviction—pace Stephen Greenblatt and other New Historicists—that Shakespeare himself did not consider possession and exorcism fraudulent. It is no doubt fruitless, in the end, to try to define the nature of Shakespeare’s personal faith (although more than a few have so attempted), and it may be irrelevant to our understanding and appreciation of his poetry, but, this aside, Kallendorf’s discussion of the elements in *King Lear* that echo the language and structures of demonological tradition is again and again illuminating. The author proves herself to be a sensitive close reader of the text. Kallendorf explores the theme of exorcism as “Neo-Aristotelian catharsis” and finally adduces the cathartic effect of *Lear* (catharsis both of characters within the play and of the audience) as further evidence that exorcism was, to Shakespeare, more than just showmanship.

The remaining works under discussion in Chapter 3 are treated as examples of the theme of the demon as scapegoat. Possession is used in *A Yorkshire Tragedy* to rationalize villainy, rather as, Kallendorf suggests, the Freudian concept of repression is sometimes used today. In *Othello* the protagonist is afflicted by the demonic Iago. Both Macbeth and Lady Macbeth demonstrate symptoms of possession—which include such phenomena as sleepwalking and the epilepsy that Macbeth shares with Othello. The ghost of the elder Hamlet functions as the possessing demon, a role underscored by allusions to demonological texts, and, with respect to Hamlet’s mental state, we are reminded that melancholy was thought by many in Elizabethan and Jacobean times to have been caused by demons. To her credit, the author acknowledges that there is a multiplicity of models for Hamlet’s madness—which she evidently accepts as entirely unfeigned—of which possession is only one. On page 143 a speech of Iago’s is wrongly attributed to Othello, a rare lapse for an otherwise careful author. I must also question Kallendorf’s reading of *Hamlet* 2.2.572–75 (“Who calls me villain, breaks my pate across…”). The author suggests that the soliloquizing Hamlet here is enquiring about the source of the symptoms of possession he is feeling. This seems a considerable stretch, even for an author understandably seeking demonological evidence wherever it might be found. While the imagery may indeed be reminiscent of demonological phenomena, taken in context the passage clearly shows Hamlet berating himself for being too cowardly to respond to human, not demonic, affronts—specifically, the murder of his father and its aftermath.

The fifth chapter, “Self-Exorcism and the Rise of the Novel,” discussing
Don Quixote, turns its literary attention toward the future and, as the title suggests, turns its demonological focus toward a quite new aspect of exorcism as well. Here the exorcist and the demoniac are one. While the traditional doctrinal elements and trappings of possession and exorcism are not forgotten in Chapter 5, broader literary concerns insinuate themselves more prominently into the demonological theme. Kallendorf makes a strong case for the importance of including demonological texts among the intertextual inventory, medical, psychological, and literary, that scholars have credited with shaping Don Quixote's mind. Again, as in the discussion of Hamlet, the author acknowledges emphatically that demonology is only one of many keys to the mystery of Don Quixote.

Kallendorf is more speculative in dealing with Cervantes' sources than with those of most of the other authors discussed earlier. Shakespeare's use of Harsnett, for instance, is readily demonstrable, but Kallendorf pretends no such certainty about the demonological works Cervantes might have known. Instead, she suggests representative possibilities, works that would have been available to him, including manuals of exorcism, that contain the kind of information with which he shows familiarity. As she does elsewhere, the author addresses the question of credence. In the mind of the Don, she argues, the images of demonology are not just metaphors. When he alludes to demons he truly believes he is possessed, and from this conviction stems the "darker side" (167) of the comedy. The author finds self-exorcistic elements in such places as Quixote's battles and in interchanges such as that between Don Quixote and the women of Barcelona, when he refuses their invitation to dance by shouting, "¡Fugite, partes adversae!" a command drawn verbatim from the exorcism ritual (175). The author argues Don Quixote's self-exorcism to be profoundly innovative, especially given that his friends, the barber and the priest, both figures traditionally associated with exorcism, are already present and therefore could have taken on the task. So innovative is the Don's activity that Kallendorf must, in fact, look to a manual published sixty years later when seeking information about self-exorcism. In a book so careful at laying out textual evidence, this would seem to be the least persuasive of texts to adduce, but Kallendorf in effect makes its very lateness part of her argument; that is, Cervantes was so innovative that he may have anticipated rather than reflected at least this one aspect of demonological thought. On a broader note, Kallendorf discusses the "gestures of emancipation" (180) that are part of Don Quixote's innovative creation of his own biography (and of Cervantes' literary innovation), noting that, just as Don Quixote now exorcises himself, earlier still he had baptized himself.

The book's conclusion, "Liturgy in Literature, or Early Modern Literary Theory and the Christian Legitimate Marvellous," returns to the polemical theme with which the book began, refutation of those scholars who would
desacralize the early modern world and affirmation of the continuing belief in God, angels, and demons. The author provides a summary discussion of several early modern writers, Dryden among them, who defended the inclusion of the “legitimate marvelous” in literature but argues that to account for the recurrence of possession and exorcism one must make the leap to the “Christian legitimate marvelous,” the most vocal advocate for which was Tasso, who, in turn, influenced numerous writers of Christian epics, including Milton. Finally, having demonstrated the importance to epic of the Christian legitimate marvelous, Kallendorf offers a brief summary of the preceding chapters as a reminder of the range of other early modern literary genres that incorporated it.

As a kind of coda, Kallendorf speculates on further possible applications of her structuralist approach, suggesting that exploration of the Christian legitimate marvelous could be extended to witchcraft, prophecy, apparitions, and astrology, with similar paradigms of theologemes constructed for these subjects as well. A brief epilogue, “Problematising the Category of ‘Demonic Possession,’” points out that what was once viewed as possession could and did come to be interpreted as, variously, melancholy, ecstasy, enthusiasm, and poetic furo—–not to mention epilepsy, tarantism, ventriloquism, stigmatism, and asthma.

There is much to be learned in the pages of this carefully constructed and lucidly written book. The author treats an arcane and sometimes intricate topic with a clear and graceful prose style, refreshingly jargon-free. The book is rich in information about demonology and is both informative and entertaining regarding the practices of exorcism. There is value as well in its literary insights, not least because the Spanish and English texts under discussion are approached from a direction that is unquestionably out of the ordinary. The author is a careful and thorough scholar, but she also has a critic’s sensibility; she is a skilled close reader. As the result of reading this book I know I will never look at some of the works under discussion in quite the same way again and I expect that passages I have seen before—–however appreciatively—as metaphors and allusions are going to strike me with a new reality when next I encounter them.
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