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ABSTRACT

Early modernity’s rise during the seventeenth century in England created a shift in culture including literary artistic expressions. This paper proposes that the rise of modernity limited the communicative power of language within literary art due to the overpowering influence of New Science and empirical explanations of reality. Underpinning the elevation of empirical reality was the impact of Northern humanism that greatly influenced and empowered the Protestant Reformation. As a result, the building blocks for secularizing Western Civilization were laid by a religious movement rooted in scholastic rigor. This paper examines the sacramental ontology of premodern England in contrast to the early modern influence of the late seventeenth century to propose that a return to premodern, sacramental examinations of texts provides unique and useful scholarly conclusions. By examining William Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, written at the beginning of the seventeenth century, in contrast to John Dryden’s adaptation, written in the latter half of the seventeenth century, an understanding of modernity’s impact on literary expression and communicative power of language will be conveyed and a path to re-enchantment proposed.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The seventeenth century marked a dramatic shift in ontological conceptions that reverberated into the following centuries. The foundation of what has been traditionally called the Renaissance was firmly established in England at the onset of the English Civil War of the 1640s. In particular, Renaissance humanism influenced various aspects of English culture such as religion, politics, and artistic expressions as articulated by Alfonso Ingegno\(^1\) and Paul Kristeller.\(^2\) Underlying late medieval and Renaissance humanism was the skeletal structure of what would become known as New Science, which formed the framework for modernity to reshape Western Civilization. With New Science, reality became progressively defined in empirical terms, and this new construct reconfigured English culture in particular by creating a new correlation between the spiritual and physical, private and public, collective and individual. As Hans Boersma argues, the sacramental ontology of premodern culture wove together the physical and supernatural, but modernity, being shaped by the New Science, unraveled the threads, creating what some imagine to be a separation between the two.\(^3\) This separation of empirical and supernatural had religious and political catalysts that shaped a new social consciousness producing completely new cultural expressions. As part of this ontological shift, literary achievements during the seventeenth century display a disenchantment of reality, in

which a dependence was placed on modern scientific methods to define reality within empirical terms that separated and sometimes directly opposed premodern belief in supernatural participation within the physical world as articulated by Max Weber⁴ and Charles Taylor.⁵ The acceleration of this disenchantment in the seventeenth century infiltrated deeper and affected more than merely the secondary, fictional narratives within literary art, but also disenchanted language itself. The power of texts was altered with the ontological shift, creating a completely altered essence of literary art.

Historians such as Jacob Burckhardt⁶ occasionally point to the rebirth of knowledge during the Renaissance as a primary facilitator for the rise of New Science and the rejection of religion as superstition, but a more nuanced analysis identifies the Protestant Reformation as a significant catalyst for modernity’s ontological alteration. The work of, among others, Max Weber⁷, Charles Taylor,⁸ Brad Gregory,⁹ and Hans Boersma¹⁰ offers a useful understanding of English culture’s complex reaction to Reformation theology and practices that created fertile soil for modernity to take root. Taylor describes premodern self-understanding as porous or ‘vulnerable to a world of spirits and powers,’ but describes the modern self as buffered.¹¹ Taylor clarifies by describing how a modern individual might process the feeling of melancholy: ‘He is told: it’s just your body chemistry, you’re hungry, or there is a hormone malfunction…it just feels this way, which is the

⁷ See Weber’s Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism
⁸ See Taylor’s A Secular Age
¹¹ Taylor, p. 27
result of a causal action utterly unrelated to the meanings of things.\textsuperscript{12} In contrast, premodern individuals were not comforted when told they had black bile because ‘this doesn’t permit a distancing. Black bile is melancholy. Now he just knows that he’s in the grips of the real thing.’\textsuperscript{13}

Taylor’s distinction of the premodern, porous individual and the buffered, modern individual shows the importance of individual perspective present within the ontological shift during the early modern period. At the heart of harrowing the ground for modernity’s seeds was the disintegration of sacred understandings of physical reality. Protestantism, rooted in Reformation theology, rejected sacramental ontology by reducing reality into separate spheres wherein modernity primarily established its framework in the physical realm.\textsuperscript{14} The implications of this rejection shown in cultural expressions during the seventeenth century, as seen in the iconoclasm of the Puritans, constrained language within the empirical, thereby becoming mere symbol and utility as opposed to its participatory essence in sacramental ontology. In a sacramental view of language, words, seen and heard, were understood to overlap with and engender the spiritual reality they signified.

A historical and philosophical understanding of sacramental ontology in contrast to early modernity’s overemphasis of physical reality as established in New Science suggests that a return to a sacramental engagement with texts opens new dimensions of communicative and formative power for literary texts. Constraining literary study within the disenchantment of modernity limits humanity’s existence to merely physical beings, but as J.R.R. Tolkien argues,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Taylor, p. 37
\item \textsuperscript{13} Taylor, p. 37; for more on premodern superstitions in contrast to modernity’s empirical explanation see Steve Bruce’s \textit{God is Dead: Secularization in the West} (Blackwell, 2002) p. 19
\item \textsuperscript{14} See Boersma’s \textit{Heavenly Participation}, p. 17; also see Taylor’s \textit{A Secular Age} p. 25-28; also see Gregory’s \textit{The Unintended Reformation} p. 298
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
'there is a part of Man which is not ‘Nature’';\textsuperscript{15} therefore, empirical frameworks of literary composition and analysis are unsatisfactory in encountering the human soul. Re-enchanting literary art can only be attained by understanding how disenchantment affected literary expressions, especially within early modernity. Understanding the historical and philosophical rise of modernity from the sacramental and enchanted ontology of premodern England allows a nuanced comparison of texts that preceded the full shift to the modern turn to the material with those that followed it. For example, the militant Protestantism in Edmund Spenser’s \textit{The Faerie Queene}\textsuperscript{16} displays fundamental Protestant beliefs that fostered the Puritan rise in the seventeenth century culminating with John Milton’s \textit{Paradise Lost},\textsuperscript{17} which Max Weber\textsuperscript{18} describes as the Puritans’ \textit{Divine Comedy}. These texts held strongly to a Christian tradition, but the natural theology within their Protestant influence created the atmosphere for Restoration authors, such as Thomas Shadwell, William Wycherley, Aphra Behn, and John Dryden,\textsuperscript{19} among others, to begin exploring secular narratives. The comparison of early modern texts, written before the English Civil War and Restoration literature, illustrates the ontological shift within English culture and more clearly defines the nuances between early modern and premodern ontology.

Vital to the rise of the Protestant Reformation and ultimately the ontological shift described above was the influence of Northern humanism, which provided the intellectual tools to

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{15} Tolkien, J.R.R. ‘On Fairy-Stories’ \textit{Tales from the Perilous Realm}. Hughton Mifflin Hardcourt Press, 2008. p. 394.
\item\textsuperscript{16} See Edmund Spenser’s \textit{The Faerie Queene: Book One} (1590) I.20.6 Spenser depicts the monster Error vomiting books and papers symbolic of Roman Catholic papal papers. This is followed by Redcross, the ideal protestant knight, ‘…stroke at her with more then manly force, / that from her body full of filthie sin / He raft her hatefull heade without remorse” I.25.6-8. The connection between Error and the Roman Catholic Church followed by Redcross’s violent defeat indicates the militant Protestantism imbedded in \textit{The Faerie Queene} and is indicative of the theological changes impacting political upheaval; for more on Spenser’s philosophical underpinnings see C.S. Lewis’s \textit{English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama} (Oxford, 1944) p. 392
\item\textsuperscript{17} See John Milton’s \textit{Paradise Lost} (1667)
\item\textsuperscript{18} See Weber, p. 44;
\item\textsuperscript{19} Shadwell’s \textit{The Virtuoso}; Wycherley’s \textit{The Country Wife}; Behn’s \textit{The Rover}; Dryden’s \textit{The Tempest}
\end{footnotes}
dismantle the corrupted ecclesiastical structures of the Middle Ages. Northern humanists differed from their Italian counterparts in that their main impetus revolved around biblical textual studies in application of the knowledge gleaned from ancient Greek and Roman texts. The biblical textual emphasis is evidenced in the study of Hebrew in addition to classical Greek and Latin in order to study the Old Testament in its original language. The Prince of the Northern humanists, Erasmus, most directly illustrates humanist textual scholarship with his Greek New Testament that provided corrections to Jerome’s Vulgate Latin translation. Another key component within humanist education was the emphasis on rhetoric. While scholasticism from the Middle Ages emphasized the meticulous logical progression of arguments, Renaissance humanism became more interested in the potential styles and forms of argument modeled after the classical works of exceptional Roman rhetoricians such as Cicero. As Paul Kristeller summarizes, the emphasis of rhetoric within humanist scholarship created ‘the intellectual climate for the New Science of the seventeenth century.’ This climate instigated by Northern humanism caused theological reform within the Roman Catholic Church, culminating in the Protestant Reformation that had unforeseen political and cultural repercussions.

But viewing Renaissance humanism as the singular cause for the disenchantment of Western Civilization is far too simplistic, as Brad Gregory articulates in *The Unintended Reformation*, wherein he portrays a historical progression of tensions between Protestantism and Catholicism sparked by Northern humanism. Throughout the sixteenth century, both Catholic and Protestant

---


22 See Kristeller, p. 122

23 See Kristeller, p. 136
thinkers utilized humanist tools to propagate their perspective as seen in England within the writings of both Sir Thomas More and William Tyndale. Understanding Puritanism’s role in eliminating sacramental ontology in English social consciousness and how this helped both fertilize secularization of society and limit the role of literary art is rooted within their radical embrace of Protestant theology, particularly Calvinism, from the sixteenth century. This is most clearly seen in Max Weber’s analysis of Puritanism where his underlying premise is rooted in the disenchantment of the physical. In order for a society to embrace the utilitarianism vital for capitalism within modernity, the physical and spiritual must be separated. This separation is what allows a cutthroat businessman in a capitalistic economic system to be a loving and devoted family man. Disconnect between personal and public, spiritual and physical grew out of the disenchantment promoted by the Puritans, rooted in the Reformation.

Weber also acknowledges the paradox of Puritan ideology. On one hand they seemed to hate culture and art, but this is problematic when examining their references to and apparent love for the classics; Puritans suppressed the theater, but *Paradise Lost* was born out of Puritan ideals. Weber argues that the seemingly inconstant view of artistic expression is linked by the Puritans’ hatred and rejection of the sacramental ontology of the Roman Catholic Church. Weber writes, ‘The Puritans ferocious hatred of everything which smacked of superstition, of all survivals of magical and sacramental salvation, applied to the Christmas festivities of the May Pole and all

---

24 See Gregory, p. 45
25 See Weber, p. 9; for more concerning disenchantment and Adorno see J.M. Bernstein’s Adorno: Disenchantment and Ethics (CUP 2001) p. 121; for more on connections between Weber’s disenchantment and Nietzsche see Alasdair MacIntyre’s After Virtue (University of Notre Dame Press, 1981) pp. 109, 114-115.
26 Weber, p. 168. ‘Its [Puritanism] attitude was thus suspicious and often hostile to aspects of culture without any immediate religious value. It is not, however, true that the ideals of Puritanism implied solemn, narrow-minded contempt of culture.’
spontaneous religious art.’ 27 Puritan rejection of sacramental ontology did not mean they excluded the beauty of the physical world, but they created a Christian utilitarianism. In other words, if literary art or any other physical expression did not directly reflect or point toward a specific virtue, then they were not useful. Instead of objects participating in the spiritual reality, they were reduced to simple metaphors or symbols reflecting a specific aspect of the supernatural or transcendent.

The symbolic versus the sacramental is especially seen within Puritans’ understanding of the Lord’s Supper and infant baptism. The Lord’s Supper was a central theological debate during the Protestant Reformation causing more radical Protestants like the Puritans and Baptists to reject any remnant of the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation. 28 Puritans wanted the ecclesiastical practice of remembering the Lord’s Supper to become exclusively symbolic and rejected any sacramental understanding of the physical bread and wine in the Eucharist. 29 This disconnect between the spiritual and physical limited the physical to mere symbol of the supernatural and had long-lasting repercussions. 30 For starters, it reduced physical reality’s role within the central ecclesiastical practice of the church. Along with baptism, the Lord’s Supper is the ecclesiastical ritual instituted by Jesus himself, and a change in the understanding of the physical objects involved indicates a monumental shift in the corporeal’s role within

---

28 ‘transubstantiation, n.’ OED Online, Oxford University Press, June 2017. 1) the changing of one substance into another 2) The conversion in the Eucharist of the whole substance of the bread into the body and of the wine into the blood of Christ, only the appearances (and other ‘accidents’) of bread and wine remaining: according to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.
29 Thomas, Keith. Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs In Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England. Oxford University Press. 1997. p. 53. Thomas compares transubstantiation to the Old Testament story of Moses changing elements magically in such a way that Pharaoh’s magicians could not do. He then says, ‘the Protestant reformers would countenance any of the old notions concerning the temporal benefits which might spring from communicating or from contemplating the consecrated elements.’
30 Borsma, Hans. Heavenly Participation, p. 51. ‘The Eucharistic body ‘really’ participated in the mystery of the unity of Christ himself. Therefore, a radical jettisoning of the Platonic elements that entered into the Christian faith may carry significant (and troubling) theological consequences.’
Protestantism, particularly Puritan worship practices. Instead of seeing the physical as participating, more radical Protestants like the Puritans saw the cosmos as merely the means to an eternal end. Their understanding of the empirical is like an elegant dinner exquisitely prepared for a celebration that is seen only as potential energy for dancing after the meal; instead of the meal participating in the celebration, the food simply becomes the conduit or vessel to arrive at another destination or realization—that is its primary use or purpose. The physical realm for Puritans did not participate in their faith beyond being the conduit to their eternal destiny. The physical was good as far as it pointed directly toward or was a clear symbol of specific supernatural realities.

As the Lord’s Supper pointed to or was a symbol of Jesus’ body and blood, so baptism was not sacramental within the Calvinist Puritans, but symbolic of a metaphysical, individual transformation. While reformers like Martin Luther maintained a very sacramental understanding of baptism that was practiced in the form of infant baptism, more radical reformers like Hubermair and Grebel31 instituted adult baptism rooted in a symbolic understanding of the ecclesiastical act itself.

With the removal of sacramental ontology, the physical becomes merely symbolic, and the physical act on an infant is farcical because it has no symbolic meaning. Without the participatory ontology, the act of baptizing an infant who is unable to make a conscious decision of faith in Jesus is bankrupt. Both the Lord’s Supper and baptism fundamentally change in function when sacramental ontology is removed. The physical objects do not participate but become symbols of specific spiritual realities, much like the elegant dinner does not participate in a celebration, but is a means to the real celebration to come.

31 Gregory, Brad. 89. Hubermair and Grebel were contemporaries of Zwindli but disagreed with him about infant baptism. Grebel said, ‘the baptism of children is a senseless, blasphemous abomination [grewel], against all scripture’
The theological tensions seen within the Protestant Reformation and radically applied within Puritanism overlapped and intertwined with English political discord during the sixteenth and seventeenth century, culminating in the English Civil War of the 1640s. Gregory argues that the New Science of the latter seventeenth century rejected both Catholic and Protestant understandings of natural philosophy and turned, instead, to rationalism and inductive reasoning as proposed in Sir Francis Bacon’s *Novum Organum*.

Literary expressions from the Restoration show a clear reaction to and rejection of Puritan ideals, yet draw from Puritanism’s rejecting of sacramental ontology to construct a more secular society wherein New Science became a vital philosophical reference point that largely rejected both sacramental and Protestant natural theology. Largely contributing to the rejection of Protestant natural theology was Radical Protestantism’s display of militant anti-sacramentality as articulated by Weber. Both the scholastic changes instigated by the rise of humanism and the political unrest agitated by the Protestant Reformation cultivated the ground for New Science to alter natural philosophy and largely contribute to disenchanting Western Civilization.

By examining literary expressions throughout modernity within the historical lens of Charles Taylor’s construction of Western Civilization’s secularization and Max Weber’s philosophical portrayal of Protestant ethics, the limitations of modernity’s engagement with literary texts becomes evident as contrasted with sacramental engagement articulated by Hans Boersma. Modernity’s disenchantment not only limits the message of literary texts, but reduces the physical text to a mere vehicle or symbol in contrast to sacramental ontology’s intrinsic participation of the text with the message and meaning. Modernity reduces the text to a tool used

---

32 See Gregory 47
33 Weber, p. 3 ‘Only in the West does science exist at a stage of development which we recognize to-day as valid.’; for an alternative view of science as only one facet of a larger secular truth see Steven Pinker’s *Enlightenment Now* (Viking, 2018) p. 433
34 Weber, p. 88-89
to perform a particular communicative function, but sacramental ontology requires the text to participate in the communicated reality. Literary texts possess far more communicative potential when composed and/or examined within a sacramental ontological framework. William Shakespeare’s comedy *The Tempest* and John Dryden’s Restoration adaptation provide an ideal opportunity to examine early modernity’s shift from sacramental ontology, which resulted in a reduction of metaphoric power.

Following Gregory’s historical narrative of the rise of New Science, the two seventeenth century versions of *The Tempest* provide a unique analysis of disenchantment’s impact on literary expressions as the plays are written on either side of the English Civil War. Although Shakespeare’s play is written well into the Protestant Reformation’s influence on English culture, the real impact of disenchantment in the rise of New Science largely does not begin to materialize until after the Civil War. The two versions also land on different sides of English theatrical history as the theatre was essentially banned during the radically Protestant, Puritan-controlled government that immediately followed the English Revolution. The reopening of the English theatre following the reinstatement of the monarchy in 1660 displayed modernity’s influence as accelerated by the aforementioned scholastic and political climates. Plays such as Thomas Shadwell’s *The Virtuoso* (1676) directly addressed, often with ambivalence, the activity of the Royal Society whose intent was to apply Sir Francis Bacon’s scientific method toward rational conclusions of the natural world divorced of the sacramental significance present within premodern natural theology. While many in English theatre were skeptical of New Science,

---

35 For further history of English theatre see Rachel Willie’s, *Staging the Revolution: Drama, Reinvention, and History 1647-72* (CUP, 2015); Susan Owen’s *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (OUP, 1996); Michael Dobson’s *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship* (OUP, 1992); Robert Hume’s *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (CUP, 1979)
their works reflect many of the same philosophical underpinnings that shaped a disenchanted ontology as evidenced in Dryden’s *Tempest*.

This paper will examine both Shakespeare and Dryden’s versions of *The Tempest* in light of the theological and political changes during the sixteenth century in order to argue that a removal of sacramental ontology instigated by the Protestant Reformation and modernity’s embrace of New Science as a reaction to, yet drawing from, radical Puritanism’s rejection of authority and promotion of individual choice disenchanted the metaphoric power of language. First, examination of Shakespeare’s inclusion of sacramental objects versus Dryden exclusion will establish a link to premodern sacramental ontology within Shakespeare’s construct of the supernatural. Following the sacramental objects, the physical setting, specifically the tempest at the beginning of the play, will be contrasted to demonstrate Dryden’s reliance on New Science and Shakespeare’s participatory representation. Finally, the overall goal of Shakespeare’s play as disclosed through Prospero’s perspective will reveal a text that participates in a larger narrative outside Shakespeare’s time and space, while Dryden’s portrayal of the same scene illustrates the limited metaphorical function of language within modernity’s delineation between the physical and supernatural.

Press, 1988. 255 Gulf between man and the divine indicates that the purpose of natural laws was not for the glorification of the deity but the wellbeing of man according to Bruno; See also Gregory 48.
The Tempest was one of Shakespeare’s final plays, and many scholars have attributed Shakespeare’s own feelings to the protagonist, Prospero. Usurped from his Dukedom by his brother and marooned on an island with his daughter, Propsero displays his magical powers learned from his extensive, and admittedly excessive, studies. When his brother’s ship nears his island, Prospero, with the help of his spirit servant, Ariel, controls an intense tempest that maroons the entire crew and passengers. Utilizing his magical power and influence, Prospero rejects the temptation to take vengeance on his enemies and ensures a comedic ending with the marriage of his daughter to the king’s son and restoration to his Dukedom. Within the plot, several key themes arise, such as Prospero’s treatment of two servants—the spirit, Ariel and the indigenous inhabitant, Caliban, but at the heart of the drama are Prospero’s crimes (neglecting his dukedom to pursue his studies) and the crimes of his usurpers. Shakespeare’s articulation of the central plot provides a more powerful metaphorical function than Dryden’s 1667 adaptation.

Many of Dryden’s alterations were to refine Shakespeare’s raw genius. Dryden directly acknowledged Shakespeare’s genius by saying, ‘All the images of nature were still present to him [Shakespeare], and he drew them not laboriously, but luckily; when he describes anything,

---

37 See Stephen Orgel’s introduction to The Tempest’s where he points out the significance and historical perspectives saying ‘…it [The Tempest] was the truest expression of Shakespeare’s own feelings, and that in the magician-poet Prospero he depicted himself.’

38 Shakespeare, William. The Tempest. edited by Stephen Orgel. Oxford University Press. 1987. Prospero acknowledges to Miranda his negligence as a Duke due to his studies: ‘And Prospero the prime duke, being so reputed / In dignity, and for the liberal arts / Without parallel; those being all my study, / The government I cast upon my brother (I.ii.74-75). Prospero admits he ’my library / Was dukedom large enough (I.ii.109-110). He tells later Miranda that he loves his books and that he prizes them above his dukedom (I.ii.166-168).
you more than see it, you feel it too.’³⁹ But when contrasting Shakespeare with Ben Jonson, Dryden reveals his perception of Shakespeare’s flaws: ‘I must acknowledge him [Jonson] the more correct poet…he [Jonson] has given us the more correct plays.’⁴⁰ Here Dryden displays the more calculated and formulaic view of playwriting. While Shakespeare’s raw talent and wit mark his genius, it is the classically formed Jonson that Dryden turns to as ‘correct.’ Dryden’s alterations attempt to apply many of Jonson’s classically informed elements and show his affinity for symmetry within the play. While Shakespeare’s Prospero has one daughter, Miranda, Dryden’s Prospero has two, Miranda and Dorinda. Instead of including only one indigenous character, Dryden includes Sycorax as Caliban’s sister. Also added in Dryden’s version is Hippolito who, like Miranda, has never seen a person of the opposite sex. These additions all add a level of symmetry to the plot: two siblings and two who have not seen the opposite sex.

Dryden makes several alterations by adding characters and altering the plot, but most significant is the change in Antonio, Prospero’s brother and usurper. Dryden portrays Antonio as immediately repentant of his crime against his brother, while Shakespeare never articulates direct repentance by Antonio. Dryden also provides more symmetry to the play with the inclusion of Prospero’s second daughter and a sister to Caliban. The coupling of siblings displays the orderly and rational move of early modern, Restoration authors, culminating in the neoclassical writings of authors like Alexander Pope⁴¹ and Jonathan Swift.⁴² Not only are characters added and the plot altered by Dryden, but also the fundamental function of Dryden’s text changes with influences of early modern forces such as New Science and the political tensions following the

⁴⁰ Dryden, p. 191
English Civil War. Shakespeare’s play retains several elements of a premodern ontological framework, creating larger metaphorical possibilities.

Shakespeare’s version of *The Tempest* is by no means a medieval morality play, but it does retain several sacramental elements, thereby remaining a sacramentally enchanted text that is consistent with the ontologies that preceded the dominance of the New Science. In Shakespeare’s version, this is most conveniently seen in the play’s use of three distinct physical objects owned by Prospero—his garments, book, and staff—that are present within his participation with magic or the supernatural. However, these objects are either altered or removed entirely within Dryden’s version, revealing delineation between the physical and supernatural. Dryden even goes so far as to apologize for the use of magic as outdated:

> But Shakespeare’s Magick could not copy’d be,
> Within that Circle none durst walk but he…
> I must confess ‘twas bold, nor would you now,
> That liberty to vulgar Wits allow,
> Which works by Magick supernatural things:
> But Shakespeare’s pow’r is sacred as King’s.
> Those Legends from old Priest-hood were receiv’d,
> And he then writ, as people then believ’d.\(^\text{43}\)

Shakespeare’s use of these objects closely follows premodern understandings of natural philosophy and supernaturally endowed objects deeply imbedded in sacramental ontology. From the Old Testament tradition of the Ark of the Covenant and Elijah’s staff, spiritually participating physical objects within Christian tradition provide a deeper and potentially more dangerous

---

\(^{43}\) See Dryden, p. 6 ‘Prologue to the *Tempest*, or the Enchanted Island’ lines 19-26
physical participation with the supernatural reality. Examining Prospero’s sacramental objects in contrast to Dryden’s alterations establishes modernity’s restrictive impact on literary expressions.

John Dryden was not a friend of Puritanism, but the cultural water in which he swam did not allow him to escape the ontological shift most notably seen in the New Science. Indicative of these cultural waters was Abraham Cowley’s poem ‘To The Royal Society’ wherein he conveys a pejorative attitude toward premodern philosophy and an embrace of the empirically verifiable of the New Science:

> With the Defferts of Poetry they fed him,
> Instead of solid meats ‘t encrease his force;
> Instead of vigorouf exercife, they led him
> Into the pleafant labyrinths of ever-frefh Difcours:
> Instead of carrying him to see
> The Riches which dee hoorded for him lye
> In Natures endlefs Trea fusie,

Cowley goes on to highlight Sir Francis Bacon’s contribution in identifying truths gleaned from the New Science. In addition to Cowley, some of Dryden’s contemporary playwrights directly addressed and critiqued the changing understanding of the physical world. For example, Shadwell’s 1678 play The Virtuoso took actual experiments from the Royal Society and

---

44 Taylor, p. 73  
46 Cowley, Abraham. ‘To The Royal Society’ lines 21-27  
47 See introduction to Shadwell’s The Virtuoso Edited by Marjorie Hope Nicolson and David Stuart Rhodes. (University of Nebraska Press, 1966); also see Carson Duncan’s The New Science and English Literature in the Classical Period (Banta Publishing, 1913); also see R.T.Gunther’s Early Science in Oxford: The life and Works of Robert Hooke. (OUP, 1923)
portrayed their absurdity on stage. Particularly striking is Lady Grimcrack’s description of her husband, the Virtuoso, attempting to swim like a frog on land.\textsuperscript{48} However, amidst the hesitancy toward the Royal Society, the inevitable change crept into the consciousness of English culture. The satirical portrayal of the Royal Society was directed at the radical application of a commonly held trust in empirically verified truths derived from the disenchantment rooted in Puritans’ distrust and disgust in sacramental conceptions of the Lord’s Supper and infant baptism. Writers like Shadwell may have scoffed at the absurd experiments, but they held a common trust in the empirical allowing secular narratives to develop. Dryden’s \textit{Tempest} displays the subtle but monumental changes, especially when examining the elimination of enchanted objects.

While both Dryden and Shakespeare incorporate magical language, Shakespeare’s play portrays physical objects as possessing sacramental qualities that present a far different understanding of the supernatural. Prospero’s magic garment is the first sacramental object seen in the play, and its depiction is a clear indication that Prospero has been supernaturally controlling, or at least altering, the storm and its impact on the ship.\textsuperscript{49} After Miranda laments that she has not the power to stop the shipwreck, Prospero assures her that, ‘There’s no harm done.’\textsuperscript{50} The past participle, \textit{done}, clearly indicates that Prospero holds some level of knowledge and control. As Shakespeare transitions from the shipwreck depicted in the first scene, he indicates that Prospero has both caused the tempest and subsequent shipwreck and assured the safety of every soul on board.\textsuperscript{51} Since the act was completed—\textit{done}—Prospero asks Miranda to ‘pluck my

\textsuperscript{48} Shadwell, Thomas. \textit{The Virtuoso}. Edited by Marjorie Hope Nicolson and David Stuart Rhodes. University of Nebraska Press. 1966. II.ii.295-9 Longvil’s aside in response to Lady Gimcrack shows the absurdity of the \textit{experiment}: ‘This is the rarest fop that ever was heard of.’

\textsuperscript{49} Shakespeare, I.ii.24

\textsuperscript{50} Shakespeare, I.ii.15

\textsuperscript{51} Shakespeare, I.ii.26
magic garments from me.' Then he proceeds to tell Miranda in past tense that he has ‘with the provision of mine art’ kept everyone safe. Prospero participated with the supernatural while wearing his magical garments, but when the garments are removed, he speaks of this power in the past tense. Prospero’s magic garments can be seen as analogous to clerical vestments worn during ecclesiastical rituals and practices within Christendom. Just as Prospero’s magic garments seem to participate in his control of the tempest, so too do the priest’s vestments participate in the sacramental ceremony of the Eucharist. To highlight the participatory nature of the vestments, consider how asinine it would be to see a priest in his undergarments performing mass—indeed, it would be sacrilegious. Such inappropriate apparel would violate the sacred participation of the physical and spiritual. Likewise, Prospero’s magic garments indicate a participatory object that impacts both the physical and the supernatural. This is directly seen later in the scene when Prospero rebukes Miranda saying, ‘hang not on my garments,’ while he is performing a miraculous act. Prospero’s rebuke comes while he is wearing garments and using his staff to disable Ferdinand, King Alonso’s son. Miranda, who has never before seen a man besides her father, is fearful that Prospero will harm Ferdinand, whom she intrinsically admires, and so grabs Prospero’s garments, resulting in the aforementioned rebuke. In light of the first account of Prospero’s magic garments, interference with the magic garments might cause an obstruction to Prospero’s ability to participate with the supernatural. In contrast, Prospero’s magic garments are never mentioned at the beginning of Dryden’s version. Indeed, Dryden never provides the adjective magical, or any synonymous qualifier in association with any of Prospero’s apparel. Dryden’s removal of the magical garments eliminates the sacramental
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52 Shakespeare, I.ii.23  
53 Shakespeare, I.ii.28  
54 Shakespeare, II.ii.475 ‘Hence! Hang not on my garments.’  
55 Shakespeare, II.ii.476-7 ‘Silence! One word more / Shall make me chide the if not hate thee.’
significance when Prospero rebukes Miranda for grabbing his garments.56 His clothes are not participatory, and Miranda’s interference is simply a nuisance. The rebuke is rooted in exclusively physical annoyance at his garments being grabbed, while Shakespeare’s clear sacramental articulation of Prospero’s magical garments expands the annoyance to include a possible break in the participatory supernatural act of freezing Ferdinand in place. The sharp contrast in Shakespeare’s and Dryden’s portrayal of Prospero’s garments is an example of Shakespeare’s premodern influence and Dryden’s embrace of early modernity’s separation of the physical and supernatural.

In addition to Prospero’s garments, Shakespeare adds to his sacramental ontological framework with inclusion of Prospero’s staff. Unlike Shakespeare’s magical garments, Dryden does include a wand synonymous with Shakespeare’s staff, though only once. Both versions indicate Prospero utilizing an object when neutralizing Ferdinand, as mentioned above, but the words used to define the physical object convey very different connotations. Dryden uses a *wand*, ‘I can disarm thee with / This Wand, and make thy Weapon drop’,57 which possibly links, directly or indirectly, Prospero’s supernatural power to acts of witchcraft,58 while Shakespeare’s *staff* and *stick* allude to the biblical tale of Moses.59 Dryden only mentions the wand once in the play, and without the context of Shakespeare’s magical garments, it is seen in isolation and therefore does not hold sacramental qualities. Shakespeare on the other hand mentions Prospero’s staff in the final act of the play when directly addressing his supernatural power. The

57 Dryden, III.v.62-63. ‘I can disarm thee with / This Wand, and make thy Weapon drop.’
58 ‘wand, n.’ *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, June 2017. A magic rod; the staff used in enchantments by a fairy or a magician. Dryden also uses this term similarly in *Indian Emperour* ii.i.15 High-Priest ‘Once, twice, and thrice, I wave my Sacred Wand, Ascend, ascend, ascend at my command. [An Earthy Spirit rises.]’
59 Exodus 7 Geneva Bible (1560)
staff is always mentioned in conjunction with one of the other sacramental objects and must be broken in order for Prospero to truly relinquish his power. Prospero promises to ‘break my staff, / Bury it certain fathoms in the earth, / And deeper than did ever plummet sound / I’ll drown my book.’ In doing so, Prospero directly links the staff and the book as being instrumental in practicing his supernatural power. If they were merely symbolic, in a radically Protestant sense, he would simply destroy or discard them, but he must break the staff and bury it with his book because their sacramental power cannot be easily destroyed. This indicates that the sacramental participatory power imbued into the staff cannot simply be removed but will remain even if the object is broken. In other words, the objects are not merely symbolic and/or conduits through which Prospero’s power passes. Rather, these objects have sacramental power that participates in the act itself.

Essential to Prospero’s participation in both the physical and supernatural is his magic book. Dryden’s version does indicate Prospero owns books (plural), but it does not make mention of a special book by which Prospero enacts his power. Shakespeare on the other hand makes it very clear through both Prospero and Caliban’s dialogue that a special book is every bit as participatory as the staff and garments. As seen above, the book is mentioned in the final act, but in act three, Shakespeare introduces the audience to its importance. Prospero ends the first scene of the act by indicating that he cannot perform his power without the participation of the book: ‘I’ll to my book, / For yet ere suppertime must I perform / Much business appertaining.’ Not only does Prospero use his garments and staff, but his book must also be employed to enact his supernatural power. The combined participation of all three objects mirrors the ecclesiastical rituals of sacramental Christian worship, and they provide a trinity of magical objects.

60 Shakespeare, V.i.54.
61 Shakespeare, William, III.i.94
In the next scene, Shakespeare provides another nuance to the sacramental quality of Prospero’s book as distinguished from Dryden. Caliban connects Prospero’s power to his books but fails to see the importance of his specific book in Shakespeare’s version. When Caliban is plotting to overcome Prospero with Stephano and Trinculo, he instructs them to, ‘Remember / First to possess his books; for without them / He’s but a sot, as I am’⁶² Caliban understands the importance of the physical object for Prospero’s participation in the supernatural but fails to see the significance of the singular book. Caliban believes all of Prospero’s books give him supernatural power, but Prospero very clearly uses a single book, instead of Caliban’s plural, books. This distinction also helps solidify the book as sacramental because it separates one physical book from others as more effectual in participating in the supernatural. In addition to the distinction between one versus multiple books, Francis X. Connor highlights the theatrical power of Shakespeare’s text as opposed to the material power: ‘Books may provide Prospero power, but his manifestations of his power are theatrical…his [Prospero’s] renunciation of his powers emphasize the dramatic, the stage, the theatrical rather than the printed book, the material.’⁶³ In light of the ontological shift, Connor’s distinction between the material book and dramatic theatre illuminates Shakespeare’s participatory text. Shakespeare’s dramatic text weaves together the supernatural into the physical with the power of the theatrical stage. Prospero’s material book is powerful because of its participation within a larger drama. Shakespeare articulates this larger drama by displaying Caliban’s inability to see the true power in Prospero’s book. Caliban’s primitive portrayal contributes to this understanding because he is unable to distinguish between the less sacramental power of written language and the participatory elevation of Prospero’s sacramental book. In contrast, Dryden’s depiction of Prospero’s books is always plural, similar

⁶² Shakespeare, William, III.ii.89-91
to Caliban’s removal of any participatory act between Prospero’s supernatural agency and a specific book. In the second scene, Dryden portrays Prospero’s books as simply physical objects with no sacramental qualities. He explains to Miranda how he was able to possess many books on their deserted isle, but no singularly sacramental book is mentioned. In fact, this same passage refers to clothes provided by Gonzalo, and neither description possesses any of the sacramental elements seen in Shakespeare’s version. Shakespeare includes a very similar conversation between Prospero and Miranda, in which Gonzalo’s assistance in providing books and clothing is gratefully articulated, but the important ontological distinction between the plays is that Shakespeare distinguishes a specific garment and book vital to his supernatural participation. Dryden includes the books and garments, but his failure to highlight a specific book or garment eliminates the sacramental power seen in Shakespeare. In both plays, Prospero’s books hold much power and influence, especially in Caliban’s mind, but Dryden’s portrayal embodies the early modern ontological construct. Dryden’s portrayal of Prospero’s library, void of a special book, constructs Prospero’s participation in the supernatural as primarily intellectual or metaphysical—the books are simply conduits or symbols of metaphysical realities, not participatory in those realities. This portrayal is consistent with a disenchanted ontological framework rooted in radical Protestantism and embraced by New Science.

Shakespeare portrays Prospero’s garments, staff, and book acting collectively as sacramental objects that possess a participatory quality. While both plays include direct dialogue between Ariel and Prospero, Shakespeare’s sacramental objects indicate Prospero’s own personal supernatural actions, whereas Dryden’s Prospero seems to primarily use Ariel as the agent of
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64 Dryden, John, *The Tempest*, I.ii.96-8 ‘and of his [Gonzalo] gentleness (knowing I lov’d / my Books) he furnishnt me from mine own Library, with Vol- / umes which I prize above my Dukedom.’
65 Shakespeare, I.ii.159-168
supernatural action. Shakespeare’s Prospero could not have accomplished his magical works without Ariel, but his own participation utilizing the aforementioned sacramental objects indicates his own active role in supernatural acts. Although Dryden’s characters use magical language, they do not seem to participate in the spiritual acts. Prospero appears to converse with Ariel, and Ariel does his bidding, but other than the freezing of Ferdinand, Dryden does not imply or insinuate that Prospero actively participates through any type of ceremony or incantation. In other words, Prospero’s supernatural ability is that he has somehow freed a spirit, Ariel, who, indebted to him, does his bidding. Shakespeare’s Prospero utilizes Ariel but also actively participates in the supernatural events through the use of sacramentally charged objects.

The sacramental objects in Shakespeare’s version also influence how the audience views the setting of the island. Due to the attention the play draws to the sacramental elements of these objects, Shakespeare imagines an isle that seemingly could exist in the primary world, as opposed to only being possible in an alternative reality or fantasy setting, because the supernatural participates in the physical reality. Magical events through sacramental objects are more believable because they not only connect, but also weave together, the physical and spiritual realms. Sacramental ontology allows supernatural phenomena to materialize in the physical world due to participatory construct of both realms. In contrast, Dryden’s depiction and rejection of sacramental elements holds to an early modern ontology where the realms are separated. Thus, supernatural events cannot be logically included in a primary, empirical reality without the setting being altered into a fantastical fairyland. In Dryden’s Tempest, the only way in which the spiritual impacts the physical is through direct conversation between beings from both realms. The spiritual can impact the physical through the tempest and freezing of Ferdinand, but it does not participate. It is separate from the physical and thereby is more fantastical. This
makes Dryden’s isle operate as a secondary or fairy world separated, not participating in, the primary world. Therefore, Dryden’s *Tempest* acts more as a fairytale, and Shakespeare’s as a myth.

English society’s ontological shift during the early modern period to a delineated understanding of the physical and spiritual is revealed in the non-sacramental objects within Dryden’s play. This shift fundamentally alters how the text itself, a physical object, operates and what function it performs. If physical objects are able to participate in and are intertwined with the supernatural, then their impact can be far greater in their metaphorical power that transcends both time and culture than a text held by modernity’s separation of the physical and spiritual. Shakespeare’s play has survived not only due to the author’s canonical reputation, but also due to the substance behind that reputation. As I will discuss later, Shakespeare’s retention of sacramental ontology rooted in the Middle Ages allows the reader to participate in the text within any time and space. The participatory nature of sacramental ontology creates a multilayered involvement in a larger narrative than the time and space preoccupied by any one individual or group. Shakespeare’s construction of supernatural participation, both in the fictional objects contained in the text and the text itself, allows the reader to participate in aspects of humanity that transcend time and culture. In contrast, Dryden’s text limits the reader’s ability to participate because the metaphors are reduced to mere conduits from one physical understanding to another. These understandings are unable to transcend the time and space surrounding them because of their symbolic, not participatory, nature. The objects within Dryden’s text and the text itself do not participate in the supernatural; thereby, the metaphorical power is limited to the physical. The text can only exist as a conduit by which the reader sees something that exists within the early modern ontology as something else within that same reality. Shakespeare’s text transcends
this limiting metaphoric power by retaining aspects of a premodern ontological framework that allows readers and audiences the opportunity to participate beyond the mere physical examinations of reality.
Reducing reality to primarily physical understandings also impacts the setting constructed by Shakespeare and Dryden. Prospero’s island, the physical space occupied within the play, conveys the deep ontological differences between the texts. While Shakespeare uses early modern vocabulary, his fundamental construction and portrayal of the physical setting reflects retention of premodern, sacramental understandings. In contrast, Dryden’s portrayal of the physical space preoccupied by the characters creates a bifurcated realm where spiritual and physical forces collide and impact each other but do not participate with one another toward a transcendent reality. To demonstrate this, consider the physical objects used in Prospero’s magical enactments. The construction of the physical space within an early modern, forked ontology significantly impacts the text’s metaphorical power. If the physical reality interacts with, but does not participate in, the supernatural reality, then the metaphorical impact on readers and audiences is greatly reduced by the physical understanding of the time of the text’s composition. For instance, the metaphorical power of traveling to Mars and discovering life is far less effective in the twentieth century than the nineteenth century within a modern ontological framework due to advancements in mastery of physical reality. However, within a sacramental framework, the mastery of physical reality affects the metaphorical significance far less because the participation of the physical and supernatural transcends mere physical representations. For example, H.G. Wells’s Martian tale *War of the Worlds* communicates a message more easily altered by time than C.S. Lewis’s Martian novel *Out of the Silent Planet*. While both novels have communicative power in the twenty-first century, Lewis’s primary message remains

---

66 See H.G. Wells’s *War of the Worlds* (1897)
67 See C.S. Lewis’s *Out of the Silent Planet* (1938)
undiminished by the advancements in space travel because his message hinges on sacramental, interwoven realities. Lewis’s tale participates in a larger narrative about the redemption of fallen man. H.G. Wells’s novel accomplishes a great deal, but the reliance on a primarily physical reality within a modern ontological construction limits the communicative power to the physical understandings of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Likewise, Dryden’s portrayal of the physical setting being influenced by the spiritual, rather than Shakespeare’s portrayal of the participation of the spiritual and physical together, greatly alters the communicative power of the two texts in subsequent centuries.

The physical construction of the island and the ontological differences are seen vividly in the portrayal of the storm. Dramatic texts are limited in their ability to create physical spaces as opposed to narratives, but the descriptions of the storm present a clear portrayal of physical reality as it relates to the supernatural within both versions of The Tempest. In his essay ‘On Fairy Stories,’ J.R.R. Tolkien articulates the limitations of drama in allowing the audiences the ability to imagine fantastical elements. As he articulates, ‘The scenes, are in Drama not imagined, but actually beheld.’ He goes on to use trees as an example: ‘Very little about trees as trees can be got into a play.’\(^\text{68}\) While Tolkien articulates his disbelief that drama can project the essence, or sacramental view of physical reality, this paper argues that Shakespeare was able to accomplish this fete in both Henry V and The Tempest. In the prologue to Henry V, Shakespeare says:

\begin{verbatim}
Oh, pardon: since a crooked figure may
Attest in little place a million,
And let us, ciphers to this great account,
On your imaginary forces work.
\end{verbatim}

\(^{68}\) Tolkien, p. 366-367
Suppose within the girdle of these walls
Are now confined two mighty monarchies,
Whose high upreared and abutting fronts
The perilous narrow ocean parts asunder:
Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts.
Into a thousand parts divide one man,
And make imaginary puissance.
Think when we talk of horses, that you see them
Printing their proud hoofs i'he’receiving earth,
For ’tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings,
Carry them here and there, jumping o'er times,
Turning th’accomplishment of many years
Into an hour-glass.  

Here Shakespeare asks the audience to use their imagination in much the same way that Tolkien asks quality fantasy literature to accomplish. Both Shakespeare and Tolkien see the value in fantastical and imaginative aspects of narratives to participate in a larger narrative. The imaginative requirements do not alter reality but focus, sharpen, and clarify it. While Shakespeare does not make a direct request of his audience in *The Tempest*, he, too, utilizes the fantastical aspects of the audience’s imagination to participate in a larger reality. While stage directions provide some inclusion of physical representations of the storm, the language within the text is the primary agent by which the audiences and readers experience the physical realm. Within the two versions, the differing descriptions of the storm and how the characters interact and encounter the storm reflect a clear ontological difference between Shakespeare and Dryden.
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69 Shakespeare, William. *King Henry V* (1599) Prologue lines 15-31
To explain this difference, I argue that the portrayals of the storm illustrate Tolkien’s distinction between *enchantment* and *magic*. Tolkien writes, ‘Enchantment produces a Secondary World into which both designer and spectator can enter, to the satisfaction of their senses while they are inside; but in its purity it is artistic in desire and purpose. Magic produces, or pretends to produce, an alteration in the Primary World…its desire is *power* in this world, domination of things and wills.’

Tolkien’s description of enchantment is similar to Boersma’s and Taylor’s description of sacramental ontology as articulated earlier. Magic, on the other hand, is a product of early modern and modern demarcations of physical reality. Tolkien’s assertion can be readily seen in his own portrayal of two wizards, Gandalf and Saruman, in *The Lord of the Rings*. In terms of the supernatural acts, Tolkien’s Gandalf *enchants* while Saruman’s enchantments turn to *magic*. Similarly, Dryden’s portrayal of Prospero’s supernatural activity is more closely related to Tolkien’s magic than his definition of enchantment. In contrast, Shakespeare’s portrayal of Prospero’s enactments with the supernatural shows a maturity from magician—as seen in his studies before being exiled—to enchanter—as seen in his participatory actions to actuate positive change. As will be discussed in depth later, Prospero’s participation in a redemptive narrative that transcends his own story moves him from a magician manipulating wills to an enchanter that conforms his will to a larger narrative than his own. Dryden’s portrayal of the storm in particular reveals Prospero’s magical enactment as a play for power, while Shakespeare displays a sacramental enchantment wherein Prospero’s supernatural activity participates in a narrative of redemption.
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70 Tolkien, p. 368
71 See in *The Two Towers* (1954) Treebeard describe Gandalf as ‘the only wizard that really cares about trees’ p. 69; Treebeard goes on to describe Saruman as ‘plotting to become a power. He has a mind of metal and wheels; and he does not care for growing things, except as far as they serve him for the moment.’ The difference in these two wizards is indicative or the difference between magic and enchantment because Gandalf participates with the life around him, specifically trees in this instance, and Saruman uses his ability supernatural ability to achieve personal gain.
Within both versions of the play, the very first scene sets apart the ontological makeup of the dramatic construction through interactions with the storm. Within the first few lines, differences arise as Shakespeare’s Boatswain speaks directly to the storm, ‘Blow till though burst they wind, if room enough!’ Dryden’s Trincalo does not speak to the storm but describes the storm: ‘The Scude comes against the Wind, twill blow hard.’ This minute difference is a reflection of a momentously altered view of physical reality. Shakespeare’s Boatswain speaks to the storm as a participant or living character, while Dryden’s Trincalo describes observations of physical forces. Reinforcing this delineation is the diction a few lines following where Trincalo shows anger at the passengers, Alonso, Antonio, and Gonzalo, for interfering with the crew’s attempts to maintain the ship’s course. Trincalo mockingly says, ‘If you can advise these Elements to silence: use your wisdom if you cannot, make your self ready in the Cabin for the ill hour.’ The words advise and wisdom are altered from the original where Shakespeare’s Boatswain says, ‘You are a councilor; if you can command these elements to silence, and work the peace of the present, we will not hand a rope more—use your authority If you cannot, give thanks you have lived so long, and make yourself ready…’ Dryden’s diction shows a slight alteration in perspective. To ‘advise’ as opposed to ‘command’ would imply a different position of power. Indeed the second alteration highlighted would corroborate this conclusion where Dryden changes command to wisdom. In terms of power, Dryden is comparing the passengers as advisors to a greater power, in this instance, the storm; Shakespeare’s diction implies the passengers might possess power over the storm. In regards to power and influence, the alterations in diction seem only to emphasize the mocking nature of Trincalo’s statement—that the other characters
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72 Shakespeare, I.i.7-8
73 Dryden, I.i.3
74 Dryden, I.i.25-26 [italics added]
75 Shakespeare, The Tempest, I.i.20-23 [italics added]
cannot affect the storm in any way. Essentially Trincalo tells the passengers that since they cannot influence the storm, they should stay out of the way of the professional seamen. The alterations seem to assist in this mockery as his terms reduce the most politically powerful characters—King Alonso and the Duke Antonio—to mere advisors. In other words, Dryden’s alterations add new levels of mockery. He mocks the politically powerful because they do not possess any ability to alter the storm, and he mocks their naiveté in thinking they can do more than a common seaman.

While the surface analysis of the alterations reveals a differentiation in power, a more philosophical examination reveals a deeper ontological modification rooted in early modernity and the New Science. As aforementioned, Northern humanism created the ‘intellectual climate’ for the natural theology of New Science and eventually the Enlightenment. One aspect of this climate was the reliance on the intellect as reflected in Weber’s depiction of the importance of intellectual will and calling.\(^76\) While the alterations of command to advise and authority to wisdom can be seen as indicators of power, they should also be seen as an illustration of the dependence on intellect in modernity’s encounter with the physical. Dryden’s diction displays the importance of the intellect as it relates to rhetoric and natural theology. When using advise, Dryden displays Renaissance humanism and Protestant emphasis on rhetoric reflecting the importance of intellectual prowess. Within this philosophical examination of Dryden’s alterations, Trincalo’s mockery of the politically powerful characters’ ability to alter the storm is not lost; indeed it is bolstered with absurdity. Dryden compares the storm to another intelligent person that can be persuaded to action through counsel. The storm is not an intelligent being, creating a mockery of the politically powerful characters who cannot use their rhetoric to alter

\(^76\) See Weber, p. 41; for more on Weber’s calling, see Quentin Skinner’s Visions of Politics (CUP 2002) pp. 150-151
the natural force, and reinforces the natural theology of the New Science. Shakespeare’s diction, on the other hand, maintains a premodern understanding within the mockery. By using command and authority, Shakespeare’s Boatswain does not emphasize intellect and rhetoric to overcome the natural world. Indeed, he is referring to a power greater than the storm rather than an intellectual argument to persuade the storm. The mockery within the text displays disbelief that the passengers possess this power, not that the storm can actually listen. Shakespeare articulates the physical world within the premodern construct wherein participation of the spiritual and physical allows for alterations within the physical world. Within a premodern sacramental ontology, the interwoven nature of reality would allow for those with the participatory ability or power to alter both realms. Dryden’s mockery is rooted in the concept that advising a storm is ludicrous, while Shakespeare’s mockery reflects the disbelief that the passengers possess the participatory authority of biblical figures like Moses or Jesus; Dryden’s text reflects an early modern natural theology, and Shakespeare’s reflects a more sacramental natural theology.

Dryden’s changes highlight the truly premodern construct behind Shakespeare’s depiction of the physical setting of the tempest because it reflects the sacramental understandings of physical alterations within premodern Christian belief of miraculous events in the Bible. For example, Moses uses his staff, a sacramentally participating object, to form violent storms over Egypt and part the Red Sea, while Jesus calms the raging storm on the Sea of Galilee. The Boatswain is mocking the passengers by essentially telling them that unless they are a Moses and can command the storm, they need to remain below deck. Dryden on the other hand uses Trincalo to tell the politically powerful passengers that the storm cannot be argued out of its rage, so go
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77 See Exodus 14:16-18 Parting of the Red Sea; Exodus 9:22-24 Hail storm in Egypt; Matthew 8:23-27, Mark 4:35-41, and Luke 8:22-25 Jesus calms the storm; Jesus did not use a sacramental object because he was the ultimate sacrament within the Christian tradition—fully God (supernatural) and fully man (physical)
below deck. Shakespeare’s construct of the storm within a premodern natural theology is reflected in these two words and displays a dispensation toward premodern constructs as opposed to Dryden’s diction that reflects the rise of New Science’s view of natural theology.

The ontological differences revealed in the initial scene’s diction also contributes to the interpretation of the second scene where Miranda first discusses Prospero’s magic. Both versions utilize almost the exact line wherein Miranda pleads with her father to relinquish the storm, but the aforementioned ontological construction of the physical space as articulated in descriptions of the storm produces very different interpretations of the same words.78 Miranda’s reference of Prospero’s art is diametrically different based on the ontological differences highlighted in the storm. Dryden’s art quite logically can be interpreted through the lens of Trincalo’s mockery of the passengers when he asks them if they can ‘advise’ the storm. In Dryden’s version, Miranda is essentially asking if her father can use his influence or art (not authority) to calm the storm. Within Dryden’s construct, Prospero’s art is his intellect whereby he manipulates the physical through his knowledge. This is more closely associated with Tolkien’s description of magic as a mode of power to manipulate wills. In contrast, Shakespeare’s depiction of Prospero’s art is more closely associated with Tolkien’s articulation of enchantment, wherein the primary goal is conforming to a higher or transcendent narrative. Dryden’s use of magic does enact redemption, as will be discussed further, but his early modern construct creates a personal redemption. In contrast, Shakespeare’s enchantment allows Prospero’s redemption to participate in a larger narrative outside his personal context.

Dryden further articulates an early modern natural theology when he portrays multiple attempts by the seamen to combat the storm. Toward the end of the scene, Trincalo commands

78 Shakespeare, I.ii.1-2 ‘If by your art, my dearest father, you have / Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them.’; Dryden 14…I.ii.5-6 ‘If by your Art, my dearest Father, you have put them in / this roar, ally ‘em quickly.’
that the ship’s anchor be utilized, followed a few lines later by Mustacho calling for the sails to be maneuvered.\footnote{Dryden, I.i.53 ‘Cat the Anchor, cat him’; I.i.58 ‘Loose the main Top Sail!’; I.i.63-5 ‘Port hard, port!...Star-board, star-board, a little steady; now steady, keep her thus, no nearer you cannot come’; I.i.67 ‘Try the Pump, try the Pump!’} Then Stephano provides steering commands in addition to Trincalo calling for the pumps to be manned. All these attempts to combat the storm are futile, but their inclusion contributes to the early modern natural theology portrayed by Dryden. The new natural theology of early modernity and New Science removes the supernatural; therefore, humanity is left to their physical actions to combat the impersonal forces of nature. The sailors’ attempts to use their skill and knowledge are futile against the force of the storm. Shakespeare’s text also depicts attempts to maneuver through the storm, but they are fewer and less descriptive. The Boatswain does give a command concerning the sails and the ship’s course, but the mechanical device in Dryden’s version—the pump—is missing in Shakespeare’s version. Shakespeare’s depiction of the sailors attempting to ride out the storm has a far different intent than Dryden’s. Shakespeare portrays the sailors as doing their part to stay alive within the turmoil of the tempest, while Dryden emphasizes the sailor’s attempts to overcome the forces of nature with mechanical inventions. Shakespeare articulates only one possible way of escape—possessing the sacramental authority of a biblical character such as Moses or Jesus—while Dryden displays the sailors putting actual trust in their physical contraptions and tools as evidenced in the use of the pumps. Finally, Dryden’s mechanical savior is further seen in the number of lines ending scene one. Shakespeare uses roughly forty lines between the mockery of the passengers and the end of the scene. Dryden uses more than double the lines, roughly ninety-five, between the mockery and the scene’s conclusion. The scene’s length contributes to the overall tone that the sailors see salvation in their physical efforts. Shakespeare’s version clearly shows a tone of despair and submission to greater forces—the physical efforts are performed, but only their prayers can save them. This
alteration in tone by Dryden is consistent with an ontology rooted in New Science and the delineation between the physical and supernatural.

The tempest in both versions creates the ontological framework that determines the purpose of each author. Shakespeare’s premodern natural philosophy creates a setting wherein sacramental participation is the only method by which to overcome overwhelming natural forces. In contrast, Dryden’s early modern ontological framework constructs a setting where knowledge of the physical allows the opportunity to overcome the empirical forces. These very different portrayals of natural philosophy affect the author’s intent for the text and the text’s impact on subsequent contexts. Just as the sacramental objects within Shakespeare’s version assert a more premodern, sacramental plot, the portrayal of the tempest also illustrates the sacramental nature of Shakespeare’s setting.
CHAPTER 4
SACRAMENTAL RESTORATION

Shakespeare’s play constructs a secondary world with roots deeply imbedded in a premodern ontology as seen in the sacramental objects and the physical setting, particularly the storm. While modernity’s infant cries influence Shakespeare’s play, its adolescent obstinance dominates Dryden’s version. The absence of sacramental objects might not directly correlate with this claim, but Dryden’s description of the storm in the initial scene indicates a clear embrace of New Science’s ultimate reality rooted in the physical realm. The depictions of the enchanted isle and the development of Prospero’s magic within both plays show a clear ontological difference, a difference indicative of the context each author occupied, more so than their personal ontological beliefs. The specific examples of Prospero’s magic and the plays’ island setting, common to both versions of The Tempest, contribute to each author’s overall purpose and help illuminate these fundamental ontological differences. As this paper asserts, the underlying variance is rooted in the rise of New Science during the seventeenth century, which created a change in widely held premodern ontological beliefs – beliefs that wove the supernatural and physical realities together in a participatory, sacramental ontology – to an ontological construct that privileged physical reality and separated the supernatural realm. Shakespeare’s and Dryden’s differing purposes for their versions of The Tempest are a reflection of the ontological shift. Not only are the magical objects and participatory storm sacramental within Shakespeare’s play, but they also contribute

to the sacramental purpose revealed by Prospero in the final scene. In contrast, Dryden's depiction of the scene largely removes this sacramental purpose. From this contrast, an understanding materializes that Shakespeare’s directly communicated purpose remains consistent with a premodern ontological framework, while Dryden’s insinuated purpose displays simple allegory that removes the nuance of Shakespeare’s language. Dryden’s fictional construction conveys meaning about the political realities of his time, but Shakespeare’s fictional framework, rooted in premodern sacramentality, participates in a larger reality of human experience contributing to its canonical status versus Dryden’s version.

Shakespeare's fictional framework and ontological belief may be conveniently located in Prospero's resolution of various plotlines in the final act of *The Tempest*. Specifically, Prospero reveals Shakespeare’s purpose in the final act and scene of the play when he addresses Ariel and rejects vengeance due to the penitence of others, a dialogue that Dryden includes but alters in his version. Dryden includes Shakespeare’s lines concerning a rejection of revenge but removes the sacramental rationale behind that decision. Prospero’s rejection of vengeance is articulated in both plays when Prospero says, ‘Yet with my nobler reason ’gainst my fury / Do I take part. The rarer action is / In virtue than in vengeance,’81 but the ontological shift and communicative differences that distinguish these plays is underscored when Prospero continues in Shakespeare’s version, ‘They being penitent, / The sole drift of my purpose doth extend / Not a frown further.’82 In these lines, Prospero goes beyond personal pursuit of virtue and avoidance of vengeance to participate in a higher restoration. By refraining from vengeance and declaring that his sole purpose is penitence, Prospero himself participates in restoration beyond his personal desires. This restoration is rooted in the Christian tradition’s narrative of restoration and redemption that

81 Shakespeare, V.i.27-28; Dryden, III.i.178-179
82 Shakespeare, V.i.28-30
requires a sacramental ontological construct. By so forthrightly stating this goal, Prospero reveals the purpose for his plot, and from here I suggest that Prospero, being an authorial and dramatic character so closely linked to the play's author, also reveals this sacramental construct as crucial to Shakespeare's thematics of the play.

The sacramental construct within Shakespeare’s play, as seen in Prospero’s sacramental objects and the depiction of the tempest, links the play to a larger narrative that crosses the line of fiction into primary reality. The sacramental Christian practices in premodern England and the ontological framework emanating from the central sacrament of the Eucharist presses into Prospero’s community of forgiveness in the original version of the play. This link or participation with the premodern sacramental ontology creates a reflection of and participation in the larger premodern narrative. Shakespeare’s consciousness of the sacramental thread within his play is irrelevant to its communicative power. Shakespeare’s Prospero individually moves from erring—as seen in his own confession of neglecting his Dukedom—to his personal redemption revealed in his restoration to Dukedom, in addition to forgiving those who trespassed against him. With this narrative, Prospero’s virtuous choice, coupled with Shakespeare’s added explanation of penitence, offers a conception of penitence different in Dryden’s adaptation. Moreover, as will be articulated, the stark difference between Antonio’s reactions within the two plays solidifies a clear dichotomy of forgiveness within Shakespeare’s and Dryden’s versions rooted in Reformation theology and political upheaval.

Shakespeare’s depiction of redemption for multiple characters is rooted in a community of forgiveness drawing from sacramental practices of confession and penance. Redemption and restoration within Shakespeare’s version emerge through interaction with sacramental objects and setting to direct the body and will of characters to acts of restitution. In contrast, Dryden’s
redemptive construct manipulates wills through supernatural acts that alter physical reality clearly revealed through Dryden’s portrayal of Antonio’s repentance. After being shipwrecked, Antonio, Alonso, and Gonzalo encounter allegorical spirits that confront Alonso and Antonio of their crime against Prospero, resulting in their repentance. At the beginning of the second act, Dryden presents an emotionally charged conversation between the three characters that addresses the primary crime of removing Prospero from his rightful position as duke and intending to murder him. Shortly into the scene, Alonso attributes their misfortunes to their crime by addressing Antonio’s question as to how they could have avoided their calamity: ‘Then, we should have helpt it, when though betrayedst thy Brother Prospero.’ Dryden’s Antonio quickly agrees and acknowledges his crime: ‘Indeed we first broke truce with Heave’n…I did usurp my Brother’s fertile lands, and now / Am cast upon this desert Isle.’ These confessions are immediately contextualized within the early modern understanding of interaction between the physical and supernatural when Gonzalo replies, ‘These, Sir, ’tis true were crimes of a black Dye, / But both of you have made amends to Heav’n.’ Gonzalo goes on to reference Antonio and Alonso’s crusades in defense of Christendom in Portugal, but Alonso highlights an economical construct of penance rooted in the tensions of Reformation theology. He challenges whether their good acts have balanced the account: ‘Must we teach Heaven what price to set on Murthers? / What rate on lawless power, and wild ambition? / Or dare we traffick with the Powers above, / And sell by weight a good deed for a bad?’ While Dryden’s Alonso seems to be referencing the premodern sacramental practice of repentance and penance for expiation of sin, his economic terminology shows the impact of the Reformation and the shift in ontological

83 Dryden, II.i.16-17
84 Dryden, II.i.21; 24-25
85 Dryden, II.i.26-27
86 Dryden, II.i. 33-36
construction. Reformation theology challenged the sacramental construct as superstitious, wherein physical acts earned supernatural merit instead of being participatory with each other. Alonso and Antonio show uncertainty in their positive acts to counterbalance their crime against Prospero.

Alonso’s declaration of uncertainty is immediately followed by Dryden’s inclusion of devils on the stage to openly confront Antonio and Alonso of their crimes. Two devils enter and begin addressing the root vice of ambition behind Antonio and Alonso’s crime. This is followed by Antonio crying out, ‘Do you hear, Sir, how they lay our Crimes before us?’ Antonio’s acknowledgement of his crime is not seen in Shakespeare’s version, and this difference indicates the manipulative nature of Dryden’s portrayal of the supernatural. The devils are supernatural beings appearing in the physical world to force the minds and wills of Antonio and Alonso to repentance. The devils introduce other devils named after specific vices attributed to Alonso and Antonio’s crime—Pride, Fraud, Rapine, and Murther. These physical representations of metaphysical realities within the minds and wills of Antonio and Alonso reinforce early modern’s reliance on symbol and manipulate through fear. When the devils leave the stage, Alonso says ‘they have left me all unmann’d; / I feel my sinews slacken’d with the fright, / And a cold sweat trills down o’re all my limbs, / As if I were dissolving into Water. / O Prospero! my crimes ‘gainst thee sit heavy on my heart.’ Antonio quickly concurs, ‘And mine, ‘gainst him.’ Within Dryden’s construct of the supernatural, Antonio and Alonso’s confessions are intellectual acts resulting from fear created by supernatural beings within the physical realm. Their wills are manipulated by the supernatural instead of being conformed—choice versus transformation. While the context of being marooned on the island influences their thoughts, it is

---

87 Dryden, II.i.56
88 Dryden, II.i.95-99
89 Dryden, II.i.100
the fear induced by the devils that causes them to repent fervently. This similarly follows Weber’s depiction of the Protestant concept of the ‘calling’ creating an economical exchange. According the Weber, Luther and other Reformation leaders emphasized the individual calling and response. Weber argues that this idea largely contributed to economic system of capitalism in subsequent centuries. Dryden’s economic terminology aforementioned in Alonso’s lines concerning the price for penance is consistent with Weber’s articulation of the Reformation’s impact on the exchange between the physical and spiritual—physical acts being a product of a metaphysical or intellectual response to a calling. Dryden’s Devils are consistent with the intellectual calling seen in the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in Protestantism. The Devils impress repentance in the mind producing actions later in the play consistent to ‘calling,’ mainly the restoration of Prospero’s Dukedom.

In contrast, Shakespeare’s Antonio never voices or indicates in any way that he is repentant for his crime against his brother. While Dryden’s Antonio shows remorse upon first being confronted with his crimes against his brother, Shakespeare portrays almost the opposite reaction. When Sebastian recollects how Antonio supplanted Prosper, Antonio replies, ‘True; / And look how well my garments sit upon me, / Much feater than before. My brothers servants / Were then my fellows, now they are my men.’ Antonio does not show remorse; in fact, he attempts to convince Sebastian to commit the same crime against his brother Alonso. Later, Ariel confronts Alonso and Antonio with their crimes against Prospero, but in a much different way than Dryden. While Dryden uses devils that were direct allegories to vices, Shakespeare uses Ariel’s music to confront the men. Upon hearing Ariel’s words, Alonso acknowledges his

---

90 Weber, p. 45
91 Shakespeare, II.i.269-272
92 Shakespeare, II.i.264-266 ‘O, that you bore / The mind that I do, what a sleep were this / For your advancement! Do you understand me?’
93 Shakespeare, III.iii.69-70 ‘that you…from Milan did supplant good Prospero’
guilt: ‘The winds did sing it to me; and the thunder, / That dep and dreadful organ-pipe, pronounced / The name of Prospero: it did bass my trespass. / Therefore my son i’ th’ ooze is beeeded.’\textsuperscript{94} Alonso acknowledges his crime and assumes he is being punished. In contrast, Antonio responds to Ariel’s words with defiance by offering to be Sebastian’s second when Sebastian declares he will ‘fight their legions.’\textsuperscript{95} Shakespeare’s construct of the tempest, the shipwreck, and the justice served is far less direct than Dryden. Dryden immediately makes the connection between the shipwreck and Alonso and Antonio’s crime against Prospero. Shakespeare’s tale creates a process of revelation for those who committed the crime. While the audience understands that Prospero is seeking justice, Antonio and Alonso do not fully understand the connection of their calamity with their crime until Ariel sings. This delay creates process of repentance, penance, and transformation rooted in premodern theology that emphasizes transformation of the mind and body rather than the mind only. The physical tempest and subsequent shipwreck cultivates a context wherein Antonio and Alonso may acknowledge guilt, later repent, and make restitution or penance resulting in both physical and spiritual transformation. From the onset, Antonio shows an obstinance toward repentance, revealing a truer reality of the human spirit and will. While he is confronted with his crime just like Alonso, their wills choose two very different paths. Alonso’s will begins to conform to virtuous actions with his acknowledgement of guilt, but Antonio exercises the ability to choose vice over virtue. Within this construct, Shakespeare reveals a more realistic examination of human experience than the manipulation seen in Dryden’s supernaturally induced fear through the devils. Shakespeare’s drama shows that even when confronted with the supernatural reality intertwined within the physical reality, individuals still have the ability to choose the path leading away from

\textsuperscript{94} Shakespeare, III.iii.97-100
\textsuperscript{95} Shakespeare, III.iii.103 also Antonio in line 104
restoration. This difference allows Shakespeare’s play to transcend the mere satirical qualities of Dryden’s to engage in the larger narrative of humanity’s need of redemption.

The larger narrative revolving around Shakespeare’s overall purpose of penitence is seen in Prospero’s change from act three to the final act. Between Ariel’s confrontation of Alonso and Antonio and their response, Prospero speaks to Ariel and summarizes his position at this point in the play: ‘My high charms work, / And these, mine enemies, are all nit up / In their distractions. They now are in my power.’

At this point Prospero has both the physical and moral upper hand—Antonio and Alonso’s physical lives are in his hands and the weight of their crimes has been thrust upon them. Yet, Shakespeare’s inclusion of the lines revealing his purpose shows penitence in Prospero’s own will. The end of act three does not display any intent to relinquish his power over them, but in act five, he declares he will not extend his power any further. While Antonio has not shown repentance, Prospero will not manipulate with further supernatural acts. To do so would place him within the clutches of vengeance, stooping him to Antonio’s level. Indeed, these lines missing within Dryden’s version show that Prospero has traveled the path of penitence wherein his mind and will have conformed to virtue. He has acknowledged his primary vice of loving his books too much, he has walked the path of repentance, and he has resisted committing revenge. Had Antonio repented, Prospero’s denial of revenge would not have been so strongly displayed. Prospero’s virtue not only shines within the tale, but it participates within a larger narrative of grace and redemption.

Shakespeare’s authorial logic to exclude repentance from Antonio’s character has been widely speculated by multiple scholars. For example, Stephen Orgel observes that Shakespeare could have portrayed a moment of repentance for Antonio as a result of all the supernatural acts, but as shown above, he fails to do this. However, Orgel proposes a political explanation based in

---

96 Shakespeare, III.iii.88-90
Prospero’s directed energy toward Alonso and the attained power through the union of Miranda and Ferdinand, which is a conventional New Historicist approach to explaining this absence in the play, and one typical of the critical discussions that have come to dominate *The Tempest*.\(^{97}\) While this reading has its merits, this moment may also be justified via a religious reading that examines Shakespeare’s Antonio through a sacramental ontological lens. Such a reading opens new possibilities of communicative power within the play that transcend the political climate surrounding the play. Foundational to this reading is the assertion that Shakespeare’s construct of Antonio’s lack of penitence stems from a participation in and is derived from the larger narrative of fallen man and redemptive grace within the Christian tradition—a redemption that restores but not to the original purpose.\(^{98}\)

Dryden’s play does not deny the supernatural; however, it occupies what Charles Taylor describes as the middle space between belief and unbelief carved from the pressures of modernity. Taylor articulates this middle space by discussing Romantic art in the seventeenth century rooted in Fredrich Schiller’s introduction of ‘play’ that attempts to forge a space for the supernatural longing amidst modernity’s glorification of physical reality. Taylor summarizes Schiller by saying, ‘in beauty, form and content, will and desire, come of themselves together, indeed they merge inseparably…Schiller sees the state of aesthetic unity as a higher stage, beyond moralism.’\(^{99}\) In other words, art or beauty is the link between the unbelief in the

---


\(^{98}\) See Tolkien’s *Silmarillion* (1977) creation mythology where the rebellious angel, Melkor, creates dissonance in the music used to create the world: ‘But as the theme progressed, it came into the heart of Melkor to interweave matters of his own imagining that were not in accord with the them of Iluvator; for he sought therin to increase the power and glory of the part assigned to himself.’ Tolkien depicts how Iluvatar or God, continued to weave the melody to include Melkor’s dissonance. In other words, the melody was not originally intended but Iluvatar redeemed the dissonance by including it within the creation melody. p. 4

\(^{99}\) Taylor, Charles, p. 358; for more on Schiller, see R.G. Collingwood’s *The Idea of History* (OUP 1946) pp. 104-106
supernatural as seen in modernity’s trust in the empirical and the belief revealed in human longing for the supernatural. Taylor goes on to describe a kind of undefined spirituality experienced at a musical concert wherein the audience’s empirical experiences seem to collectively participate in something transcendent. The religious or spiritual experience at the concert occupies the middle space where art becomes a kind of symbol for the supernatural. Taylor asserts that the loss of premodern language as a result of modernity’s buffered individual creates a vacuum wherein a connection to transcendence is attempted through art. While Taylor’s assertions are directed centuries after Dryden’s play, they are relevant because modernity’s adolescence in the late seventeenth century already reveals the conflict that creates Taylor’s middle space. Dryden’s use of symbol and direct allegory to make a connection with the supernatural reflects a desire to encounter the transcendent while remaining firmly rooted within the physical reality. The supernatural infiltrates and manipulates physical reality instead of participating in a common or shared reality of redemption or restoration.

Further, Max Weber’s depiction of Puritan ideals shows how the gap—Taylor’s middle space—between the supernatural and the physical took shape. First, Weber articulates the isolation found within Puritanism’s antisacramentality by asserting the lack of community found outside sacramental worship. Instead of expressing faith through communal ceremonies, he observes that Protestants believed in a private, intellectual choice to fulfill the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith. Faith is expressed in the mind; therefore, saving faith is a nonphysical act performed in isolation. This isolation causes tension within the individual as it does not provide tangible evidence or certainty of grace. As a result, actions demonstrating the private act of faith are required. Weber writes:

---

100 Taylor, Charles p. 360
101 Weber, p. 52
The community of the elect with their God could only take place and be perceptible to them in that God worked (operatur) through them and that they were conscious of it. That is, their action originated from the faith caused by God’s grace, and this faith in turn justified itself by the quality of the action…The religious believer can make himself sure of his state of grace either in that he feels himself to be the vessel of the Holy Spirit or the toll of the divine will…faith had to be proved by its objective results.  

Weber reveals the uncertainty of grace in his articulation of the ‘quality of the action’ that justifies or proves the faith. How can Protestants know for certain that their actions are of a particular quality to indicate a saving faith? In addition to this tension lies a deeper fundamental belief that influences modernity and is seen in Dryden’s construct of repentance. Deeper than the quality of the action is the function the action takes within the Protestant ethic; the actions proving faith are not participatory but a product. The reciprocating, woven tapestry of physical and supernatural reality seen in sacramental ontology is unraveled within radical Protestantism as highlighted by the English Puritans. In place of sacramental ontology, the Puritans, who greatly influenced the formation of English identity at the dawn of modernity, turned reality into a mathematical formula wherein supernatural, metaphysical sums produced or equaled certain physical responses. The hypocritical practices of the Roman Catholic Church to which the Reformation responded were seen as the reverse process where physical action produces supernatural results. The physical action producing spiritual results was seen as a kind of superstition or magician’s trick for gaining salvation. The Puritans saw this as a violation of Scripture and scrupulously removed all form of ceremony that hinted at a physical response to

---

102 Weber, p. 57; for more on the ‘iron cage’ that Weber proposes at the end of his work culminating the quality of work to the paradox of the Protestant ideal, see Marshal Berman’s All that is Solid Melts into Air (Simon & Schuster 1982) p. 27-28.
gain spiritual favor. Weber emphasizes this point by saying, ‘The genuine Puritan even rejected all signs of religious ceremony at the grave and buried his nearest and dearest without song or ritual in order that no superstition, no trust in the effects of magical and sacramental forces on salvation, should creep in.’\textsuperscript{103} The more mathematical approach to physical and supernatural interactions greatly influenced the rise of modernity, and Taylor’s middle space takes shape between the two separated realities.

While the Puritans did not advocate for a secular society, their formulaic construct dividing the physical and supernatural paved a path for a mathematical or symbolic approach that might be seen as influencing many portions of English society outside church walls and infiltrating theatrical stages. Dryden’s portrayal of the supernatural and physical realities reflects the formulaic Puritan construct of the two realities. This is most clearly seen when the devils influence Antonio and Alonso’s repentance in the first scene of act two in Dryden’s \textit{Tempest}, in which spiritual beings influence an intellectual conclusion, resulting in a physical restoration of Dukedom. Dryden’s mathematical construct does not reflect a love for Puritanism—indeed, after the Restoration, Dryden was a staunch Royalist and reminded so until his death—but it reveals that the products of the Reformation extended beyond radical Protestantism.\textsuperscript{104} The very rationale that Puritans used to defend their foundational belief in salvation by grace through faith alone was the same justification used by modernity to separate the spiritual from the physical. A side affect of modernity’s movement to purely physical explanations within New Science was that language also became formulaic and mathematical. The communicative power of tales was reduced to symbol; therefore, Dryden’s text, more closely following modernity’s wave of new science, is limited to its own time and space. The symbolic meaning of Prospero’s fall and

\textsuperscript{103} Weber, p. 53  
\textsuperscript{104} See James Andersen Winn’s, \textit{John Dryden and His World}
restoration is not participatory in a larger reality of redemption and restoration, but a reflection of the political tensions caused by the English Civil War and the subsequent Restoration Period. In other words, Dryden’s play reflects the restoration of his contemporary context from a Royalist perspective that fails to connect with a larger restoration of humanity. In contrast, Shakespeare’s *Tempest*, like most of his literary work, refuses to explicitly identify itself with contemporary political events, which is a key reason it transcends his own time and space through the sacramental construct wherein its narrative power participates in a higher or transcendent reality.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

While the notion of Shakespeare's 'transcendence' has long fallen out of fashion after the academic turn to historicism, the ontological contexts of his work's creation may be fruitfully recovered in a way that offers this notion a new, and arguably necessary, currency. J. R. R. Tolkien articulates a modern longing for the transcendent, as well as modern science’s failure to satisfy that longing. Within his defense of the power of fantasy in ‘On Fairy Stories,’ Tolkien challenges the modern justification of mythology as an explanation of the physical. Modern theories of mythology claim that mythological creatures such as dragons represented prehistoric creatures, but Tolkien articulates his childhood irritation at being told dragons were symbolic of a prehistoric beings, concluding:

I was eager to study Nature…but I did not want to quibbled into Science and cheated out of Faerie by people who seemed to assume that by some kind of original sin I should prefer fairy-tales, but according to some kind of new religion I ought to be induced to like science. Nature is no doubt a life-study…but there is a part of man which is not ‘Nature,’ and which therefore is not obliged to study it, and is, in fact, wholly unsatisfied by it.105

Instead of joining the modern embrace of science, Tolkien proposed an alternative rooted in sacramental ontology wherein the physical points to, or, in sacramental terms, participates in a larger reality or narrative. To use the example of dragons, Tolkien would say the prehistoric beings were participating in the truer concept or archetype portrayed in the idea of dragons within narrative art. In other words, dragons do not represent prehistoric beings; instead,

105 Tolkien, ‘On Fairy Stories’ 394
according to Tolkien, prehistoric beings point to or participate in a reality represented more fully, but not completely, in dragons. This being so, both dragons and prehistoric beings participate in a higher reality. Similarly, for Tolkien, the enchantment of fictional narratives is their participation in a larger reality in which the physical world also participated. He writes, ‘the peculiar quality of this secondary world (if not all the details) are derived from Reality, or are flowing into it.’106 Within the conclusion to his discussion of fairy story, Tolkien coins the term *eucatastrophe*. Playing on the literal meaning of *catastrophe*—sudden turn—and the Latin *eu*—meaning good—Tolkien reveals the ‘good sudden turn.’ Tolkien argues that this concept is ‘a far-off gleam or echo of *evangelium* [transcendent reality] in the real world…The Gospel contains fairy-story or story of a larger kind which embraces all the essence of fairy-stories.’107 Tolkien’s depiction of a larger story is the transcendent reality that narratives create, particularly fantastical narratives. The supernatural elements within literary art do not point to or reflect physical reality; neither do physical elements symbolize spiritual realities. Both supernatural and physical representations in literary art participate in the essence of a larger reality.

Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* fundamentally participates in the fantastical or supernatural, and his construction more closely aligns with Tolkien’s vision for sacramental participation between the fictional narrative, the primary world, and a larger essence, reality, or narrative. Prospero’s sacramental objects, the tempest, and Antonio’s repentance all point to a larger reality or narrative than Shakespeare’s own historical context. In contrast, Dryden’s depiction of repentance directly reflects the political climate of the Restoration. Dryden’s portrayal of the enchanted isle is like the dragons representing prehistoric beings; his portrayal is symbolic of a
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106 Tolkien, ‘On Fairy Stories’ p. 386
107 Tolkien, p. 387
specific reality contained within his own time and space. This direct allegory cheapens the text or limits its interpretative function.

Hans Boersma explains the contrast in function for theological studies within premodern and modern ontological constructs, saying, ‘An intellectualist approach…implied that theology’s task was to grasp and overcome mystery…however, the purpose of theology was rather to enter into mystery’s hidden depths.’\textsuperscript{108} Boersma’s distinction in theology can also be applied to literary studies wherein modernity has asked, or rather required, literary scholars to overcome mystery. Both modern philology and modern literary criticism works to remove mystery and provide detailed explanation. The components and elements of narrative and linguistics have split and unraveled language to arrive at isolated and often empirically grounded truths. William Wordsworth famously wrote ‘we murder to dissect’\textsuperscript{109} to convey the romantic ideal of examining nature as a whole instead of focusing on one aspect at the expense of the larger reality. In modernity’s attempt to overcome mystery through disenchantment, I propose that literary scholarship is often guilty of reducing its scope to isolated and dissected components of larger realities. By examining Shakespeare’s and Dryden’s versions of \textit{The Tempest}, I propose that literary scholarship can be re-enchanted and criticism avoid Wordsworth’s accusation of murder by dissection through a return to mystery. Viewing texts as intrinsically mysterious and empirically unexplainable allows their message to transcend the texts’ time and space and speak to the human experience of all generations and cultures due to the shared human narrative.

\textsuperscript{108} Boersma, Hans. \textit{Nouvelle Théologie and Sacramental Ontology} (Oxford 2009) p. 5 The intellectual approach was shaped by modernity while premodern, sacramental ontology shaped theological studies that embraced mystery.

\textsuperscript{109} Wordsworth, William ‘The Tables Turned’; also see John Keats’s ‘To a Nightingale’; to examine realism’s despair concerning empirically defined reality see Thomas Hardy’s Jude the Obscure (1895); to examine modernism’s distrust in purely scientific explanations of reality see Ford Maddox Ford’s \textit{The Good Soldier} (1915), James Joyce’s \textit{Ulysses} (1922), T.S. Eliot’s \textit{The Waste Land} (1922), and W.B. Yeats’s poetry.
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