



EDITED BY
INA HABERMANN AND
MICHELLE WITEN

Shakespeare and Space

*Theatrical Explorations
of the Spatial Paradigm*

palgrave shakespeare studies

General Editors: Michael Dobson and Dymna Callaghan



Palgrave Shakespeare Studies

Series editors:

Michael Dobson
The Shakespeare Institute,
University of Birmingham,
Stratford-upon-Avon, United Kingdom

Dympna Callaghan
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York, USA

Palgrave Shakespeare Studies takes Shakespeare as its focus but strives to understand the significance of his oeuvre in relation to his contemporaries, subsequent writers and historical and political contexts. By extending the scope of Shakespeare and English Renaissance Studies the series will open up the field to examinations of previously neglected aspects or sources in the period's art and thought. Titles in the Palgrave Shakespeare Studies series seek to understand anew both where the literary achievements of the English Renaissance came from and where they have brought us. Co-founded by Gail Kern Paster.

Editorial board members:

Margreta de Grazia

Peter Holland

Michael Neill

Lois D. Potter

David Jonathan Schalkwyk

More information about this series at

<http://www.springer.com/series/14658>

Editors
Ina Habermann • Michelle Witen

Shakespeare and Space

Theatrical Explorations of the Spatial Paradigm

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Ina Habermann • Michelle Witen
University of Basel
Basel
Switzerland

Palgrave Shakespeare Studies

ISBN 978-1-137-51834-7

ISBN 978-1-137-51835-4 (eBook)

DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-51835-4

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016935291

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2016

The author(s) has/have asserted their right(s) to be identified as the author(s) of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Design and Patents Act 1988.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Macmillan Publishers Ltd. London.

All plays are cited from W. Shakespeare (1997), *The Norton Shakespeare*, S. Greenblatt et al., New York: Norton unless otherwise indicated.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
	<i>Ina Habermann and Michelle Witen</i>	
Part I Shakespearean Spaces		
2	Shakespeare's Enclaves	17
	<i>Andreas Mahler</i>	
3	The Theatrical Topology of Tyranny in <i>Richard III</i>	39
	<i>Christina Wald</i>	
4	Thickets and Beaches: Evoking Place in the Stories of <i>King Lear</i>	59
	<i>Werner Brönnimann</i>	
5	'The Lady Shall Say Her Mind Freely': Shakespeare and the S/Pace of Blank Verse	79
	<i>Margaret Tudeau-Clayton</i>	
6	Hybrid Spaces in <i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>	103
	<i>Elisabeth Bronfen</i>	

7	The Sea in <i>Pericles</i> <i>Bernhard Klein</i>	121
Part II Migrating Shakespeare, Migrating Hamlet		
8	Universals in the Bush: The Case of <i>Hamlet</i> <i>Dominique Brancher</i>	143
9	The German Hamlet: Ghostly Encounters in the Space of the Stage and the Novel <i>Alexander Honold</i>	163
10	‘One Cannot Act Hamlet, One Must Be Hamlet’: The Acculturation of Hamlet in Russia <i>Thomas Grob</i>	191
11	<i>Hamlet’s</i> Mobility: The Reception of Shakespeare’s Tragedy in US American and Canadian Narrative Fiction <i>Gabriele Rippl</i>	229
12	Local Habitations: Hamlet at Helsingør, Juliet at Verona <i>Balz Engler</i>	257
	Index	269

NOTES ON THE CONTRIBUTORS

Dominique Brancher is Assistant Professor of Early French Literature at the University of Basel. Her principal areas of research are the relationship between literature and knowledge during the Renaissance period, representation and censorship, and the theory of passions. She has two forthcoming books: *Deshonestes pudeurs: Les équivoques d'une passion à la Renaissance* and *Quand l'esprit vient aux plantes: Botanique sensible et subversion libertine (XVI^e – XVII^e siècles)*.

Elisabeth Bronfen is Full Professor of English and American Studies at the University of Zürich. Her research interests are Anglo-American Literature and visual culture, psychoanalysis, gender studies as well as Shakespeare and his cultural effects in modern culture. Her recent publications include *Specters of War: Hollywood's Engagement with Military Conflict* (2013) and *Night Passages: Philosophy, Literature, Film* (2014).

Werner Brönnimann taught English and American Literature and Cultural Studies at the Universities of St Gallen and Basel until his retirement in 2013. He is a general editor of the *Englisch-deutsche Studienausgabe der Dramen Shakespeares* and is currently at work on his bilingual edition of *King Lear* in that series. Further research interests include ecological themes in literature, in particular the precarious nature of the human habitat.

Balz Engler is Professor Emeritus of English Literature at Basel University, Switzerland. He has published a critical edition of Shakespeare's *Othello*, which includes a German prose translation of the play. He has written books on the translation of Shakespeare, on the relationship between poetic texts and their modes of communicating, and on literature as performance and its cultural implications (*Poetry and Community*, 1990). He has edited eight collections of essays, among

them one on community drama, *Das Festspiel* (1988; co-edited with Georg Kreis), on *European English Studies: Contributions towards the History of a Discipline*, two volumes (2000, 2008; co-edited with Renate Haas), and on *Shifting the Scene: Shakespeare in European Culture* (2004; co-edited with Ladina Bezzola Lambert). His research interests now focus on Shakespeare as a cultural icon.

Thomas Grob is Professor of Slavic Literatures at the University of Basel. He is editing Ivan Bunin's prose in German, has co-edited the collection *Romantik und Geschichte* (2007) and is the author of *Daniil Charms' Unkindliche Kindlichkeit* (1994) as well as a book on Post-Romantic Russian Literature (two volumes, forthcoming). His research interests include Slavic (especially Russian and Polish) Romanticism and Avantgarde, Fantastic Literature, cultural narrativity and space(s), and contemporary literature, where he has published widely. He is currently working on a research project about (post)imperial narratives/narration in Slavic Literatures and co-edited the book, *Erzählte Mobilität im östlichen Europa* (2014).

Ina Habermann has been Professor of English at the University of Basel since 2007 and Director of the Centre of Competence *Cultural Topographies* since 2009. Her fields of research include early modern literature and drama with a focus on Shakespeare, 1930s and 1940s literature and film, cultural history and theory and spatial studies. She is the author of *Staging Slander and Gender in Early Modern England* (2003) and *Myth, Memory and the Middlebrow: Priestley, du Maurier and the Symbolic Form of Englishness* (2010).

Alexander Honold has been Professor of German Literature at the University of Basel since 2004. He has taught at the universities of Stanford, New York, Berlin, Freiburg and Constance, and as a literary critic, he regularly contributes to leading newspapers. His research interests include modernist literature, Romanticism, narratology, literary representations of intercultural relations, cultural forms of knowledge, the semantics of landscape, and the First World War. Book publications include *Hölderlins Kalender. Astronomie und Revolution um 1800* (2005), *Kilimandscharo. Die deutsche Geschichte eines afrikanischen Berges* (2011) and *Die Zeit schreiben. Jahreszeiten, Uhren und Kalender als Taktgeber der Literatur* (2013); edited collections include *Ins Fremde schreiben. Gegenwartsliteratur auf den Spuren historischer und fantastischer Entdeckungsreisen* (2009) and *Ost-westliche Kulturtransfers. Orient – Amerika* (2011).

Bernhard Klein is Professor of English at the University of Kent. His research focuses on early modern literature and culture, maritime studies, and travel writing. Select publications include *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern*

England and Ireland (2001), *Literature and Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain* (2001; co-edited with Andrew Gordon) and *Sea Changes: Historicizing the Ocean* (2004; co-edited with Gesa Mackenthun). He has most recently published a series of essays on Luís de Camões' *The Lusíads* and is currently co-editing 1 volume in the new 14-volume critical edition of Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*, forthcoming from Oxford University Press. He is also the general coordinator of the EU-funded Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctoral Programme TEEME—*Text and Event in Early Modern Europe* (2011–2018).

Andreas Mahler teaches English Literature and Literary Systematics at Freie Universität Berlin. Previously, he held posts in Intermediality Studies at Karl-Franzens-Universität in Graz, Austria, as well as in English Literature and Linguistics at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich. His research focuses on early and late 'modernity' as well as on theories of 'mediality', the literary, the comic, and the aesthetic. Recent publications include a co-authored book on the genre of comedy, a comparison of the storytelling in Flaubert and Joyce as well as a co-edited volume on the theory and history of a 'history of ideas'.

Gabriele Rippl is Professor and Chair of Literatures in English at the University of Berne. Her current research spans intermediality, ekphrasis in Anglophone Indian literature, and the construction of classical antiquity in twentieth and twenty-first-century Anglophone literatures. She is co-editor of *Anglia. Journal of English Philology*. Her publications include: *Beschreibungs-Kunst* (2005; authored); *Metzler Handbuch Kanon und Wertung* (2013; co-edited); *Towards a New Monumentalism? Cultural and Aesthetic Perspectives beyond Postmodernism* (special issue of *Anglia* 131/2+3, 2013; edited); *Haunted Narratives: Life Writing in an Age of Trauma* (2013; co-edited); *Handbook of Intermediality* (2015; edited); *Lebenstexte* (1998; authored); and *Imagescapes: Studies in Intermediality* (2010; co-edited).

Margaret Tudeau-Clayton is Professor of early modern English Literature at the University of Neuchâtel. With a BA and PhD in English Literature from King's College, Cambridge, she taught at the Universities of Geneva, Lausanne and Zürich before moving to Neuchâtel in 2006. She is author of *Jonson, Shakespeare and Early Modern Virgil* (1998; reprinted as pbk 2006) as well as numerous articles and chapters on English Renaissance literature, especially on translation and on Shakespeare, although she has also written on Virginia Woolf. She has co-edited three collections of essays: with Martin Warner, *Addressing Frank Kermode* (1991); with Philippa Berry, *Textures of Renaissance Knowledge* (2003); and with Willy Maley, *This England, That Shakespeare* (2010). She is currently working on a monograph entitled *Shakespeare's Englishes*.

Christina Wald is Professor of English Literature and Literary Theory at the University of Constance. She has taught at the universities of Cologne Augsburg, at Harvard University and at Humboldt-University Berlin. Her research interests span contemporary drama, early modern drama and prose fiction, TV series, film and adaptation studies, psychoanalysis, gender and postcolonial studies. She is the author of *Hysteria, Trauma, and Melancholia: Performative Maladies in Contemporary Anglophone Drama* (2007), *The Reformation of Romance: The Eucharist, Disguise and Foreign Fashion in Early Modern Prose Fiction* (2014) and co-editor of several essay collections and textbooks, including *The Literature of Melancholia* (2011) and *English and American Studies: Theory and Practice* (2012). She is editor of the *Journal of Contemporary Drama in English* (JCDE) and a member of the executive board of the German Shakespeare Society.

Michelle Witen is a Postdoctoral Teaching and Research Fellow at the University of Basel, where she is working on a habilitation dealing with nineteenth-century newspapers and poetry. Her research interests include Modernist incorporation of musical structure, particularly in James Joyce's works, serialized fiction, and nineteenth-century vices and laws. She has published with *Genetic Joyce Studies*, *Variations*, *European Joyce Studies*, and *Time Present*; her forthcoming publications include an edited volume *Modernism and Wonderland* (2016), a chapter on Eliot and Music in *The Edinburgh Companion to T.S. Eliot and the Other Arts* (2015), and her monograph, *James Joyce's Absolute Music*, is in manuscript.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AC</i>	<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>
<i>AYL</i>	<i>As You Like It</i>
<i>1H4</i>	<i>Henry IV Part One</i>
<i>H5</i>	<i>Henry V</i>
<i>Ham</i>	<i>Hamlet</i>
<i>JC</i>	<i>Julius Caesar</i>
<i>KL</i>	<i>King Lear</i>
<i>MA</i>	<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i>
<i>Per</i>	<i>Pericles</i>
<i>R3</i>	<i>Richard III</i>
<i>Tem</i>	<i>Tempest</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Taming of the Shrew</i>

LIST OF FIGURES, ILLUSTRATIONS AND APPENDIX

List of figures, Illustrations

2.1	Plot system of <i>As You Like It</i>	22
2.2	Topos, heterotopos and utopos	24
5.1	'Temperantia' in Henry Peacham, <i>Minerva Britannia</i>	88
5.1	Thomas Digges, <i>A prognostication</i>	92

Appendix

	'Blank Verse': A Timeline	98
--	---------------------------	----

Introduction

Ina Habermann and Michelle Witen

1 THINKING SPATIALLY IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM

‘Can this cock-pit hold/ the vasty fields of France?’ (*H5*, Prologue 11–12). The answer to this rhetorical question, famously asked by the Chorus in Shakespeare’s *Henry V*, is of course ‘Yes, it can!’ In very general terms, the issue in this quotation, as in our book, is the theatre’s ability to represent and to produce space. More precisely, this collection is about Shakespeare and space: about early modern theatre as an ‘ostentatiously spatial art-form’ (West 2002, 3), the Elizabethan and Jacobean playhouse, theatrical representations of place (both contemporary and historical) and social space, the dramatic representation of early modern geographies, and the migrations of Shakespeare, the configurations of Shakespeare’s reception in later times and distant places.

Ever since Aristotle, critics have acknowledged the importance of spatial representation in drama and theatre. As regards the early modern theatre specifically, Henry S. Turner sees it as a spatial art that developed in tandem with other contemporary developments in technology such as mapping. He distinguishes between the ‘arts of spatial *structure* (carpentry,

I. Habermann (✉) • M. Witen
University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland
e-mail: ina.habermann@unibas.ch; michelle.witen@unibas.ch

masonry, fortification, architecture), the arts of spatial *movement* (navigation, ballistics, hydraulics), and the arts of spatial *representation* (surveying, mapping, painting, sculpture)' (Turner 2006, 25–6). For Turner, the theatre 'encompassed all three aspects of the spatial arts, and for this reason it formed the ideal site for a convergence between the techniques of the carpenter, the surveyor, the engineer, and the playwright' (26). He introduces the term 'topographeses' to denote the 'representation of place by texts of all kinds but also by maps, diagrams, paintings, or images, and even by built structures' (30). Due to the complexity of spatial representation, the main issue is not the mimetic representation of place, but in the

'topographic' play, the fundamental images, symbols, 'ideologemes' (in Althusserian terminology), 'philosophemes' (that of Derrida), 'myths' (that of Barthes), or discursive 'statements' (that of Foucault) that characterized early-modern culture more broadly are articulated through the representation of place and become the primary way in which concrete places themselves emerge into representation. At this level of analysis, places become the vehicles through which problems of social class, political identity and belonging, status aspirations, modes of production and value, competing epistemologies about the social and political world, or attitudes towards urban order and urban experience can be scrutinized and dissected. (32–3)

Endorsing Turner's sophisticated analysis of the 'topographic' play, we want to add topology as another analytical term, originally drawn from qualitative geometry. While the concept was only developed in the nineteenth century, we believe it to be helpful for a characterization of the early modern stage.

Topology as a concept focuses on relational space, on continuity and connectivity. To give an example, the London tube map is a topological map, which shows the different lines and their points of connection, with only the most schematic reference to the actual geographical space, let alone the topography, of the city. Geometric shapes are seen as topologically equivalent, or homeomorphous, when they can be transformed into each other without cutting or gluing. Such topological structures can also have multiple dimensions, thus lending themselves to a description of complex phenomena.¹ We suggest that the early modern stage can be seen as a topological 'node', an interface linking different times and spaces in a

¹For a more extended discussion of the concept see 'Shakespeare's Topology of Shipwrecking' (Habermann 2012).

multidimensional theatrical experience. Thinking in terms of topology, we do not, for example, have to determine, in response to certain seemingly contradictory clues in the play, whether Shakespeare's *Tempest* is set in the Mediterranean or in the 'New World', but we can try to relate to the ways in which Mediterranean, Atlantic and mythic references blend in the minds of Londoners around 1600 to form a complex imaginary whole. We can analyse how, in Shakespeare's 'spatial art', places and people, both real and imaginary, as well as worlds with multiple cultural and historical resonances become linked with early modern London audiences, and, via cultural tradition, with us. In this way, many elements which might otherwise be conceived as incongruous become integrated in a spatial logic which has the flexibility, the complexity, and visceral persuasiveness of metaphor.

Even though the importance of space for the theatre has long been acknowledged, the 'spatial turn' in the latter part of the twentieth century with its concomitant extension of the notion of space has made it necessary to revisit it in a study of the theatre. In order to prevent the concept from becoming too fuzzy to be heuristically useful, we propose a taxonomy of spatial definitions, exemplifying their respective uses and connections in individual essays and thus showing how productive the spatial paradigm continues to be for the study of Shakespeare's work. We hope that in this way, the collection can also serve as an introduction to the study of Shakespeare and space, a brief overview of the field so far, and an inspiration for further work along similar lines. Taking our cue from contemporary spatial theory, we conceive of space as political and relational, seeing it as a 'sphere of the possibility of contemporaneous plurality' (Massey 2005, 9).

2 SEVEN TYPES OF SPACE

We suggest that in the study of Shakespeare's drama it makes sense, for analytical purposes, to distinguish between seven types of space: (1) structural/topological space, (2) stage space/setting/locality, (3) linguistic/poetic space, (4) social/gendered space, (5) early modern geographies, (6) cultural spaces/contact zones, and (7) the material world/cultural imaginary. There is of course overlap between these different aspects, and while a differentiation is analytically helpful, it needs to be supplemented by an awareness of the whole spectrum.

1. Structural/Topological Space Yuri Lotman famously used the concept of topology in his spatial semiotics, focusing on the typological analysis of literary works. As he argues, spaces are demarcated by boundaries, whose crossing constitutes an event within the story (Lotman 1974; Lotman 1990).² This conception of topological space is valid, though somewhat static, in line with the structuralist preoccupation with binary oppositions. Beyond this, Michel Serres drew attention to the importance of in-between spaces that express the dynamic aspect of topology, particularly in mythical discourse. Myth, and the literature which grew out of mythical discourse, should therefore be read in terms of its spatial constellations, connections and transformations (Serres 1977, 39). With regard to Shakespeare and drama, this aspect of space is thus concerned both with structural patterns in the plays themselves and with the ways in which these patterns are transferred onto the stage. At one level, this is an issue of ‘practical epistemologies’, as Henry Turner puts it with recourse to an etymological inquiry into the word ‘plot’: ‘During the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the term ‘plot’ [...] derived from the field of geometry as it developed in a practical context, where they designated the schematic diagrams or working drawings used by the mason, surveyor, or carpenter’ (Turner 2006, 21). The term is also used for the stage ‘as an extension of this artisanal use’ (21). The question is therefore which elements the *playwright* joins together and how (a connection acknowledged in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* in the theatrical activities of the ‘rude mechanicals’), what is represented, and what remains ob-scene. We argue that because of this emphasis on forging links, the early modern stage, most prominently that of public theatres such as the Globe, is particularly suited to topological analysis.

This also touches the question of what is genuinely dramatic in theatre as a spatial art. In his influential theory of language, Karl Bühler analysed various forms of *deixis*, paying particular attention to what he calls ‘*Deixis am Phantasma*’ (Bühler 1982, 123), which denotes the linguistic means we have of placing something in front of the ‘mind’s eye’ of another person, or an audience. For Bühler, in epic and (narrative) film, audiences and readers project themselves into the action, while in drama, the things to be imagined are drawn *into* the space that the audience shares with the

² Benjamin Wihstutz also employs the notion of topology for an analysis of the theatre, defining it much more narrowly, however, than we do in this volume. Wihstutz focuses on the boundary between performance space and auditorium, which can be twisted and changed, but never removed completely (Wihstutz 2010, 10).

performers (392). Ultimately, this is the topo-logical explanation why ‘this cockpit’ can hold ‘the vasty fields of France’.

2. *Stage Space/Setting/Locality* This facet of space focuses on performance. Issues of interest here are the material space of the playhouse, the technical, social, economic and legal conditions of staging and the ways in which the theatre is embedded in its environment, in our case the urban space of London, and other institutions such as the court (De Sousa 2010; Dillon 2000, 2010, 2012; Fitzpatrick 2011; Gurr 1992; Hopkins 2007; Ichikawa 2013; Turner 2006). It also comprises setting and the ‘spatial semiosis’ (West 2002, 6) which determines how specific places and localities are evoked on stage.³ As Janette Dillon emphasizes, theatres are ‘real, physical spaces’, but also ‘places of “virtual reality”’, literally staging in material form fictions and fantasies which offer an audience vicarious experiences. Their relationship to the wider physical space that surrounds them is therefore both mediated and provisional’ (Dillon 2000, 7). This specific connection between the real and the virtual has led Michel Foucault to see the theatre as a heterotopia (Foucault 1986). Related to this, we argue that the theatre can be conceptualized as a ‘Thirdspace’ in the sense of Edward Soja (1996), who draws on the work of Henri Lefebvre and Foucault to describe a mode of spatial awareness, and embeddedness, that combines the ‘real’ and the ‘imagined’ to create a multi-dimensional conception of reality informing all social practice.

3. *Linguistic/Poetic Space* Though this facet of space has a material side to it, making us think about the ways in which the dramatic text actually occupies space on the page (Erne 2003, 2005), and aural space (intrinsically related to time) as part of the soundscape of drama (Bloom 2007; Folkert 2002), the characteristic we have chosen to foreground in this collection is somewhat metaphorical. The focus here is on blank verse, whose tolerance of irregularities and freedom from rhyme allow characters to express their meaning and their personality more freely. In his preface to *Paradise Lost*, John Milton has famously interpreted this linguistic room for manoeuvre as an ‘ancient liberty recovered to heroic poem from the troublesome and modern bondage of rhyming’ (Milton 1971, 39). In Shakespeare’s characteristic and innovative use of the form, this ‘spacious’

³For a discussion of theatre semiotics with helpful bibliographical references see West (2002, 5–8). See also Turner (2006).

verse form comes to accommodate lively social interaction and psychological development.

4. *Social/Gendered Space* One consequence of the ‘spatial turn’ has been the emphasis on a spatial conception of the social world as a set of relations. Space emerges as intrinsically political, as a product of cultural practices and (local and global) power relations (De Certeau 1984). In order to analyse social space, Henry Lefebvre has proposed the conceptual triad of ‘spatial practice’, ‘representations of space’ and ‘representational spaces’ (Lefebvre 1991, 33, 38–9), or in other words ‘the triad of the perceived, the conceived and the lived’ (39). The theatre dramatizes and displays spatial practice in Lefebvre’s sense, at the same time drawing attention to conceptualized space (related to the modes of production), and providing the ‘images and symbols’ (39) of representational space through which space is lived—a space that is also always gendered (Massey 1994). This aspect of our taxonomy foregrounds the fact that the early modern theatre is a social space, situated in an urban environment, and that it stages the production and negotiation of social space (De Sousa 2010; Dillon 2000; Schwarz 2011; Sullivan 1998; Yachnin 2013).

5. *Early Modern Geographies* The exploration of the playwright’s geographic imagination is central to this aspect of Shakespeare and space. In his seminal book *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*, John Gillies calls for a ‘poetics of Renaissance geography’ (Gillies 1994, 99) which could fruitfully be explored through an analysis of Shakespeare’s idea of the ‘exotic’, focused on the structural significance of such figures as Othello, the ‘extravagant and wheeling stranger/ Of here and everywhere’ (I.I.138–9). Gillies analyses the ‘paradox of a geography conscious of its novelty, confident of its superiority to the ancient geography, energetically generating a new poetry to make sense of its radically incongruous world-image, yet still enthralled to the imagery of the past’ (188). Taking their cue from Gillies as well as from Richard Helgerson’s *Forms of Nationhood* (Helgerson 1992), critics have been concerned with the dialogue between literature and early modern techniques of cartography and chorography (Gordon and Klein 2001; Klein 2001; Matei-Chesnoiu 2009, 2012; Mulready 2013; Sanders 2011). In this context, again, we argue that a topological approach will improve our understanding of the ways in which different historical times are amalgamated on Shakespeare’s stage. In her recent study on spatiality and drama, *Geoparsing Early Modern English Drama*, Monica Matei-Chesnoiu explains this amalgamation through the

topological notion of ‘telemesic’ space, from Greek *telos* (end, result) and *mesos* (middle, centre), which describes a ‘transmission of the sense of distant locations as if being in the middle of things’ (Matei-Chesnoiu 2015, 9). Spectators can visualize interconnected topological spaces *as if* they were in the middle of action, travelling along the continuous surface of a Moebius strip. ‘This non-Euclidian topological figure morphs from one side to the other as it progresses in space-time’, with ‘the dramatic twist [as] the key’ (9) to distant worlds and times.

In *The Tempest*, a play that has a particular ‘will to travel’ (Hulme and Sherman 2000, xiii), Shakespeare found another suggestive image for this topological complexity, which appears in an intriguing exchange between Antonio and Sebastian in Act II, right after Gonzalo’s geographically problematic equation of Tunis with the ancient Carthage. Antonio and Sebastian are teasing Gonzalo:

Antonio: What impossible matter will he make easy next?

Sebastian: I think he will carry this island home in his pocket, and give it his son for an apple.

Antonio: And sowing the kernels of it in the sea, bring forth more islands.

(*Tem* II.1.85–9)

In this surprising image, which recalls the mythic genealogy of the Greek Sporades, the island morphs into a small, three-dimensional object which can be carried in a pocket—like an apple, recalling a little globe—and back again, via a kind of spawning process, into an island. This is an apt visualization of theatrical topology, pertinent to an understanding of early modern geographies: the ‘impossible matter’ of morphing Carthage into Tunis, the Mediterranean into the New World, time into space, through the magic of the stage.

6. *Cultural Spaces/Contact Zones* This aspect of space focuses on cultural spaces (*Kulturräume* in German) as the areas where a more or less homogeneous culture can be found. These areas can be regions, nation states or larger entities, whose demarcations may differ with regard to issues of language, customs or religion. In any case, such demarcations are always highly political, contested and subject to change. Boundaries between such cultural entities are fuzzy, so that it makes sense to speak of contact zones where hybrid phenomena tend to be particularly conspicuous. Significantly, the definition of cultural spaces also includes the

traffic between them, and issues of migration. People travel and migrate, but importantly, in the present context, texts, ideas and stories migrate with them. Therefore, to conceive of Shakespeare's impact on other cultures in terms of the negotiation of cultural spaces, rather than within the paradigms of translation studies, comparative literature and the study of 'influence', enables a more precise understanding of the cultural work that Shakespeare's plays have done. As Stephen Greenblatt observes, Shakespeare 'clearly preferred picking something up ready-made and moving it into his own sphere, as if the phenomenon of mobility itself gave him pleasure. And he never hinted that the mobility would now have to stop: on the contrary, he seems to have deliberately opened his plays to the possibility of ceaseless change' (Greenblatt 2010, 76–7). It is this mobility, or, in Hulme and Sherman's words quoted above, the 'will to travel', which can help to answer why Shakespeare is one of the most important authors of world literature and how he has become all things to (many, if not) all people.⁴

7. Material World/Cultural Imaginary This aspect of space foregrounds the ways in which literature as a fictional form of worlding contributes to shaping our perception of the material world—issues which have recently been investigated in literary geography, geocriticism and explorations of literary tourism (Piatti 2008; Tally 2011, 2014; Watson 2006). This includes famous phenomena such as William Wordsworth's Lake District or Thomas Hardy's Wessex. It also includes Shakespeare's Stratford, a small English provincial town whose layout, character and economy are inextricably connected with its most famous son as well as places which Shakespeare chose as setting and which are now trying to live up to this legacy, not least for economic reasons, in order to gratify literary tourists. These tourists make their pilgrimages in search of an authenticity they believe to be invested in actual places in the material world, inspired by a desire to touch the very ground that their favourite characters (could have) walked on. We argue that such journeys are in fact expeditions in 'Thirdspace', but that it makes little sense to 'deconstruct' such endeavours, since this oscillation is an intrinsic part of the cultural imaginary's impact on the material world.

⁴For a recent postcolonial study of Shakespearean appropriations see *Native Shakespeares* (Dionne and Kapadia 2008).

3 THIS VOLUME

The collection is divided into two parts: Part I, ‘Shakespearean Spaces’, explores representations and negotiations of space in Shakespeare’s work, mainly addressing the first five types of space as outlined above. Part II, ‘Migrating Shakespeare, Migrating *Hamlet*’, focuses mainly on cultural spaces and contact zones as well as the impact of the cultural imaginary on the material world (types six and seven). For this latter part, we have selected *Hamlet* as a case study, since no other play has had the same ‘theatrical mobility’. The uses of space in Part I have a clear trajectory: foregrounding the ways in which our readings are informed by theory, we move from a structural approach to issues of staging and thence to linguistic space as well as social and gendered spaces of exchange, with a final turn to geopolitics and early modern geography, in order to show the critical potential of a multi-layered notion of space.

The first two essays of Part I, Andreas Mahler’s ‘Shakespeare’s Enclaves’ and Christina Wald’s ‘The Theatrical Topology of Tyranny in *Richard III*’, use a topological approach, analysing the complexities of plot structure in *As You Like It*, *King Lear*, *Hamlet* (Mahler; type 1, 4) and *Richard III* (Wald; type 1, 2), emerging from a skillful deployment of political, theatrical and psychological space. Werner Brönnimann, in ‘Thickets and Beaches: Evoking Place in the Stories of *King Lear*’, focuses on the staging of space (type 2), showing how the evocation of place is undermined by a radical spatial indeterminacy in *King Lear* that is simultaneously linguistic, geographical and historical. With Margaret Tudeau-Clayton’s contribution “‘The Lady shall say her mind freely’: Shakespeare and the S/Pace of Blank Verse’, we move to a metaphorical use of space in dramatic language (types 3 and 4), particularly in *Hamlet*, as evidenced by an emphasis on the liberating (and gendered) potential of blank verse. Elisabeth Bronfen’s essay ‘Hybrid Spaces in *Antony and Cleopatra*’ focuses on gender, arguing that the theatrical blending between Cleopatra and Queen Elizabeth opens up a hybrid space which is both historical and mythical, including, and going beyond, a geopolitical dimension (types 4 and 5). This latter concern is followed up in Bernhard Klein’s essay, ‘The Sea in *Pericles*’, which addresses the staging of the eastern Mediterranean as a space of cultural resonance in early modern England, both encompassing and surpassing biblical/mythical associations to form an implied political and mercantile space that can be detected through setting, dialogue, and historical context (types 1 and 5).

Part II, which is concerned with migrations of Shakespeare, has a tight focus on *Hamlet*, Shakespeare's most globally resonant play. This part opens with Dominique Brancher's 'Universals in the Bush: The Case of *Hamlet*', which discusses *Hamlet*'s seeming universality in the light of anthropological, evolutionary, postcolonial and globalizing approaches, while considering the cultural spaces opened up by Shakespeare's impact on other cultures (type 6). These cultural spaces are then studied in detail in essays on the 'German Hamlet' (Alexander Honold), the 'Russian Hamlet' (Thomas Grob), and the 'North American Hamlet' (Gabriele Rippl). All three contributions aim at a comprehensive overview, and a detailed analysis of cultural negotiations of *Hamlet* in their respective cultures, showing impressively just how great the impact of the play, and particularly the character of 'the Dane' himself, has been on the theatrical, intellectual and political life of other nations. The volume closes with Balz Engler's essay, 'Local Habitations: Hamlet at Helsingør, Juliet at Verona', which discusses material traces of Shakespeare's cultural and economic impact (type 7), resulting from such spatial practices as literary pilgrimage and tourism.

4 UNDISCOVERED COUNTRIES

In her book *Supernatural Environments in Shakespeare's England*, Kristen Poole gives an outline of changes in the perception of space and the discovery of 'absolute space' in the early modern period (Poole 2011, 6–17; 8), making a case for a 're-enchantment of geography' (219) in response to an overly secular conception of space in the early modern period. This religious, or metaphysical dimension is relevant to our definition of social space and early modern geographies, since it is crucial to keep in mind that the scientific revolution had only just begun.

Poole asks: 'What, I wonder, would it feel like to inhabit this space, at once a metamorphic one that allowed for the regular incursions of the supernatural, and a geometric one that was stable and ordered?' (17). Hamlet would perhaps answer: 'Oh God, I could be bounded in a nutshell and count myself a king of infinite space, were it not that I have bad dreams' (*Ham* II.2.248–50). The 'bad dreams' are about the residue of the metaphysical geography of heaven, hell and purgatory, which undermines any confidence one might feel about the new mastery of the world. If the early modern stage is an interface, or a topological node, as we have argued, it also opens doors to these supernatural, uncanny spaces, and the

‘undiscovered country’ (III.1.81) of death. In the essays that follow, particularly in Part Two, we will trace Hamlet’s travels and explore the reasons for the play’s, and the character’s universal appeal.⁵ One reason for this may be that, by oscillating between the perception of confinement in a claustrophobic space (the ‘prison’ (II.2.239) of Denmark and the prince’s own troubled mind) and inklings of infinity, *Hamlet* circumscribes a space of cosmic proportions which insistently puts universality on the agenda. *Hamlet*’s travels thus often take the form of a quest for some Archimedean point from where to make sense of the infinite mutability of cultural exchange.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The editors would like to thank Ben Doyle and Tomas René from Palgrave for their support, Johanna Schüpbach and Sabina Horber for help with the manuscript, and Elisabeth Jenny-Stiftung (Riehen) for financial support.

WORKS CITED

- Bloom, G. 2007. *Voice in Motion. Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bühler, K. 1982. *Sprachtheorie*. Stuttgart: Fischer.
- De Certeau, M. 1984. “Spatial Stories”. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Sousa, G.U. 2010. *At Home in Shakespeare’s Tragedies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Dillon, J. 2000. *Theatre, Court and City, 1595–1610: Drama and Social Space in London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dillon, J. 2010. *The Language of Space in Court Performance, 1400–1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dillon, J. 2012. *Shakespeare and the Staging of English History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dionne, C., and P. Kapadia. 2008. *Native Shakespeares: Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Erne, L. 2003. *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erne, L. 2005. “Words in Space: The Reproduction of Texts and the Semiotics of the Page”. *SPELL. Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature* 17: 99–118.

⁵See also the edited essay collection *The Hamlet Zone*, for a wide-ranging overview of European adaptations and appropriations of *Hamlet* (Owen 2012).

- Fitzpatrick, T. 2011. *Playwright, Space and Place in Early Modern Performance: Shakespeare and Company*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Folkerth, W. 2002. *The Sound of Shakespeare*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. 1986. "Of Other Spaces". *Diacritics* 16(1): 22–7.
- Gillies, J. 1994. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, A., and B. Klein (eds.). 2001. *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenblatt, S. 2010. "Cultural Mobility: An Introduction". In *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto*, edited by S. Greenblatt et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gurr, A. 1992. *The Shakespearean Stage, 1574–1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermann, I. 2012. "'I shall have share in this most happy wreck': Shakespeare's Topology of Shipwrecking". *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 148: 55–72.
- Helgerson, R. 1992. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hopkins, D.J. 2007. *City/Stage/Globe: Performance and Space in Shakespeare's London*. London: Routledge.
- Hulme, P., and W.H. Sherman (eds.). 2000. *'The Tempest' and Its Travels*. London: Reaktion.
- Ichikawa, M. 2013. *The Shakespearean Stage Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, B. 2001. *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Translated by D. Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lotman, J. 1974. "Zur Metasprache typologischer Kulturbeschreibungen". In *Aufsätze zur Theorie und Methodologie der Literatur und Kultur*, edited by K. Eimermacher. Kronberg: Scriptor.
- Lotman, Y.M. 1990. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Translated by A. Shukman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Matei-Chesnoiu, M. 2009. *Early Modern Drama and the Eastern European Elsewhere*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Matei-Chesnoiu, M. 2012. *Re-Imagining Western European Geography in English Renaissance Drama*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Matei-Chesnoiu, M. 2015. *Geoparsing Early Modern English Drama*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Milton, J. 1971. *Paradise Lost*. Edited by A. Fowler. London: Longman.
- Mulready, C. 2013. *Romance on the Early Modern Stage: English Expansion Before and After Shakespeare*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Owen, R.J. (ed.). 2012. *The Hamlet Zone: Reworking Hamlet for European Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Piatti, B. 2008. *Die Geographie der Literatur. Schauplätze, Handlungsräume, Raumphantasien*. Göttingen: Wallstein.
- Poole, K. 2011. *Supernatural Environments in Shakespeare's England: Spaces of Demonism, Divinity and Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sanders, J. 2011. *The Cultural Geography of Early Modern Drama, 1620–1650*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwarz, K. 2011. *What You Will: Gender, Contract, and Shakespearean Social Space*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Serres, M. 1977. "Discours et Parcours". In *Identité: Séminaire interdisciplinaire dirigé par Claude Lévi-Strauss*, edited by J.-M. Benoist. Paris: Editions Grasset et Fasquelle.
- Soja, E. 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sullivan, G. 1998. *The Drama of Landscape: Land, Property and Social Relations on the Early Modern Stage*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Tally, R. 2011. *Geocritical Explorations: Space, Place, and Mapping in Literary and Cultural Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tally, R. (ed.). 2014. *Literary Cartographies. Spatiality, Representation, and Narrative*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Turner, H.S. 2006. *The English Renaissance Stage. Geometry, Politics, and the Practical Spatial Arts, 1580–1630*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watson, N.J. 2006. *The Literary Tourist. Readers and Places in Romantic & Victorian Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- West, R. 2002. *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage. From Shakespeare to Webster*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Wihstutz, B. 2010. "Einleitung". In *Politik des Raumes. Theater und Topologie*, edited by E. Fischer-Lichte and B. Wihstutz. Paderborn: Fink.
- Yachnin, P. 2013. "The Reformation of Space in Shakespeare's Playhouse". In *Making Space Public in Early Modern Europe: Performance, Geography, Privacy*, edited by A. Vanhaelen and J. Ward. London: Routledge.