EDITED BY LAURIE MAGUIRE

HOW TO DO THINGS WITH SHAKESPEARE

NEW APPROACHES, NEW ESSAYS

Blackwell
Publishing

How To Do Things with Shakespeare

New Approaches, New Essays

Edited by
Laurie Maguire

Blackwell
Publishing

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148–5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

First published 2008 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

1 2008

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

How to do things with Shakespeare: / new approaches, new essays / edited by Laurie Maguire.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4051-3526-9 (hardcover : alk. paper)—ISBN 978-1-4051-3527-6 (pbk. : alk. paper) 1. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616—Criticism and interpretation. 2. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616—Examinations—Study guides. 3. Criticism—Authorship. 4. Report writing. I. Maguire, Laurie E.

PR2976.H69 2007
822.3′3—dc22

2007003778

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 10.5 on 13 pt Galliard
by SNP Best-set Typesetter Ltd., Hong Kong
Printed and bound in Singapore
by C.O.S Pte Ltd

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy, and which has been manufactured from pulp processed using acid-free and elementary chlorine-free practices. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover board used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website at
www.blackwellpublishing.com

Contents

Notes on Contributors vii

Introduction 1
Laurie Maguire

Part I How To Do Things with Sources 5
Editor's Introduction 7
1 French Connections: The *Je-Ne-Sais-Quoi* in Montaigne and Shakespeare 11
Richard Scholar

2 Romancing the Greeks: *Cymbeline*'s Genres and Models 34
Tanya Pollard

3 How the Renaissance (Mis)Used Sources: The Art of Misquotation 54
Julie Maxwell

Part II How To Do Things with History 77
Editor's Introduction 79
4 *Henry VIII*, or *All is True*: Shakespeare's "Favorite" Play 82
Chris R. Kyle

5 Catholicism and Conversion in *Love's Labour's Lost* 101
Gillian Woods

Part III How To Do Things with Texts 131
Editor's Introduction 133
6 Watching as Reading: The Audience and Written Text in Shakespeare's Playhouse 136
Tiffany Stern

7 What Do Editors Do and Why Does It Matter? 160
Anthony B. Dawson

Part IV How To Do Things with Animals 181
Editor's Introduction 183
8 "The dog is himself": Humans, Animals, and Self-Control in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* 185
Erica Fudge

9 Sheepishness in *The Winter's Tale* 210
Paul Yachnin

Part V How To Do Things with Posterity 231
Editor's Introduction 233
10 Time and the Nature of Sequence in Shakespeare's *Sonnets*: "In sequent toil all forwards do contend" 236
Georgia Brown

11 Canons and Cultures: Is Shakespeare Universal? 255
A. E. B. Coldiron

12 "Freezing the Snowman": (How) Can We Do Performance Criticism? 280
Emma Smith

Index 298

Notes on Contributors

Georgia Brown works on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English literature. She is the author of *Redefining Elizabethan Literature* (2005) and has published numerous articles on Marlowe, Queen Elizabeth I, Renaissance translation, *Antony and Cleopatra*, Spenser, attitudes to war in ancient Greek literature, teaching Renaissance poetry, disgust in Marston's drama, and Ottoman representations of Constantinople. An essay on the monstrous in *Othello* and *Macbeth* is forthcoming at the end of 2007 and she is currently revising a book on Renaissance embroidery.

A. E. B. Coldiron, Associate Professor of English, Florida State University, specializes in late medieval and Renaissance literature, with publications on such authors as Chaucer, Christine de Pizan, Spenser, Du Bellay, Sidney, Donne, and Milton. In *Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles of Orleans: Found in Translation* (2000), she examines a fifteenth-century poet's trilingual oeuvre as a strong challenge to traditional literary periodization. In *Gender, Translation, and Print Poetics 1476–1558* (forthcoming), she studies early Tudor printers' and translators' complex, resistant appropriations of French discourses on gender. Her current inquiries are about how the cross-cultural traffic in early printed poetry affected the long-term development of English literary aesthetics.

Anthony B. Dawson is Professor of English (emeritus) at the University of British Columbia. He is the author of several books, including *Watching Shakespeare* (1988), *Hamlet* (in the *Shakespeare in*

Performance series), and *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare's England* (co-written with Paul Yachnin). The author of many articles on Elizabethan drama and on textual and performance theory and practice, he has as well edited Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* for the New Mermaids and *Troilus and Cressida* for the New Cambridge Shakespeare series. He is currently editing, with Gretchen Minton, *Timon of Athens* for Arden Shakespeare.

Erica Fudge is Reader in Literary and Cultural Studies at Middlesex University. She is the author of *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture* (2000), *Animal* (2002), and *Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality and Humanity in Early Modern England* (2006), editor of *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans and Other Wonderful Creatures* (2004), co-editor with Ruth Gilbert and Susan Wiseman of *At the Borders of the Human: Beasts, Bodies and Natural Philosophy in the Early Modern Period* (1999), and co-founder of the Animal Studies Group whose book, *Killing Animals*, was published in 2005. She has written for *The Times Higher Education Supplement* and *History Today*, and is Associate Editor for the Humanities of the journal *Society and Animals* and director of *The British Animal Studies Network*.

Chris R. Kyle is Associate Professor of History and the Humanities at Syracuse University, New York. He has edited *Parliament, Politics and Elections 1604–1648* (2001) and co-edited with Jason Peacey *Parliament at Work* (2002). The author of numerous articles on seventeenth-century political culture, he is currently finishing a monograph, *Theatre of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Modern England*. He is also co-directing an exhibition at the Folger Shakespeare Library on "Renaissance Journalism: The Invention of the English Newspaper," due to open in December 2008.

Laurie Maguire is a Fellow of Magdalen College and Reader in English at Oxford University. Her books include *Shakespearean Suspect Texts* (1996), *Studying Shakespeare* (2004), *Where There's a Will There's a Way* (2006), and *Shakespeare's Names* (2007). She has published widely on Renaissance drama, textual problems, performance, and women's studies.

Julie Maxwell is Fellow and Lecturer in English at Lucy Cavendish College, University of Cambridge. Her first book, *You Can Live*

Forever (2007), is a novel and is published by Jonathan Cape. She has written pieces for *Renaissance Quarterly*, *The Ben Jonson Journal*, *Notes and Queries*, *Areté*, and the forthcoming *Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*. She is currently working on a book about religion in the life and works of Ben Jonson.

Tanya Pollard is Associate Professor at Brooklyn College, City University of New York. Her publications include *Drugs and Theater in Early Modern England* (2005), *Shakespeare's Theater: A Sourcebook* (2003), and essays on early modern theater in *Shakespeare Studies*, *Renaissance Drama*, and various edited volumes. She is currently writing a book on the emergence of new literary genres in early modern England and their debts to the ancient world.

Richard Scholar is University Lecturer in French and a Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. His research focuses on the connections between early modern European literature and thought. He is the author of *The Je-Ne-Sais-Quoi in Early Modern Europe: Encounters with a Certain Something* (2005) and co-editor of *Thinking with Shakespeare: Comparative and Interdisciplinary Essays* (2007). He is currently writing a book on Montaigne and the art of free thinking.

Emma Smith is Fellow and Tutor in English at Hertford College, Oxford. She is the author of *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare* (2007), *Shakespeare in Production: King Henry V* (2002) and *Othello* (2005), as well as articles on Shakespeare and early modern theater. She is working on ideas of authorship and anonymity on the early modern stage, and on the intersections between film theory and Renaissance drama.

Tiffany Stern is the Beaverbrook and Bouverie Fellow and Tutor in English Literature at University College, Oxford. Her monographs are *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (2000) and *Making Shakespeare* (2004); with Simon Palfrey she co-authored *Shakespeare in Parts* (2007). She has edited the anonymous *King Leir* (2002) and Sheridan's *The Rivals* (2004), and is editing George Farquhar's *Recruiting Officer*, Brome's *Jovial Crew*, and Shakespeare's *Merry Wives*. She is a general editor of the New Mermaids play series, and is on the editorial board of the journals *Shakespeare*, *Shakespeare Bulletin*, *Shakespeare Yearbook*, and *Review of English Studies*. Her current

project is to complete a monograph, *The Fragmented Playtext in Shakespearean England*.

Gillian Woods is a Junior Research Fellow at Wadham College, Oxford. She teaches literature of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. She is currently working on a book-length study of Catholic semiotics in Shakespearean drama.

Paul Yachnin is Tomlinson Professor of Shakespeare Studies and Chair of the English Department at McGill University. He is co-director of the Shakespeare and Performance Research Team and director of the Making Publics project. Among his publications are *Stage-Wrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, and the Making of Theatrical Value* and (with Anthony Dawson) *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare's England*. He is an editor of the forthcoming Oxford *Works of Thomas Middleton*. Works-in-progress include editions of *Richard II* and *The Tempest*, and a book-length study, *Shakespeare and the Social Thing: Making Publics in the Renaissance Theatre*.

Introduction

Laurie Maguire

One of the first reactions to the exciting new field of feminist criticism was to point out that there are many kinds of feminism(s). Gilbert and Gubar's influential discussion of *Jane Eyre* (1979) didn't necessarily work for writing by women, for black women, for lesbians, for dramatic works, for language theorists, for French feminists, and so on. The field became subdivided and its various allegiances specifically nominated – French feminism, Anglo-American feminism etc.

The sheer vastness of Shakespeare studies in recent decades has meant that critical subdivision is essential (consequently one aligns oneself with an approach – textual, new historicist – rather than with the period or subject: Renaissance/Shakespeare). But sometimes the newly emergent *Companion* literature, in seeking to summarize each of these subdivisions, runs the risk of flattening critical diversity into a series of cultural positions which have been inadvertently reduced to a template.

In many ways this is inevitable: in seeking to grasp a new territory, students need an overview. In overviews it is not always possible to explore why textual specialists do not all agree that Shakespeare revised his plays, or prepared them for publication (for example); it is not possible to consider what is the next step for those who do, nor to chronicle how new orthodoxies come to prevail or what was wrong with the old. *How To Do Things with Shakespeare* stems from my sense that the publishing market is good at helping students identify and understand the current positions, but not so helpful in showing

them how to think ahead – or indeed, to think back to the questions, problems, omissions, and dissatisfactions which led us to our current critical positions.

All literary research (like research in general) is a reaction to something. This is as true of large critical movements (feminism as a desire from female academics to see their experiences reflected in the critical literature) as it is of individual articles which respond to a sense of unease (something is omitted in current literature, misrepresented, simplified), a discovery or a reposing of an old question (what is the evidence for the received wisdom that Shakespeare wasn't interested in publishing his plays? Didn't know Greek drama?), a disagreement with an opinion currently in print, a meandering reflection: What if I inverted the question? We see this most clearly in medicine where breakthroughs are made when researchers approach things from a different angle (not: "why do some people get cancer?" but "why doesn't everyone get cancer?"). Literary research is no different, although its preliminary questions may not be posed as starkly.

Our research questions tend to be implicit in the methodology of our subsequent published research. What I asked contributors to do in this volume was to foreground not their methodology but the questions that led them to their topic or essay in the first place. Essays on (for example) animals or Catholicism or the culture of quotation do not simply emerge like Minerva, fully formed. What led up to the essay? What caught the writer's attention which meant that s/he had to write this essay? What questions preceded the essay?

For each of the essays that follow I offer a short introduction explaining the critical needs that I had or perceived which led me to commission the topic of the essay and why I chose that particular contributor. The contributor then offers a short autobiographical introduction which sets the essay in the context of his or her interrogative thoughts, needs, and practices. Readers will judge for themselves how well or how differently the essays follow on from the questions which prompted them; often, research moves in an unanticipated direction. There are many ways to do things with Shakespeare. But when these contributors show us how to do things with the topics and questions with which they set out, they show us not what to think but how we might begin to think.

The idea is that we can then go on and do things like that (or not like that) ourselves.

Work Cited

Gilbert, Sandra and Gubar, Susan 1979: *The Madwoman in the Attic*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Part I

How To Do Things with Sources

Editor's Introduction

Just thirty years ago Philip Brockbank viewed source-study as one of the highest forms of Shakespeare scholarship; by the end of the twentieth century the esteem in which this activity was held had fallen irrecoverably and Stephen Greenblatt could declare that source-hunting is "the elephant's graveyard of literary history." Greenblatt's metaphor continues to encapsulate the dominant attitude. His image is regularly quoted approvingly (see Goldberg 1987: 243) and developed sympathetically; thus Jonathan Gil Harris (1994: 408) talks of "that tired terrain" of source-study; and in a recent online article Peter Bilton (2000: §1) extends Greenblatt's image: "The paths once worn by Shakespeare source-hunters are becoming faint and overgrown. They lead through footnote graveyards with dismissive headstones. Modern warning signs tell angels where not to tread." When scholars do investigate sources they now feel the need to position themselves carefully or defensively in relation to Greenblatt's metaphor. For example, in her survey of the field of romance as Shakespeare inherited it, Darlene Greenhalgh (2004) concludes with a defense of source studies as a form of what we now call intertextuality.

There was, certainly, something mechanical, linear, and often unimaginative about the methodology of the New Critics who collated Shakespeare texts with their sources. There was also something distorting: Boswell-Stone's edition of Shakespeare's Holinshed, for example, focuses on what Shakespeare used, not on the vast chunks he didn't. And there was textual prejudice, with the ideological traffic tending to move only one way: Shakespeare rewrites/adapts/improves his sources, but when others use Shakespeare as a source, their product is

inferior or derivative. In one of the most interesting essays of recent years – Stephen Miller's comparison of *The Taming of the Shrew* with its related version, *The Taming of a Shrew* (Q 1594) – Miller shows what we miss by concentrating only on what is most similar in the two texts (i.e., the areas where *A Shrew* runs closest to Shakespeare) and not on the areas of greatest divergence. His focus on the latter makes it clear that the writer of *A Shrew* had a coherent agenda in adapting Shakespeare's unconventional comedy and that his adaptation of his Shakespearean source makes him, in effect, a literary critic, the first Shakespeare critic. Miller's argument is a wonderful example of How To Do Things with Sources.

So, too, are the three essays which follow, all of which offer new and flexible ways of thinking about questions of influence. Richard Scholar is a comparative literature specialist (French/English), and his work is rooted in philosophy as much as it is in literature. Consequently, he was well positioned to realize that a verbal tic in Shakespeare – "I know not what" – was part of a continental philosophical current, the struggle to put indefinable emotional affinity (or antipathy) into words. His study of Shakespeare's most important humanist contemporary, the French essayist Michel de Montaigne (1533–92), looks at the way both writers respond to this intellectual Zeitgeist without one writer being demonstrably influenced by the other. Instead, he shows the influence this contemporary issue has on the language and ideas of *Merchant of Venice*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *Much Ado About Nothing*. Scholar's essay chronicles not the specific influence of one author on another, but the air that both breathed. (This is source-study as literal inspiration, from the Latin *inspirare*, to breathe in.) Because his essay is such a bracing example of comparative criticism, and because it shows us how to shed our preconceived approaches, it provides a critically supple starting point for both this volume and this section.

Tanya Pollard has degrees in both Classics and English, so she is doubly qualified to write about the twin subjects of classical influence and generic inheritance in Shakespeare. Genre is usually a problem for readers and critics alike. It is the first subject we encounter when we read a Shakespeare play: individual quarto volumes – and plays in performance – tell readers and audiences what genre of drama they are about to see or read. The Folio collection of Shakespeare's plays, prepared by his contemporaries and published in 1623, divides the canon into three generic categories (indeed, the volume is titled *Mr William*

Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, Tragedies). Modern editors add a fourth genre – romance – and all criticism acknowledges that Shakespeare, particularly the Jacobean Shakespeare, liked to mix genres. But criticism rarely moves beyond listing comic moments in tragic plays and vice versa. Surely there must be more to the subject than that?

When did genre first become a problem? Genre was presumably unproblematic in Greek festival drama where the nature of the festival told the audience what kind of play they were going to see. And because festivals were competitions for dramatists, the dramatist must have had a rough idea of the generic rules by which he was playing. How did we get from the Greeks to the Renaissance? This was the question which prompted me to seek out Tanya Pollard, as it seemed to me that they could best be addressed by an expert in both Classics and English. In "Romancing the Greeks" Pollard turns her critical acumen on Shakespeare's most generically mixed play, *Cymbeline*, and uses her classical knowledge to place it in context. Her essay not only offers new information about *Cymbeline* in relation to Greek romance, but redefines what used to be called source-study.

Redefinition is also Julie Maxwell's project in "The Art of Misquotation." In this essay she shows us not just How To Do Things with Biblical Quotations but, more important, How the *Renaissance* Did Things with Biblical Quotations. Maxwell's work in this area first came to my attention in her (forthcoming) book on Ben Jonson. Here, she inverts our paradigmatic assumption that an author is paying most attention to his source – in this case, the Bible – when he is reproducing it most accurately. This twenty-first-century attitude, with its high valuation of textual fidelity, views early modern authors as occupying a position somewhere between a photocopier (the original must be faithfully reproduced) and a modern academic (accurate reproduction of sources is essential). But our modern attitudes, Maxwell demonstrates, are the opposite of the Renaissance approach in which considerable artistic energy is expended on alteration – alteration which can look to us like misquotation. Maxwell's careful analysis of biblical sources and their Shakespearean variants uses conventional source-study identification and linguistic tallying for completely different artistic ends. Her essay has given me a new perspective on Renaissance authors because it shows me how they, in turn, approached the texts they read.

In fact Maxwell's essay, like those of Richard Scholar and Tanya Pollard, has much in common with recent studies in the new territory

of Renaissance reading: one thinks of the work of William Sherman, Heidi Hackel, and Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton. In these studies critics look at how Renaissance readers read. And Shakespeare was a reader before he was a writer. What the three essays below investigate is not so much what Shakespeare read, but *how* he did things with what he read.

Works Cited

Bilton, Peter 2000: "Another Island, Another Story: A Source for Shakespeare's *The Tempest*." *Renaissance Forum* 5/1. www.hull.ac.uk/renforum/v5no1/bilton.htm.

Goldberg, Jonathan 1987: "Speculations: Macbeth and Source." In *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*. Ed. Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O'Connor. New York: Methuen, 242–64.

Greenblatt, Stephen 1985: "Shakespeare and the Exorcists." In Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (eds.) *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. New York: Methuen, 163–87.

Greenhalgh, Darlene C. 2004: "Shakespeare and Romance." *Literature Compass* 1/1. www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi.

Harris, Jonathan Gil 1994: "'Narcissus in thy Face': Roman Desire and the Difference it Fakes in *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45, 408–25.

Miller, Stephen 1998: "The Taming of a Shrew and the Theories: Or, 'though this be badness, yet there is method in't'." In Laurie E. Maguire and Thomas L. Berger (eds.) *Textual Formations and Reformations*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 251–63.

Chapter 1

French Connections: The *Je-Ne-Sais-Quoi* in Montaigne and Shakespeare

Richard Scholar

Rationale

I first became interested in the connections between the French literary tradition and the English as an undergraduate at Oxford in the 1990s. My undergraduate degree in English and French offered the chance to study the two subjects in parallel, but not to compare them, and I've been exploring how one might do so meaningfully ever since. This essay is one such exploration. It prolongs a long-running conversation with my English tutor at that time, Tony Nuttall, to whom it is dedicated. Nuttall, the most philosophically minded of literary critics, taught his students to take Shakespeare seriously as a thinker. For Nuttall, this chiefly meant reading Shakespeare alongside Greek and Latin authors, and I remember him telling me early on that I had chosen the wrong combination: I should be reading Classics with English, not French. I felt inspired to disagree, not only by my contrarian nature, but also because I was at that time discovering Montaigne. Here too was a writer who, when read closely, turned out to be a thinker. I quickly learnt, as all students of the question do, that *The Tempest* contains a demonstrable textual reminiscence of the essay "Des cannibales." This intrigued me but hardly satisfied me:

the connection between Montaigne and Shakespeare seemed at once harder to pin down and more important than that.

As a research student, I moved away from the business of literary comparison, and became interested in the words and phrases that early modern authors use to explore the limits of what can be known and explained. I chose as my case study the phrase "je ne sais quoi," which I had encountered in various writers of the period, including Montaigne and Pascal. I came to see the *je-ne-sais-quoi* not only as a phrase with a rich early modern history but as more besides: a means of tracing, in the texts, first-person encounters with a certain something – whether love or hatred, sympathy or antipathy – that is as difficult to explain as its effects are intense. Such encounters recur in Montaigne's essays and in Shakespeare's plays, of course, and they seem to provoke in both texts a parallel process of mental and literary experimentation. I was ready to return to the old question of what connects Montaigne and Shakespeare from a new angle of approach.

Why, four centuries on, do we go on wanting to do things with Shakespeare? The most powerful reason, I suggest, is that his work stages with a haunting intelligence questions that still concern us. We watch, read, teach, study, and perform Shakespeare today because he moves us and, at the same time, makes us think with him. The questions that his work raises have to do, among other things, with the nature of being, the fabric of the world, human identity and motivation, the actions of individuals and groups, and the status of the artistic imagination. Those questions may appear, when extracted from their dramatic contexts in this way, to belong to the realms of metaphysics, physics, psychology, ethics, politics, history, and aesthetics. However, they should only ever be temporarily extracted from their dramatic contexts, for it is there alone that Shakespeare encounters them and invites us to do the same. Twentieth-century criticism was marked by T. S. Eliot's assertion that, where Dante was a great poet and philosopher, Shakespeare was merely a great poet (Eliot 1934). Eliot rightly saw that underlying the work of Shakespeare there is no stable intellectual system comparable to the medieval Christian Aristotelianism of the *Divine Comedy*. He did a disservice to the thoughtfulness of Shakespeare's work, however, in implying that it might be measured

against some such external system. Thinking with Shakespeare must involve both thinking about the questions that his work explores and thinking through the poetic, dramatic, and rhetorical – in short, the literary – modes of their exploration.

Critical interest in Shakespeare as a literary thinker has started to revive from Eliot's famous assertion only in recent years (see Nuttall 2007; Poole and Scholar 2007). This revival might be aligned with certain tendencies in both Shakespearean studies and in early modern studies at large. Work on the history of the book has countered the established view of Shakespeare in his own lifetime as a writer of ephemeral texts for stage performance alone and portrayed him instead as a "literary dramatist," in Lukas Erne's phrase, who also produced texts for a new kind of reader (Erne 2003). The growing body of interdisciplinary and comparative work in early modern studies, meanwhile, has reinforced the idea of a thinking dramatist as well as a literary one. It has tended to emphasize that, however difficult it may be to determine with precision the nature and extent of his learning, Shakespeare belongs to an age that tested the limits of what could be thought and said, whether by prizing rhetorical exercises such as disputation *in utramque partem* (presenting arguments on either side of an established topic), or by recreating literary genres such as the learned paradox (opposing received wisdom in a given discipline) which remind their users of the provisionality and fragility of apparently stable systems of thought (see Maclean 1998; McDonald 2001).[1] Shakespeare's work can be seen as an expression of the same experimental intellectual culture: it draws upon ideas, themes, and propositions from the philosophies of the ancient world and from various strands of medieval and Renaissance thought, not to demonstrate its allegiance to them, but to put them to the test.

Seen in this light, the work of Shakespeare appears to have little in common with that of Dante, but much more with that of Montaigne. Readers have long been fascinated by the encounter, real or imagined, of these two near contemporaries. As early as 1780, Edward Capell pointed out that Gonzalo's description of an ideal commonwealth in *The Tempest* (act 2, scene 2) is based upon Montaigne's chapter "Of the Caniballes" (book I, chapter 31), and John Sterling went on to establish in 1838 that Shakespeare's source for the passage was not Montaigne's first book of *Essais* (first published in 1580) but John Florio's 1603 English translation. This intertext still provides the single piece of indisputable evidence of a connection between the two

connection: some of the plays mentioned, such as *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (ca. 1595), precede the earliest conjectured date upon which Shakespeare is thought to have read Florio's Montaigne. The encounter between the two writers is not located in history so much as in a quasi-allegorical critical fiction. The comparison is designed to do other work: it sets out, as A. D. Nuttall (2004) does in his work on Shakespeare and the ancient Greek playwrights, to account for a case of apparent literary "action at a distance"; it discovers in Montaigne and Shakespeare two near-contemporary literary masterminds, connected by a common European cultural tradition and by certain shared preoccupations, and producing works that, when read side by side, illuminate one another.

What follows is a comparative reading of Montaigne and Shakespeare that reveals their differences, as much as their similarities, by means of what might be called a fluid analogy. This reading combines two of the approaches outlined above in so far as it examines a preoccupation that Montaigne and Shakespeare inherit from their shared intellectual culture and, at the same time, the literary resources with which they handle that preoccupation. It should quickly become apparent, however, that this combined approach is the effect of no distant methodological calculation: it is dictated by the topic in question itself. The *je-ne-sais-quoi*, by its very nature, threatens established norms of reflection and control and so compels Montaigne and Shakespeare to put it, and their own resources for dealing with it, on trial.

Early Modern Encounters with a Certain Something

What, then, is the *je-ne-sais-quoi*? Dropping the phrase into conversation today inevitably raises an eyebrow. In the early modern period, however, the term posed a problem. It happens sometimes, in our encounters with others, that we are moved by a certain something for which we struggle to find an explanation or a name even as its effects transform us. What is that something? And how – if at all – can it be put into words? Such questions fascinated early modern Europeans and are to be found at work in a wide range of their literary and philosophical texts, some of them well known today, others all but forgotten. These texts show the *je-ne-sais-quoi*, a term with precursors in Latin and the Romance languages, emerging in early seventeenth-

Montaigne and Shakespeare put commonplace instances of sympathy and antipathy to different uses in their work. Here Montaigne is describing phobias he has seen develop in people who, as children, were not taught to control them:

> I have seene some to startle at the smell of an apple, more than at the shot of a peece [firearm]; some to be frighted with a mouse, some readie to cast their gorge [vomit] at the sight of a messe [dish] of creame, and others to be scared with seeing a fetherbed shaken: as *Germanicus*, who could not abide to see a cocke, or heare his crowing. (Florio 1965: I. 25, 176; Montaigne 1992: I. 26, 166; note that the chapter numberings in book 1 of Florio's translation are slightly different from those in modern editions of Montaigne)

Here he is listing tricks that the senses play upon the judgement:

> I have seene some, who without infringing their patience, could not well heare a bone gnawne under their table: and we see few men, but are much troubled at that sharp, harsh, and teeth-edging noise that Smiths make in filing of brasse, or scraping of iron and steele together: others will be offended, if they but heare one chew his meat somwhat aloude; nay, some will be angrie with, or hate a man, that either speaks in the nose, or rattles in the throat. (Florio 1965: II. 12, 316; Montaigne 1992: II. 12, 595)

Here is Shakespeare, or rather Shylock in the trial scene of *The Merchant of Venice*, on being pressed to explain why he prefers to claim his pound of flesh from Antonio than to receive the 3,000 ducats owed to him:

> I'll not answer that –
> But say it is my humour: is it answered?
> What if my house be troubled with a rat,
> And I be pleased to give ten thousand ducats
> To have it baned? What, are you answered yet?
> Some men there are love not a gaping pig;
> Some that are mad if they behold a cat;
> And others when the bagpipe sings i'the nose
> Cannot contain their urine: for affection
> Masters oft passion, sways it to the mood
> Of what it likes or loathes. Now for your answer:

very things that their predecessors called by other names: the Jesuit author Dominique Bouhours, in a polite philosophical conversation of 1671 on the topic, has one of his interlocutors claim that the *je-ne-sais-quoi* is "the foundation of what people call 'sympathy' and 'antipathy'" (Bouhours 1962: 146). The new term visibly supplants its more established neighbors in the same semantic field and, as a result, passages such as those in Montaigne and Shakespeare quoted above appear to us to take their place in the genealogy of the *je-ne-sais-quoi*. This impression is reinforced by the fact that at various moments, as we shall see, Montaigne and Shakespeare call upon various non-substantival forms of the French phrase and its English cognates ("I know not what" and "I wot not what") to describe encounters with a certain something – as though, with hindsight, one could see in their work the emergence of the *je-ne-sais-quoi* as a keyword for such encounters waiting to happen.

Such an impression would prove misleading if it were allowed to impose a reductive coherence on the variety of terms and phrases used by both writers. The *je-ne-sais-quoi* offers no more than a synthesis, after the fact, of various encounters. If handled with caution, however, hindsight may prove of benefit here. The *je-ne-sais-quoi* articulates with greater clarity than its precursors a number of early modern preoccupations about the role of powerful sympathies and antipathies in human relations. These relations presuppose the presence of three things: the two parties mutually affected by the relation, and the relation itself, that subtle *tertium quid* which links their fortunes. The *je-ne-sais-quoi*, thanks to its constituent elements and to the different grammatical forms the phrase can take, may designate each of these three things. It adds above all to the notions of "sympathy" and "antipathy" its inbuilt subjective perspective and its pithy assertion that the subject's experience cannot be explained. Encountered by a subject (the *je*) otherwise capable of knowledge (*savoir*), the *je-ne-sais-quoi* frustrates all positive attempts to explain or express what it is, and forces the subject to say "I know not what." In the process, it raises questions about the subject of experience (what does it do to one to encounter a certain something?), about its object (what is that "something"?), about the limits of knowledge (is it truly inexplicable?), and about the resources of expression (how – if at all – can it be put into words?). These, as we shall see, are some of the questions that Montaigne and Shakespeare explore as they put the *je-ne-sais-quoi* through its different literary trials.

Chapter 7

What Do Editors Do and Why Does It Matter?

Anthony B. Dawson

Rationale

In this essay I am trying to respond to some of the complexities involved with the editing of Shakespeare's texts at the present time. Editors prepare texts for publication, and in the case of Shakespeare this involves a complex process of modernization, adjudicating between alternative readings, coming to grips with long editorial and performance traditions, etc. But, as I outline at the beginning of the essay, how we think about what a text is has changed over the past twenty years or so. Textual theory now stresses uncertainty, instability, and indeterminacy when it used to stress stability and coherence. So I begin with a question about what difference this makes to the actual process of editing. I want to take another look at certain principles that have slipped out of fashion – ideas such as authorial intention and editorial judgement. One often comes across the view these days that an author's intention is both unknowable and irrelevant, and that basing a text on what one can discern about the author's intention is at best chimerical and perhaps even dishonest. While one can readily concede to the "new textualists" who propound such views that there are many uncertainties and instabilities surrounding Shakespeare's "original" texts, I argue that there are strong reasons for refining and sharpening our sense of the author behind the text rather than abandoning it altogether. Can we be more precise about what we can know, instead of giving up on historical knowledge altogether?

Another much-debated issue in Shakespeare studies at the moment is the relation between text and performance. Are the texts we have essentially scripts for the theater, or do they have a more literary provenance? Did Shakespeare care about publication? Who bought Shakespeare's plays in quarto, and why? Did printed texts appeal to an anti-performance snobbery? Too often in discussions of this sort, both sides seem to insist on a kind of wall between the literary and the performed, whereas I see them as intimately intertwined; so I wanted in the essay to stress that interconnectedness, to see the literary and the performative as mutually energizing. I thus offer what I hope is a riposte to the sort of thinking that isolates Shakespeare's texts, making them only one thing or the other instead of both.

Finally, and perhaps most usefully in a volume of this sort, I wanted simply to describe the kinds of things editors are faced with when they put together a modern Shakespearean text – what decisions do they have to make and what kinds of evidence and analysis will they need to pursue in order to make wise, well-informed decisions? To illustrate such matters, I adduce a couple of examples, the most extended on *Timon of Athens*, drawn from my own experience of editing. In the end, the work of editors has significant implications for the meaning of Shakespeare's plays, which is why it's important and why users of modernized texts need to be aware of what editors actually do and why they do it.

Editors today work in a climate of distrust, and perhaps not without reason. First of all there is a general distrust in the stability of texts; indeed, there is energetic debate about what a text actually is. Some have argued that texts are always and inevitably plural – that there is no such thing as *Hamlet* but only *Hamlet*s, whether printed texts or performances, instantiations at particular times and places of an unknowable object that we call *Hamlet* but which has no real existence. Secondly, there is distrust of the figure of the author, who has been dissolved into a network of collaboration, including, in Shakespeare's case, fellow actors, other writers, scribes, printers, and publishers. Thirdly, there is distrust of the work of the editor him- or herself; those who wish to argue for the radical instability of texts often scorn editors for being committed to an outmoded idea of authorial

intention and the possibility of distinguishing between texts that may be closer or farther away from such intention. Some theorists have therefore called for an abandonment of editing in favor of facsimiles or what Leah Marcus (following Randall McLeod) called "unediting." An editor who ignores all this does so at her peril.

Nevertheless, editors, partly at the behest of publishing companies with an eye to the marketplace, keep on producing new versions; and their work involves thousands of small decisions about textual details which, unless they are to be entirely random, must inevitably be based on some principle or other. Usually the principles involved depend on an idea of authorship, however attenuated. Even to correct "obvious" errors, an editor has to rely on what she can infer about intention, and with more complex textual puzzles she often has to confront the possibility of contradictory intentions producing contradictory results. The solution requires a move to a narrative about how a particular text came to be the way it is. One of the key characters in such narratives is someone we can call Copytext. This character came into prominence during the heyday of the "New Bibliography" and was given a distinguished pedigree and a brilliant rationale by W. W. Greg. Copytext is a kind of trickster figure, seemingly innocuous and even helpful to the narrator/editor; but he lays traps, leading the narrator down culs-de-sac or suddenly displaying her irrationality. To rely on Copytext is both necessary and dangerous.

Let us look at a familiar example. Readers unfamiliar with the vagaries of Copytext might, innocently enough, pick up G. R. Hibbard's Oxford edition of *Hamlet* and fail to find certain well-known passages – most prominently perhaps the fourth act soliloquy in which Hamlet meditates on the mysterious reasons why he continues to delay his "dull revenge." In Hibbard's text, Hamlet does not appear at all in 4.4, which is reduced to an eight-line scene consisting of Fortinbras' instructions to his Captain. Gone is the self-lacerating soliloquy on the part of the anxious hero, as well as his chat with the Norwegian Captain; instead, we move quickly on to Gertrude's fears and the disturbances of Ophelia's mad scene. Readers accustomed to the "received" text might wonder what is going on, but those aware of the contexts (and contests) of modern editing will be able to nod sagely, knowing that the shape-changer, Copytext, has been up to his usual tricks.

At the same time, in this instance, the editor seems to be holding the trickster in check. Let us think for a minute about Hibbard's narrative. He omits from his edition 18 passages (a total of about 230 lines) that

Index

Abbott, George, Archbishop of Canterbury 89
Act for the Restraint of Abuses 73
Adelman, Janet 222–3
aesthetics 274n.
  in film 283
  neoclassical 263
  relation to politics 277n.
Aethiopica 35–43, 45, 48–51
affinity *see* antipathy
All is True *see* Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*
Allott, Robert 143
Alpers, Svetlana 204
amplitude and plenitude 262
animals 185–206, 210–27
  animal studies 186–8
  dogs 185–206
  and the economy 187, 210–11, 214, 217–18
  in film 187
  and identity 199
  and loyalty 213
  horses 187
  in hunting 212
  mistreatment of animals 219
  in performance 192–4
  in philosophy 187–8
  poultry 220
  and reason 188, 194
  references to dogs in Shakespeare 212–13, 214, 215
  sheep 216–19
  versus humans 195
  welfare organizations 186
  see also urination
antipathy 8, 12–32
Apollonius of Tyre 37–8
apostasy 112
Aquinas, Thomas 201
Aristotle 37, 45, 47, 200, 202, 267–8
Armstrong, Philip 187
Ascham, Roger 61
Asquith, Clare 103
Aubrey, John 72
Auden, W. H. 27, 30

Baker, Richard 154
Baldwin, T. W. 60, 61, 64
Barnes, Barnabe 246
Barroll, Leeds 46
Barton, Anne 119
Basse, William 142
Bate, Jonathan 275n.

Beadle, Richard 193
Beaumont, Francis 143, 145
see also Fletcher, John
beauty 267, 270
Belvedere 107
Benjamin, Walter 291
Bentley, G. E. 46
Bérenger, Jean 89
Berger, Thomas L. 296n.
Berry, Edward 211
Bible 9, 54, 59
Acts 67
1 Corinthians 60, 64, 66, 67
Ecclesiastes 59
Ezekiel 67
Genesis 63, 65
Isaiah 68, 69
Luke 71
Mark 68
Matthew 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 74
1 Peter 71
Proverbs 59, 60, 64, 69, 218
Psalms 59, 65, 215
Revelations 63
see also St. Paul
Bible translations
Bishops' Bible 63–4, 66, 69, 71
Coverdale 69
Geneva Bible 60, 64–5, 66, 69
King James 64, 65, 215, 218
Tyndale 125n.
Vulgate 62, 125n.
Biblical plays 70
Billington, Michael 287–8
Bilton, Peter 7
Blayney, Peter 141
Bliss, Lee 47, 88
Bliss, Matthew 193
Blount, Thomas 147
Bluett, Henry 87
Boccaccio, Giovanni 97n.
Boehrer, Bruce 194, 199, 211
Bohannon, Laura 274n.
Boleyn, Anne 86
Booth, Stephen 268
Bouhours, Dominique 20
Boutcher, Warren 14
Bowden, Peter 214
Brabant 112
Brahe, Tycho 188, 189, 196
Branam, George 277
Bray, Alan 203
Britain, Roman 36, 47–9
Brockbank, Philip 7
Brockliss, L. W. B. 89
Brome, Richard 148
Brooks, Harold 193
Brown, John Russell 263, 276n.
Bullen, A. H. 125n.
Bullough, Geoffrey 95
Bunyan, John 68
Burke, Kenneth 106
Burt, Jonathan 187
Bush, Douglas 37
Butterfield, Herbert 86

Campbell, Kathleen 193
Candido, Joseph 95
canon
and adaptation 262
and ambiguity 262
and biography 260
and canon formation 257–63
and class 261–2
and didactic literature 260
and genre 258–9
and interpretation 262
and intertextuality 260
and means of production 259, 273n.
and medium 259, 274n.
and patronage 259, 273–4n.
Capell, Edward 13
Cardano, Girolamo 31n.
Cardinal Wolsey 88

1 Cardinal Wolsey 88
Carpenter, Richard 217
Carr, Robert, earl of Somerset 90
Cartwright, William 140, 148
Catholic League 103, 116, 126n.
Catholicism 102–29
Cave, Terence 15
Cawdry, Robert 112
Caxton, William 58
Cecil, Robert, earl of Salisbury 89, 91
censorship 55, 72–3
Cervantes, Miguel de 56
Chambers, E. K. 70, 73, 125n.
Chapman, George 75, 126n.
Charles de Bourbon, Cardinal 116
Charles, prince (son of James I) 94
Chaucer, Geoffrey 61, 89, 167
Cheney, Patrick 137
children 223–5
  illegitimate 223
  infanticide 223, 225
Children of the Queen's Revels 46, 47
Cicero 61, 62, 199
Cipolla, Carlo 253
civility 195, 196, 198, 201, 202, 203
Clark, A. M. 125n.
classics 8–9, 11
  classical tags 62
  Greek drama 16
  Greek romance 36–8, 45, 47–50
  influence of 37, 45, 46, 51
Clayton, F. W. 124n.
Cogswell, Tom 93
Coleridge, Hartley 72–3
Colie, Rosalie 246
collaboration 163, 170–2, 177
Collier, Jeremy 72
commonplace books 55, 58–9, 137, 142, 144, 155n.
commonplaces 14, 18
Condell, Henry 88, 258
Coote, Edmund 112
copytext 162–3, 178
Corum, Richard 126n.
Cowley, Abraham 154
Cranmer, Thomas 217
criticism
  comparative 11–32
  feminist 1
  lexical studies 12, 14
  methodologies 2, 55, 80, 102, 185, 273n., 282, 290–1
  New Bibliography 162, 285
  New Criticism 7, 79
  New Historicism 34, 79–80
  performance criticism 234–5, 280–96
  Renaissance literary criticism 45
Cross, Henry 70
cues, actors' 135
cultural capital 257–8

Daniel, Samuel 126n.
Dante 12, 266, 267, 269
Davenant, William 149, 152
death, fake 39, 41
De Grazia, Margreta 296n.
De Jean, Joan 266
Dekker, Thomas 138, 142, 148, 150
De La Boétie, Étienne 21, 29
Della Porta, Giovanni Battista 31n.
Demosthenes 61, 62
dénouement 42
Derrida, Jacques 187
Desan, Philippe 14
Dessen, Alan 151
Devereux, Robert, earl of Essex 90
Dobson, Michael 193–4, 199, 263, 275n., 276n.
Doleman, R. *see* Persons, Robert
Donne, John 56, 260

Draxe, Thomas 218
Drayton, Michael 126n.
Du Bartas, Guillaume de Salluste 106, 111
Duffy, Eamon 105
education 55, 57–67, 70
eighteenth century 63–73, 256, 257

Elias, Norbert 197, 198
Eliot, George 55, 71
Eliot, T. S. 12, 79, 261
Elizabeth, princess (daughter of James I) 95
Elizabeth I 113
succession crisis 117–21
Elliot, J. H. 89
Ellrodt, Robert 14–15
Elze, Karl 95
England, relations with France 103
England's Helicon 107
England's Parnassus 107
English sensibility 263, 275n.
epic 37, 48
epyllion 233
Erasmus, Desiderius 56, 58, 62, 66
Erne, Lukas 13, 133, 136, 137, 141, 166, 168
Ewbank, Inga-Stina 191

Feil, J. P. 73
Felperin, Howard 89
Field, Richard 125n.
film 289, 291–2
Branagh *Henry V* 125n., 291
Kozintsev *Hamlet* 292
Olivier *Henry V* 291
Olivier *Hamlet* 292
Fiston, William 196
Fitz, Linda 296n.
Fitzgeffrey, Henry 141
Fleay, F. G. 125n.
Fletcher, John 45, 88
Beaumont and Fletcher 46, 166
Fletcher, John (not the dramatist) 195–6
see also Shakespeare, *Henry VIII* and *Two Noble Kinsmen*
Florio, John 13
see also Montaigne
Foakes, R. A. 86–7, 88, 95, 263, 275n.
Forcione, Alban 37
Ford, John 149
Fowler, Elizabeth 183
Foxe, John 83
France 103, 256–79
French religious wars 102, 107, 117–18, 122, 126n.
Frederick, Elector Palatine 95
Freeman, Arthur 124n.
Freud, Sigmund 283, 293–4
friendship 21–5, 199–203
Frye, Northrop 89
Fulbecke, W. 126n.

Gallagher, Lowell 104
Garber, Marjorie 296n.
Garrett, M. 73
Gascoigne, George 246
Gayton, Edmund 158
Gell, Robert 93–4
George, David 263
genre 8–9, 15, 34–50, 101–30, 147, 227, 246
Gesner, Carol 36
Gilbert, Sandra 1
Goffe, Thomas 149
Gold, Field of the Cloth of 91, 96
Goldberg, Jonathan 7
Gosson, Stephen 38
Gower, John 37–8
Grafton, Anthony 10

Green, Frederick 275n., 276n., 277n.
Greenblatt, Stephen 7, 29, 197, 292–3
Greene, Robert 37
Greenhalgh, Darlene 7
Greg, W. W. 125n., 162
Gregory, T. 104, 115
Grey, Catherine 118
grief 40–2
Grinke, Paul 124n.
Guarini, Giambattista 45, 46, 47
Gubar, Susan 1
Gurr, Andrew 125n., 147

Hackel, Heidi 10
Haines, C. M. 275n., 276n., 277n.
Halio, Jay 89
Hall, Edward 83
Hall, Joseph 37, 143
Harington, John 199
harmony 268
Harris, Jonathan Gil 7
Hart, James 196
Harvey, Gabriel 103, 111
Hatlen, Burton 198
Heliodorus *see Aethiopica*
Heminge(s), John 88, 258
Henke, Robert 45, 47
Henri III 115
Henry, prince of Wales (son of James I) 94, 95
Henslowe, Philip 70
Herbert, Philip, earl of Pembroke 89
Heresbach, Conrad 211, 220
Heywood, Thomas 143
Hibbard, G. R. 162, 168
Holderness, Graham 282
Holinshed, Raphael 7, 83
Holmes, P. 118
Höltgen, Karl 188
Homer 36, 48, 61, 167
Hope, Jonathan 46
Howard, Frances 90
humanism *see* education
Hurstfield, Joel 79, 118

identity 21, 23–4, 198–9, 201, 210
Infanta Isabella of Spain 118
intertext 13

Jackson, Shannon 290
James I (and VI) 86, 118
James, Heather 48
Jardine, Lisa 10
Je-Ne-Sais-Quoi 12–32
Johnson, Samuel 35
Jones, Zachary 31–2n.
Jonson, Ben 58, 69, 72, 73, 74–5, 89, 126n., 143, 145–6, 147, 151
Jowett, John 175
Jusserand, J. J. 264, 275n., 276n.

Kastan, David Scott 120, 274n.
Kean, Hilda 187
Kennedy, Dennis 295
Kermode, Frank 89
Kerrigan, John 247
Kipling, Rudyard 69
Knight, Charles 170–1
knowledge 12
Knowles, Ric 284, 285
Kyd, Thomas 149–50

La Harpe, Jean-François de 263–73 *see also Lycée*
Lake, Peter 89–90, 93
Lamb, Mary Ellen 103
Lander, Jesse 296n.
Lanier, Douglas 292
La Place 263–4
Larson, Kenneth 263, 264, 275–6n.