

How To Do Things with Shakespeare

New Approaches, New Essays

Edited by
Laurie Maguire

How To Do Things with Shakespeare

How To Do Things with Shakespeare

New Approaches, New Essays

Edited by
Laurie Maguire

 **Blackwell**
Publishing

© 2008 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd
except for editorial material and organization © 2008 by Laurie Maguire and chapter 9
© 2008 by Paul Yachnin

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

The right of Laurie Maguire to be identified as the author of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

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

<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	vii
Introduction <i>Laurie Maguire</i>	1
Part I How To Do Things with Sources	5
Editor's Introduction	7
1 French Connections: The <i>Je-Ne-Sais-Quoi</i> in Montaigne and Shakespeare <i>Richard Scholar</i>	11
2 Romancing the Greeks: <i>Cymbeline's</i> Genres and Models <i>Tanya Pollard</i>	34
3 How the Renaissance (Mis)Used Sources: The Art of Misquotation <i>Julie Maxwell</i>	54
Part II How To Do Things with History	77
Editor's Introduction	79
4 <i>Henry VIII</i> , or <i>All is True</i> : Shakespeare's "Favorite" Play <i>Chris R. Kyle</i>	82
5 Catholicism and Conversion in <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> <i>Gillian Woods</i>	101

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 <i>Tiffany Stern</i>	136
7 What Do Editors Do and Why Does It Matter? <i>Anthony B. Dawson</i>	160
Part IV How To Do Things with Animals	181
Editor's Introduction	183
8 "The dog is himself": Humans, Animals, and Self-Control in <i>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</i> <i>Erica Fudge</i>	185
9 Sheepishness in <i>The Winter's Tale</i> <i>Paul Yachnin</i>	210
Part V How To Do Things with Posterity	231
Editor's Introduction	233
10 Time and the Nature of Sequence in Shakespeare's <i>Sonnets</i> : "In sequent toil all forwards do contend" <i>Georgia Brown</i>	236
11 Canons and Cultures: Is Shakespeare Universal? <i>A. E. B. Coldiron</i>	255
12 "Freezing the Snowman": (How) Can We Do Performance Criticism? <i>Emma Smith</i>	280
<i>Index</i>	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 Lear* (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

authors. Subsequent efforts to strengthen or supplement that connection, most of them designed to define and measure Montaigne's "influence" upon Shakespeare, have been concentrated in two main areas of enquiry.

The first is the external context: this includes, among other things, the reception of Montaigne in early modern England and the question of Shakespeare's place in that reception history. J. M. Robertson's 1909 study portrays a self-taught Shakespeare whose mind reaches its philosophical maturity only after reading Florio's Montaigne. In recent years, Warren Boutcher has countered this view, arguing that Montaigne's book was read in England from the 1590s to the 1620s principally as a means of promoting the secular household education of the social élite rather than as a repository of philosophical wisdom (Boutcher 2003). He then examines Shakespeare's dramatic use of the *Essais* from that perspective.

The second area of enquiry is what might be called the internal context: this includes, among other things, the lexical, conceptual, and literary parallels between the two writers. Lexical studies inevitably focus on the role that Montaigne's translator John Florio, a teacher of modern languages to the English nobility wishing to demonstrate the richness of his linguistic resources, plays as a mediator in the process of transmission. George Coffin Taylor's 1925 study lists over 750 words coined by Florio in his English Montaigne and picked up by Shakespeare in plays written in the years following the translation's first appearance in print (1603). Taylor concludes from his study that, in thought as well as in word, "Shakespeare was, beyond any doubt, profoundly and extensively influenced by Montaigne" (Taylor 1925: 5). Philippe Desan has revised Taylor's findings, suggesting that extracts of Florio's translation may have circulated in manuscript among the London literati as early as 1597–8, while arguing that Shakespeare seems to have been more interested in Florio's coinages than in Montaigne's ideas (Desan 2003). Desan is not alone in wishing to reduce the number and size of Shakespeare's conceptual "debts" to Montaigne as chalked up by Taylor and his more enthusiastic successors. Many critics have objected that the ideas Shakespeare seems to have borrowed from Montaigne may often come from elsewhere since they are commonplaces of the intellectual and rhetorical culture shared by the two authors. With these strictures in mind, Robert Ellrodt's 1975 article suspends the question of Montaigne's conceptual influence over Shakespeare, preferring instead to place the

development of a new kind of self-consciousness in Montaigne and the post-1603 Shakespeare within the broader context of the European history of ideas. This approach runs the risk, although it is one that Ellrodt generally avoids, of transforming the two authors into conventional thinkers whose work can be easily identified with some external intellectual system or tradition: in other words, philosophers of the kind that Eliot saw in Dante. A transformation of this kind takes place each time, to take one frequent example, that Montaigne is characterized in the secondary literature as a straightforward “skeptic.” Montaigne, like Shakespeare, does of course borrow material – ideas, topics, and commonplaces – from various philosophical traditions, including skepticism, but one needs also to understand how both writers operate upon this material with the structures, devices, and strategies – the literary resources – at their disposal.

The idea that these resources might in turn become the object of a comparison has been put forward recently by Terence Cave (2007). Returning from a different perspective to the topic explored by Ellrodt – the marked self-consciousness of Montaigne and Shakespeare – Cave argues that this serves both authors as an instrument of experimental thought. He groups moments of theatrical self-dramatization in Shakespeare (including the mechanicals’ play at the end of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, statements such as “All the world’s a stage” in *As You Like It*, and the Mousetrap in *Hamlet*) together with quasi-theatrical situations (the bed-trick in *All’s Well that Ends Well*, the Duke’s experiment in *Measure for Measure*, and the trials and false trials of plays like *The Merchant of Venice*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*). These examples, Cave says, are not to be understood as the dramatist’s self-congratulatory asides, but as his experiments, second-level strategies by means of which the characters are induced to think about their situations and we with them. In this, they resemble key passages in the work of Montaigne, who consistently foregrounds the unfolding process of reflection over the matter ostensibly in hand. The term that Montaigne uses for this process is *essai*, meaning literally a “trial,” and referring here not to a literary genre – this is a later development – but to a mental and writerly experiment. This etymology allows Cave to encapsulate his literary parallel thus: “Shakespeare’s trials, and the other procedures that operate in the same way, are his *essais*” (Cave 2007: 117).

Note that the comparative approach here is no longer the one taken by Robertson, Taylor, and others of an earlier generation. It is no longer designed to establish “influence” or even necessarily historical

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-

century France as a keyword in the debate. The term spreads to other vernacular languages of early modern Europe, particularly English, in the following decades. By the middle of the seventeenth century, the earlier questions are ready to be rephrased: what is the *je-ne-sais-quoi*? And how – if at all – can it be put into words?

The emergence of the *je-ne-sais-quoi* as a keyword serves to crystallize a set of hitherto unrelated preoccupations already present in the intellectual culture of early modern Europe. Natural philosophers of the period commonly point out that humans encounter effects whose physical causes are imperceptible to them: we observe that a piece of iron moves towards a nearby magnet, for example, but experience can determine neither what is responsible for this attraction nor how it takes place. Other paradigm cases include the fall of heavy bodies, the vacuum, and the ebb and flow of the tides. Strange cases of attraction and repulsion do not just occur between inanimate substances. The couple “sympathy” and “antipathy” designates a powerful relation between people, as well as things, by virtue of which they are affected by the same influence, one which draws them together in the case of “sympathy,” and which mutually repulses them in the case of “antipathy.” Such relations are observed throughout nature: between inanimate substances and animate beings (e.g., in the effects upon animals and humans of drugs and poisons); between different animals (e.g., in the fascination of cats for birds and the antipathy between wolves and lambs); between animals and humans (e.g., in phobias such as the fear of spiders); and between humans (e.g., in affection and loathing, love and hatred, at first sight). These cases are legion. Montaigne, surveying the infirmities of human perception and knowledge in the chapter entitled “An Apologie of Raymond Sebond,” asks: “how many hidden properties and quintessences doe we daily discover?” (Florio 1965: II. 12, 232; Montaigne 1992: II. 12, 526). His interrogative syntax leaves room for occult qualities and quintessences, sympathies and antipathies, to multiply infinitely. Unresolved phenomena are thought also to baffle human understanding in the realm of culture: it is commonly said that the qualities required for artistic and social distinction are as elusive as any found in the realms of nature and the human passions. Such commonplaces should not be assumed to be inert formulations of general consensus, however, for their truth, application, and explanation are hotly disputed: in this domain as in so many others, the commonplace is best understood as a stretch of disputed territory between conflicting discourses, a borderland open for further exploration.

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 somewhat aloud; 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:

As there is no firm reason to be rendered
 Why he cannot abide a gaping pig,
 Why he a harmless necessary cat,
 Why he a woolen bagpipe, but of force
 Must yield to such inevitable shame
 As to offend, himself being offended:
 So can I give no reason, nor will I not,
 More than a lodged hate and a certain loathing
 I bear Antonio, that I follow thus
 A losing suit against him. Are you answered? (4.1.42–62)

These three passages, the last of which I shall return to later in this essay, differ above all in their contexts. They are similar, however, not just in their taste for the weird and whimsical but also in their content and phrasing. The most striking parallels between them – their listing of powerful antipathies towards harmless animals, their anaphoric sequences starting “some . . .” and finishing “and others . . .,” and their use of phrases such as “in the nose” and “cannot abide” – lead George Coffin Taylor to conclude that, “except for the early date of *The Merchant of Venice*, one would naturally conclude the Shakespeare passage had been influenced by the Montaigne passage” (Taylor 1925: 7). Since Taylor considers influence in this case to be impossible, the passages appear as a dead-end in his study, a wrong turning narrowly avoided. Despite recent conjectures about the earlier circulation of Florio’s manuscript, influence still seems highly unlikely here, and it may be fruitless to search for a source shared by both writers given how often commonplaces about sympathies and antipathies are repeated in a variety of late sixteenth-century European texts.² Influences are not the only fruits of critical enquiry, however, and these passages may also be investigated, using the comparative approach outlined above, as examples of Montaigne and Shakespeare’s different encounters with the *je-ne-sais-quoi*.

Neither writer, of course, would have described these encounters in this way. In the passages quoted above, Montaigne talks of “hidden properties” and Shakespeare of “affection,” and elsewhere both writers refer to “sympathy” and “antipathy.” The rise to prominence of the *je-ne-sais-quoi* postdates the work of Montaigne and Shakespeare by several decades. Yet, when the phrase does emerge as a keyword, early modern Europeans consider that they are using it to talk about the

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.