CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

Introduction

David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore

I

Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion contains contributions from both literary scholars and historians of religion; as such, it is a cross-disciplinary volume that illuminates Shakespeare's plays and the early modern religious beliefs that circulated in Shakespeare's England. Most notably, this volume explores Shakespeare's creative engagement with early modern religious culture, but it does so without assuming that Shakespeare can himself be aligned with any specific doctrinal beliefs, religious group, or confession. The chapters in this book thus eschew firm or reductive assertions about Shakespeare's personal religious convictions. Instead, contributors focus on his imaginative recasting of different currents of early modern religious culture and beliefs in their great variety, an array of perspectives that was at once contradictory, competing, and deeply contested.

Like the Cambridge University Press volume on *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought* edited by David Armitage, Conal Condren, and Andrew Fitzmaurice,[1] this book offers fresh interdisciplinary perspectives on a large topic that has generated much critical controversy. In doing so, it is likely to generate more discussion, since it does little to resolve the vexed question of Shakespeare's confessional position or positions. This volume is timely, however, because both literary scholars and historians of early modern religion contribute their particular insights into religious matters and debates in relation to Shakespeare's plays. We have attempted, in bringing together historians of religion and literary critics, to engage both specialists and more general readers of Shakespeare, including student readers – anyone interested in tracing Shakespeare's imaginative engagement with the variety of religious beliefs and practices that characterizes early modern English culture.

[1] David Armitage, Conal Condren, and Andrew Fitzmaurice (eds.), *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

How do Shakespeare's plays give dramatic, imaginative, and provocative expression to diverse early modern religious perspectives and faiths – some of them contradictory, paradoxical, and dissonant – without resolving them? This volume attempts to address this question in relation to the religious complexities and changing culture of Shakespeare's England. Shakespeare gives dramatic expression to both Protestant and Catholic perspectives in his plays, a reminder that he lived in an age marked by tumultuous religious change and divisions brought about by the cataclysm of the Reformation that shattered western Christendom. Henry VIII's England, in which Shakespeare's father was born, was predominantly a Catholic nation, albeit a nation riven with tensions and instabilities generated by the evangelical culture of the Reformation.[2] Catholics were still widespread during the early years of Elizabeth's reign,[3] but by the time Shakespeare was thriving as a playwright in London – in the late 1580s, the 1590s, and the first twelve or thirteen years of the seventeenth century – England was predominantly a Protestant nation, Elizabeth herself having been excommunicated and deposed in a papal bull of 1570 for "usurping monster-like the place of the chief sovereign of the church of England" and prohibiting "the exercise of true religion" and the Roman Church.[4] To be sure, there were plenty of ambiguities and inconsistencies within the Elizabethan religious settlement (which "wedded an essentially Calvinist theology to an essentially Catholic institutional structure, minus the pope"),[5] although Elizabeth identified herself as a Protestant ruler.

These tensions persisted over the course of Shakespeare's life, as Elizabeth's successor – James I, the patron of Shakespeare's King's Men – self-consciously presented himself in print as a major Protestant exegete and theologian (the figure of "Religio" appears prominently on the 1616 title page of his *Workes*). The English Reformation, although long and partial, was ultimately, in the words of Diarmaid MacCulloch, a "howling

[2] See Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals and the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, 2003); Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie (eds.), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[3] See Chapter 2 below, p. 42.

[4] See *Regnans in excelsis*, in Robert S. Miola (ed.), *Early Modern Catholicism: An Anthology of Primary Sources* (Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 486–8; quotations from p. 487.

[5] Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), p. 136. See also Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603*, 2nd edn. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), pp. 28–30.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

success,"[6] even as Protestant anxieties about the presence of Catholics (as Chapters 2 and 3 by Peter Marshall and Felicity Heal remind us) were never assuaged, including in King James's London, and even as Elizabethan England remained religiously divided and mixed (as Chapter 2 likewise makes clear).[7] Yet the degree to which Shakespeare himself can be characterized as a Protestant – was he a more moderate one tolerant of different faiths in religiously diverse London? – continues to provoke scholarly debate and conjecture. Likewise, the degree to which he can even be characterized as a religious playwright remains subject to debate. *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion* challenges and complicates one-sided attempts to attribute to Shakespeare himself firm or rigid religious identifications, affiliations, or sets of religious practices (e.g., Shakespeare-as-Catholic or Shakespeare-as-Calvinist). Instead, the chapters in this volume stress the ways Shakespeare's plays explore, by giving voice to, a wide range of religious beliefs, practices, and confessional positions circulating in Shakespeare's England.

Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion addresses a number of major questions about Shakespeare's plays in relation to the religious culture, divisions, allegiances, and intellectual history of early modern England and Europe. How orthodox or mainstream are the religious perspectives dramatized in Shakespeare's plays? How experimental and daring are Shakespeare's plays, especially the tragedies, when it comes to representing early modern religious thought, experience, speculation, and anxieties? Do Shakespeare's plays implicitly endorse, question, challenge, or complicate Protestant orthodoxy and the widespread belief in providentialism in early

[6] Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Impact of the English Reformation," *Historical Journal*, 38 (1995), 152. See also Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 4; Peter Marshall (ed.), *The Impact of the English Reformation, 1500–1640* (London: Edward Arnold, 1997); Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of the Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), and *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988).

[7] On Catholicism as an ongoing topic of intense political discussion and anxiety throughout the span of Shakespeare's career (and beyond), see also Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1993); Alison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination* (Cambridge University Press, 1999); and Michael C. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage, and Religion, c. 1550–1640* (Cambridge University Press, 2006). For the creative blending of Catholicism's visual emphasis with Protestantism's focus on the Word, see especially Beatrice Groves, *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare, 1592–1604* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007). Studies arguing for Shakespeare's relation to Catholicism include Richard Dutton, Alison Findlay and Richard Wilson (eds.), *Theatre and Religion: Lancastrian Shakespeare* (Manchester University Press, 2003); Richard Wilson, *Secret Shakespeare: Studies in Theatre, Religion and Resistance* (Manchester University Press, 2004); David N. Beauregard, *Catholic Theology in Shakespeare's Plays* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2008); and Phoebe Jensen, *Religion and Revelry in Shakespeare's Festive World* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

modern England? How do the plays interrogate and test, in original and powerful ways, early modern religious prejudices towards Catholics, Puritans, Jews, Muslims, and radical religious groups (e.g. Brownists)? Can these theatrical works be seen in the context of notions of toleration and intolerance in the early modern period? Do they challenge ways we think about the categories of the secular and the religious in the early modern period and the boundary critics have sometimes constructed between them? Finally, how does Shakespeare explore the relations between religious beliefs, politics, and issues of early modern English national identity and chauvinism?

The chapters in this volume likewise consider the degree to which we view Shakespeare as a religious playwright. If Shakespeare wrote "scripts that were intensely alert to the social and political realities of their times,"[8] he also wrote plays that were equally alive to the religious tensions of their times. Yet while modern criticism has produced books with such titles as *Political Shakespeare* or *Shakespeare's Political Drama*,[9] it might seem odd to entitle a study *Religious Shakespeare* or *Shakespeare's Religious Drama*. Shakespeare, after all, was not a religious playwright in the sense that John Bale or John Foxe were. Religion nonetheless permeates Shakespeare's plays: it does so in terms of their great wealth of biblical allusions,[10] in their echoes of the Book of Common Prayer and the Psalter,[11] and in their uses of religious language (sometimes for comic or parodic purposes as in the cases of characters like Bottom or the vivacious Falstaff, the latter wittily employing godly language as he banters with Prince Hal). The plays simultaneously evoke features of both Catholic and Protestant culture, and it is this richness that makes it difficult for us to pinpoint Shakespeare's own doctrinal allegiances. The plays, for example, refer to key religious concepts and places (e.g., Heaven or the fires of Hell and Purgatory); to the notion of salvation and damnation (central to understanding the non-Roman tragedies); and to religious institutions and buildings (e.g., parishes as well as chantries), financial systems (tithes), liturgical

[8] Stephen Greenblatt, *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2004), p. 12.

[9] Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (eds.), *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), and Alexander Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays* (London: Routledge, 1988).

[10] For Shakespeare's rich and various uses of biblical allusions, see now Hannibal Hamlin, *The Bible in Shakespeare* (Oxford University Press, 2013). See also Steven Marx, *Shakespeare and the Bible* (Oxford University Press, 2000), and Groves, *Texts and Traditions*, ch. 1.

[11] See Daniel Swift, *Shakespeare's Common Prayers: The Book of Common Prayer and the Elizabethan Age* (Oxford University Press, 2103).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

rituals and practices, and church ales. The plays can also vividly depict the demonic imagination and demonic possession; examine both zealous and non-Protestant religious groups (e.g., Puritans, Catholics, Jews, or Muslims); and explore religious hatred and prejudices. They represent characters burdened with guilt and sinfulness, who struggle to show contrition and seek forgiveness; they dramatize spiritual resurrection, miracles, and faith;[12] and they depict individuals, notably Hamlet, who engage in anxious religious questioning and express profound uncertainty about the world beyond this one.

Yet despite the rich presence of religion in the plays, it is hard to think of Shakespeare as a religious writer in the same way that we consider Spenser or the zealous Milton as authors deeply committed to religious causes or theological doctrines.[13] Shakespeare's plays, David Kastan asserts, "assume a world in which God is immanent,"[14] and yet his most devastating tragedy and depiction of extreme human suffering, *King Lear*, arguably challenges the very idea of such immanence and the widespread religious perception in early modern England that God's hand was directly and assiduously at work in the world, constantly intervening in human affairs.[15]

It may indeed make more sense to view Shakespeare as a writer whose plays engage creatively and dramatically with various – and sometimes contradictory and dissonant – facets of religious culture in early modern England and Europe without, in the end, his being a deeply or consistently religious writer who makes clear-cut confessional choices.[16] In any case, as the chapters in this volume remind us, it is hard to think of Shakespeare as a doctrinaire religious author and even harder to think of him as a writer who identified with militant religious causes (as, say, Sidney, Spenser, and Milton did). Furthermore, as the chapters in this volume attest, it is difficult to be sure of Shakespeare's personal religious convictions, despite claims – far from certain – that his father was a Catholic,[17] in the way we can know

[12] On this topic, see Richard C. McCoy, *Faith in Shakespeare* (Oxford University Press, 2013), which examines the recovery or awakening of faith not in a narrowly religious sense but in relation to the powers of figurative language, theatrical illusion, and stagecraft. See also Chapter 11 below.

[13] See David Kastan, *A Will to Believe: Shakespeare and Religion* (Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 4. Also see Chapter 4 below for ways in which Shakespeare differs from Spenser in handling Reformation issues.

[14] Kastan, *Will to Believe*, p. 6.

[15] Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, pp. 2, 6.

[16] Cf. Alison Shell, *Shakespeare and Religion*, Arden Shakespeare Critical Editions (London: Bloomsbury, 2010), who notes Shakespeare's "confessional invisibility" (p. 235).

[17] The indecisive evidence for "John Shakespeare and Catholicism" is carefully reviewed in the biographical entry for Shakespeare by Peter Holland in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (www.oxforddnb.com); moreover, as Holland notes, "there is . . . no reason to assume that the adult William shared his father's religious views," even if they were Catholic.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

Jonson's with his conversion to Roman Catholicism and his re-conversion to the Church of England.[18] Despite documentary evidence concerning Shakespeare's life, we possess no personal letters, diaries, autobiography, testaments of faith, or religious tracts or treatises that might give us some insight into his religious persuasions or ecclesiastical allegiance. To be sure, the plays dramatize both Catholic and Protestant perspectives: for example, Hamlet Senior's Ghost has come from Purgatory (central to Roman Catholic teaching) and refers to Catholic liturgical practices which he has been denied (see 1.5.76–9), whereas Hamlet voices religious views that evoke the newer reformed ideas of Luther and Calvin.[19] In a larger sense, *Hamlet* imaginatively dramatizes an unresolved tension at the heart of the unfinished Elizabethan Reformation and the church: vestiges of Catholic liturgy juxtaposed with Protestant theology and a Protestant church still haunted by its Catholic past.[20] Yet this religious ambiguity or tension dramatized in *Hamlet* hardly reveals Shakespeare's own personal persuasions which, perhaps, must remain as mysterious as the cosmos Hamlet speculates about.

It may instead be more fruitful to ask why Shakespeare evokes both Catholic and Protestant dimensions in his great tragedy, and to stress *the dramatic and imaginative uses* to which he as a creative and independent-minded playwright puts these competing and dissonant religious perspectives. The Christian Hamlet is deeply influenced by a Reformation view of human nature: his corrosive and weary sense of the depravity of humankind accords with a sense that Denmark is rotten, sick, and claustrophobic, so that his world has become "a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours"

[18] See Ian Donaldson, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Oxford University Press, 2011), esp. pp. 138–44, 271–5. For Shakespeare's biography in relation to the elusive problem of his religious beliefs and the question of his father's Catholicism, see esp. Chapter 1 below; see also Kastan, *Will to Believe*, ch. 2. Cf. Jeffrey Knapp, *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation, and Theater in Renaissance England* (University of Chicago Press, 2002) for an attempt to define Shakespeare's own religious beliefs and to see English Renaissance playwrights themselves "as a kind of ministry" whose plays were intended as "contributions to the cause of true religion" (p. 9) and "godly enterprises" (p. 2), so that the theater became an alternative to the prelatical church. For a critical response to Knapp, see Chapter 11 below, p. 225.

[19] For more on Catholic and Calvinist perspectives in *Hamlet*, see Chapter 1 below.

[20] For this tension, see MacCulloch, *Later Reformation*, p. 5. Even the godly Elizabeth maintained the crucifix and candles in her private chapel and preferred a formal, sung liturgy over an excess of sermons: Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 361, and Chapter 3 below, p. 59. See also Chapter 2 below, p. 42. The liturgy of the Church of England was more elaborate than that of other churches in the Reformed world; it retained bishops, fully functioning cathedrals, as well as deans, canons, paid choirs and organists, and a tendency to use the English Prayer Book in a ceremonial way: Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Christianity: The First Three Thousand Years* (New York: Viking, 2009), p. 649. See as well the scholarship cited in notes 59 and 60 of Chapter 2 below.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

(2.2.293).[21] That Hamlet Senior offers a Catholic perspective makes some sense in terms of the play's representation of two generations (since first-generation Protestants, after all, had Catholic parents); that his Ghost comes from Purgatory also takes on a symbolic resonance in a dark and protracted tragedy full of "foul crimes" (1.5.12) that often evokes the sense of living through a kind of Purgatory. The Christian prince whose outlook is shaped by reformed views, moreover, sees his world providentially ("There's a divinity that shapes our ends" and "a special providence in the fall of a sparrow" [5.2.10, 157–8]).[22] However, Horatio's concluding summary of the bloody revenge tragedy with its "accidental judgements" and "casual slaughters" (5.2.324–8) offers another, more skeptical interpretation of the play's events – one in tension with providential explanations. Even within *Hamlet* we get competing, contradictory, and dissonant religious perspectives. Rather than encourage easy or simple resolutions to these conflicting perspectives, Shakespeare, it seems, aims in his imaginative ways to animate, and thereby to provoke readers and spectators to think about, the deepest matters of religious belief and controversy.

Yet if Shakespeare's plays are permeated by references to early modern religious matters, they nevertheless provide little evidence of his being a committed religious writer with specific religious persuasions such as, say, Foxe, Spenser, Herbert, or Milton enunciate. In the absence of such specific allegiances, does this mean that he is ultimately a great secular writer, as many twentieth-century critics liked to emphasize? The boundary often invoked between the secular and the religious in the early modern period is too simple and unhistorical, as Brian Cummings has powerfully and persuasively reminded us.[23] One might consider Shakespeare's Falstaff, for example, as a great secular comic figure with an agile and fertile imagination; yet his clever uses of Puritan cadences – "O, thou hast damnable iteration, and art indeed able to corrupt a saint . . . God forgive thee for it" (*1 Henry IV* 1.2.80–2), he tells Hal as he wittily justifies his vocation of stealing – complicate a simple binary between the secular and the religious. Such language reminds us that Shakespeare's contemporary audiences – steeped

[21] Citations from Shakespeare in the Introduction are taken from *The Norton Shakespeare* based on the Oxford text and edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katherine Eisaman Maus (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997).

[22] For Hamlet's latter providential assertion, see Matthew 10:29 and Calvin's *Institutes*, 1.xvi.1, 1.xvii.6. In the Elizabethan translation of Calvin's words, God works "by susteynyng, cherishing, & caring for, with singular prouidence euery one of those thinges that he hath created euen to the least sparrow": *The Institution of the Christian Religion*, trans. Thomas Norton (London, 1561).

[23] Brian Cummings, *Mortal Thoughts: Religion, Secularity and Identity in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture* (Oxford University Press, 2013), esp. pp. 1–18.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

in biblical culture, familiar with sermons delivered in London parishes and at Paul's Cross, and aware of the long-standing animus of zealous reformers against festivals and theater[24] – were closely attuned to such religious idioms and their biblical allusions and would have relished Falstaff's nimble, mock-sanctimonious uses of godly discourse. Even in Falstaff's inventive festive world, religious and secular issues creatively intersect. As the chapters in this volume examine Shakespeare's plays in relation to early modern religious culture, they likewise highlight the unstable and porous division between the two categories and eschew a narrative of secularization that places Shakespeare at its very center.

This volume, moreover, explores Shakespeare's imaginative and intellectual engagement with currents of early modern religious beliefs without reducing early modern religious experience to issues of power or political control.[25] Hamlet's anxious religious questing, including his ability to engage with doubts and uncertainties, for example, is symptomatic of his capacious, wide-ranging mind struggling with his profound sense of grief and acute sense of mortality; it cannot be confined to issues of power, even as he despises the sinister politics and duplicity of the Danish court. Yet, at the same time, *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion* does at points consider ways that religious concerns in Shakespeare intersect with political ones. This point of exchange allows Shakespeare to enrich religious and political ambiguities in his plays. For instance, Shakespeare complicates and deepens the character of Claudius in *Hamlet* by portraying him as an efficient and slippery Machiavellian politician who skillfully uses regal language at the court and yet who, in private, is also burdened with a keen sense of his "rank" offense which "hath the primal eldest curse upon't"; consequently his guilty conscience cannot show genuine contrition as his soul desperately struggles "to be free": "O wretched state, O bosom black as death, / O limèd soul . . . / Help, angels! Make assay!" (3.3.36–7, 67–9).

Or consider the case of *Henry V*, which illustrates how Shakespeare dramatizes interconnected issues of religion, politics, and militant nationalism; the intertwining of these issues introduces different kinds of ethical and political ambiguities. There religious language can be exploited to

[24] For more about the antagonism between godly reformers and the stage, see Chapters 1 and 3 below.

[25] Critics identifying as New Historicist or materialist are sometimes criticized for "reducing" the complexity of the plays to a single struggle between a dominant ideology and its (real or imagined) alternatives. As with any approach, such work ranges from the very rich to the reductive. Notable examples of that work (e.g., the influential studies of Shakespeare by Stephen Greenblatt) would not be out of place in a collection like ours.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

justify dubious claims to wage war in the name of national interests. When Henry V, a Catholic king whose chauvinistic national politics would have resonated in Protestant England, asks whether he has a just *casus belli* so that he can wage war against France, the Archbishop of Canterbury addresses the king's concern about "right and conscience," while fueling the zeal for war and national unity by invoking biblical authority (Numbers 27:8; see 1.2.96–114). In his vehement and skillful oratory, Henry V himself links vengeance and "the will of God" (1.2.189) as he justifies his nationalistic campaign against France. Even when the English Army seems enfeebled before the great battle of Agincourt, Henry asserts: "We are in God's hand" (3.6.155). And when the French suffer a spectacular defeat, Henry declares, "God, thy arm was here" (4.8.100) and calls for "all holy rites" (4.8.100, 116). Henry V's religious language is an instrument of his political and national ambitions, but is it also more than that? Shakespeare leaves the answer to this question unresolved, allowing for interpretive instabilities and ambiguities: we can see the ruthless, immoral uses of religion for militant political purposes and yet acknowledge that on some level the warlike and rhetorically skillful Henry is indeed a religious man whose chauvinistic leadership and pursuit of national unity the play enables us both to admire and question. In *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion*, the chapters by Beatrice Groves, Peter Lake, Adrian Streete, Paul Stevens, and Michael Davies (to mention several contributions) also examine ways that religion, politics, and issues of national identity interact in other plays by Shakespeare, thereby generating ethical and political ambiguities.

II

For several decades literary critics have approached religion as a cultural activity that shares with imaginative literature a set of common symbols, concepts, and interpretive strategies. This yoking of the domains of fiction and religion, most apparent in work on the early modern stage, was given particular impetus by New Historicist critics, who argued that symbolic activities of all kinds might be included in our notion of culture, and that purely "literary" or "theatrical" uses of language could not be restricted to imaginative writing.[26] Over the last several decades a number of critics have produced powerful interpretations of Shakespearean and early modern theatrical texts, identifying key concepts – conversion, dissimulation,

[26] The most influential articulation of this wider scope is Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (1980; University of Chicago Press, 2005).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-02661-2 — Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion
Edited by David Loewenstein , Michael Witmore
Excerpt
More Information

dispossession, idolatry, and imitation – that place the basic operations of playing and theatrical "feigning" on the fault lines of larger sectarian debates.[27]

After the New Historicism brought an anthropological approach to thinking about religion, later approaches moved further afield into philosophy, contemporary cultural history, and the history of the book. Contributors to a notable collection of essays edited by Ken Jackson and Arthur Marotti, for example, have brought phenomenological and postmodern perspectives to the question of how religion or religious conflict is expressed in Shakespeare's plays.[28] Renewed interest in social, intellectual, and book history, as well as modern language philosophy, has introduced additional perspectives on the religious impulses and diverse religious traditions that seem to animate Shakespeare's plays.[29]

The chapters in this collection do not always represent a departure, in either direction or method, from this important body of preceding scholarly work, although our contributors tend to employ historicist rather than postmodern critical methods. Readers will, however, find a subtle shift of emphasis that is due – in part – to the context of the discussion, but also to the kinds of thinkers and critics that are part of the ongoing discussion about Shakespeare and early modern religion. We have already stressed the fact that several historians of religion contribute chapters to the volume, providing complex historical and cultural perspectives on the tensions and alignments that characterized the times in which Shakespeare lived and wrote. As a result, the texture of argument in this volume is at times more granular, more likely to recognize eddies and cross-currents in early modern

[27] See Stephen Greenblatt, "Shakespeare and the Exorcists," in *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988), ch. 4; and *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton University Press, 2002); Deborah Kuller Shuger, *Political Theologies in Shakespeare's England: The Sacred and the State in "Measure for Measure"* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001); Jeffrey Knapp, *Preachers and Players in Shakespeare's England* (Berkeley, CA: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1995).

[28] Ken Jackson and Arthur F. Marotti (eds.), *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion: Early Modern and Postmodern Perspectives* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2011). See also Marotti and Jackson, "The Turn to Religion in Early Modern English Studies," *Criticism*, 46 (winter 2004), 167–90; Julia Reinhard Lupton, *Citizen-Saints: Shakespeare and Political Theology* (University of Chicago Press, 2005); James Knapp, *Image Ethics in Shakespeare and Spenser* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Julia Reinhard Lupton and Graham Hammill (eds.), *Political Theology and Early Modernity* (University of Chicago Press, 2012); Jennifer Waldron, *Reformations of the Body: Idolatry, Sacrifice and Early Modern Theater* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); and Victoria Kahn, *The Future of Illusion: Political Theology and Early Modern Texts* (University of Chicago Press, 2014).

[29] See, e.g., Groves, *Texts and Traditions*; Shell, *Shakespeare and Religion*; Sarah Beckwith, *Shakespeare and the Grammar of Forgiveness* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011); Cummings, *Mortal Thoughts*.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org