Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

Introduction

Katharine A. Craik

Shakespeare was writing his plays and poems just as the word 'emotion' was emerging into common currency. In its first usages, traceable back to the 1590s, the term referred to the general disturbance suggested by the Latin term *emovere* (to move out), and Shakespeare and his contemporaries indeed often described as *motions* the impulses that aroused the mind, body and soul.[1] Early modern emotions were not simply conditions or experiences, then, but dynamic forces that effected change from one state to another. This is what Kate means when she recognises the 'strange motions' that flit across Hotspur's face in *I Henry IV* as portents of war; this is the 'inward motion' that prompts the Bastard towards 'sweet poison' in *King John* and this is the 'motion / That tends to vice' that Posthumous believes taints all womankind in *Cymbeline*.[2] Here and elsewhere in Shakespeare's plays and poems, emotion precipitates action in individual subjects, transforming in turn the ways in which they relate and express themselves to one another and to the world at large. *Shakespeare and Emotion* gives serious and sustained attention to the emotions as a way of approaching Shakespeare's works as art from the past, as well as the place of these works in the present. It begins with the assumption that emotion offers a deeply promising (and often challenging) prospect for imagining and enacting change.

Few would dispute that emotional intensity is the hallmark of Shakespearean drama, together with a powerful ability to generate feeling among readers and audiences. Sensory experience, the emotions and ideas of affect have recently become central critical frameworks, and have provided a wealth of new topics for research into Shakespeare and early modern literature more generally. Some of this work shares conceptual territory

[1] See the OED definitions of 'emotion' (3a: 'an agitation of mind; an excited mental state); and 'motion' (11.12a: 'an inner prompting or impulse').
[2] *I Henry IV*, 2.3.54; *King John*, 1.1.212; *Cymbeline*, 2.5.20–1.

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

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

with the cognitive sciences, and overlaps in productive ways with the history of medicine. The study of the emotions plays an increasingly important part in identity politics, and is emerging as one way in which the humanities in general – and literary criticism in particular – can reflect on lived life.[3] The turn towards the emotions has been particularly exciting for Shakespeareans, igniting lively debates about the interface between writing, inwardness and the world. Text-based, practice-based, theoretical and historical approaches to the emotions have opened up new avenues of scholarly and creative possibility, and the interior landscapes of those who have encountered Shakespeare's works in the distant and not-so-distant past have emerged as an especially important thread.[4] Critics have lately begun to consider more flexibly and self-critically the experiences of diverse audiences, and to probe more thoughtfully their own emotional investments in literature.[5] Together the essays in this volume set out to offer a snapshot of the current state of scholarship in this still young field, bringing the recent surge of interest in passionate and emotional experience into conversation with some of the most urgent debates in Shakespeare studies. Since this area is developing so rapidly, however, *Shakespeare and Emotion* also provides a more speculative forum to foster new and experimental work.

The chapters in *Shakespeare and Emotion* take different methodological approaches, considering the plays and poems from a variety of disciplinary perspectives drawn from literary, theatrical, historical, cultural and film studies. Some are written by established scholars who have played and continue to play a central part in developing early modern affect as a thriving area of study. Others are contributed by early career scholars whose work is taking the field in distinctive, new directions. The book's main goal is to explore emotional and passionate experience as an animating – and sometimes alienating – force within Shakespeare's plays and poems. An additional aim is to consider, through emotion, the continuing

[3] One important recent study is Sara Ahmed's *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (Edinburgh University Press, 2014). On the more general development of emotionology as a distinct 'intellectual mode', see Susan C. Karant-Nunn, *The Reformation of Feeling: Shaping the Religious Emotions in Early Modern Germany* (Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 3.

[4] On audience and emotion, see Farah Karim-Cooper and Tiffany Stern, eds., *Shakespeare's Theatres and the Effects of Performance* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014); Evelyn Tribble, *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Time* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011); and Penelope Woods, 'Skilful Spectatorship? Doing (or Being) Audience at Shakespeare's Globe Theatre', *Shakespeare Studies*, 43 (2015), 99–113.

[5] On the recent history of the Globe theatre, including the nature of spectating, see Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, eds., *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

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

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

importance of Shakespeare's works today, especially our sense of who we are and who we might become. Shakespeare's continuing centrality to western notions of complex interiority shows no sign of abating, and his persistent cultural prominence is, in itself, a good reason to probe further the emotional appeal of his works. To borrow a phrase from *Measure for Measure*, Shakespeare's works are 'motion generative' in our own world, not only capturing emotional experiences that belong to the past but also reimagining and reinscribing, in new ways, the interconnected actions, events and encounters, which make up affective life now.[6]

I

What precisely *is* an emotion? It is as well to say from the outset that there is no consensus on the subject, and that the body of scholarship dealing with this and cognate concepts (affections, passions, sensations, the senses) is vast and overwhelming. In Shakespeare studies, however, this adaptable, overlapping conceptual vocabulary in fact seems worth retaining since it is an important feature of the works themselves. It would be difficult, for example, to make a hard and fast distinction between 'motions' and 'affections' in Lorenzo's description in *The Merchant of Venice* of a man who remains unmoved by music: 'The motions of his spirit are dull as night / And his affections dark as Erebus.'[7] Motions are sometimes integral features of the self or spirit, as in the lines above; at other times, motion and spirit seem distinct from or even at odds with one another. In *Othello*, for example, Brabantio describes Desdemona as 'Of spirit so still and quiet that her motion / Blushed at herself'.[8] But if it seems futile to pin down one exact meaning for 'emotion', or to tease out precise differences between the broader descriptive terms for affective life, Shakespeare nevertheless still gives a name to happiness, grief, love, shame, anger and sympathy. And as we will see, particularly in the second half of *Shakespeare and Emotion*, his dramatisation of such emotions remains richly responsive to analysis. Taking a wide and generous view of what emotions are and do, this volume's contributors argue, through Shakespeare's works, that emotion can be understood not only as a pattern of dispositions, attitudes or behaviours but also as a kind of evanescence or dispersal; a version of surrogacy or substitution; a recognisable habitus which is vulnerable to

[6] *Measure for Measure*, 3.2.98. Here Lucio is describing, in a rather different context, Angelo's unfitness to govern Vienna.
[7] *The Merchant of Venice*, 5.1.86–7. [8] *Othello*, 1.3.95–6.

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

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

perverse disruption; an experience of stalling which poses an affront to settled cognition; or a set of conditions inseparable from life itself. In every chapter, however, emotion involves the dynamic and often unpredictable capacity for transformation suggested by *emovere*.

Many early modern playwrights and poets wrote in interesting ways about inwardness. *Shakespeare and Emotion* proposes however that Shakespeare's works are particularly vivid in this respect, and especially rich in their engagement with ancient and medieval traditions. Scholars have found persuasive evidence of Shakespeare's engagement with Plato's soul in which the emotions tug, often irresistibly, against our ability to live and act reasonably and Aristotle's soul, in which rational and irrational impulses become increasingly interdependent. He also inherited Cicero's account, in *Tusculan Disputations*, of the *perturbationes animi* (passions of the soul), which centre around the *aegritudines*, or distresses, and can be divided into four generic categories (pleasure and pain, desire and fear).[9] We know that Shakespeare engaged with stoic philosophy, especially Seneca's account of how emotions impose unrealistic expectations upon the world, leading inevitably towards frustration and disappointment.[10] He had absorbed the church fathers' view of emotional and ethical life as intricately intertwined, a view encapsulated in Augustine's description, in *On Free Will*, of the mortal struggle to temper with *ratio* (reason) the *motus animae* (motions of the soul), which would otherwise always draw the appetitive desire towards sin. Particularly important, too, is Thomas Aquinas' later identification of the eleven fundamental passions made up of six concupiscible and five irascible forces, which reside somewhere between the soul's lower parts and the higher 'intellective' ones shared by God.[11] All of these systems informed the early modern theory of the humours which depended on principles of shifting flux. And all of them filtered, in various combinations, into early modern affective life – although never straightforwardly into Shakespeare's works. For while certain emotional regimes, scripts and repertoires are evident in the plays and poems, Shakespeare's grasp of emotional life was not anchored in any

[9] Barbara Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600–1700* (Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp. 16–24.

[10] A concise summary of ancient Greek and Roman ideas about emotion, including Seneca's, can be found in Robert Solomon's 'The Philosophy of Emotions' in *Handbook of Emotions*, eds. Michael Lewis, Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones and Lisa Feldman Barrett (New York: Guilford Press, 2008), pp. 3–16 (5–6).

[11] For an account of Thomist *passiones animae*, see Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling*, pp. 144–68 (esp. 150).

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

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

one system, as the following essays together make clear. Instead the capaciousness of his imagination allowed him to move flexibly within, between and outside these systems, sketching an eclectic and improvisatory version of somaticism which does justice to the unsystematised business of living.

The sheer volume of ancient and early modern emotional taxonomies suggests an enduring cultural desire to sort and order phenomena that are exceptionally difficult to sort and order. However, their variety and mutual incompatibility also betray the important fact that emotional states may be composite, blended and fugitive, and Shakespeare often acknowledged the difficulties involved in capturing complex feeling within fixed frameworks. Every available emotional system 'gave the soul a kind of geography', as Barbara Rosenwein has put it, but such orderly methodologies sometimes seem at odds with the emotional crises Shakespeare was interested in exploring.[12] The emotions experienced by his characters can be mercurial, speedy or evanescent, particularly when connected to desire: witness Orsino's 'unstaid and skittish' motions in *Twelfth Night*, the speaker's 'swift motion' in the *Sonnets* or the 'raging motions' which Iago equates with 'unbitted lusts' in *Othello*.[13] Powerful drama indeed often arises in Shakespeare's works from the endlessly malleable spaces between experiencing, expressing and interpreting emotion, and the difficulty of articulating overwhelming feeling through the inadequate, artificial system of language itself. As Cordelia says, 'Love, and be silent'.[14] The opening scene of *King Lear* indeed prises open the fundamental human problem of determining the extent to which others' emotions are authentic (involuntarily felt) or artificial (voluntarily called up), and Shakespeare returned again and again to this key source of tension.

If the resistance of emotional complexity to pre-determined, logical structures lies at the centre of human trust and relationality, it also lies at the heart of performativity. Evelyn Tribble has recently argued that early modern actors cultivated in their bodies 'kinesic intelligence' based on movement, which, over time, became habituated and reproducible.[15] All the same, in order to seem authentic to an audience in the theatre, this skilful kinesis must chime with the unsystematised and unsystematisable 'motions' of the mind, body and soul. Jesuit thinker Thomas Wright is

12 Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling*, p. 149.
13 *Twelfth Night*, 2.4.16; Sonnet 45, line 4; *Othello*, 1.3.322.
14 *King Lear*, 1.1.62.
15 Evelyn Tribble, *Early Modern Actors and Shakespeare's Theatre: Thinking with the Body* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), p. 59.

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

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

often quoted as an important source on early modern emotional life, and his treatise *The Passions of the Minde in Generall* (1604) also contains an important note on how actors and orators create an impression of emotional genuineness:

> By mouth he telleth his minde; in countenance he speaketh with a silent voice to the eyes; with all the universal life and body hee seemeth to say 'Thus we move, because by the passion thus we are moved.'

Wright describes the link between emotion and self-expression as central to what we recognise as 'the universal life' – which may, in turn, be convincingly replicated through rhetorical or theatrical *imitatio*.[16] This illusion ('hee seemeth') only works, however, when the actor successfully conveys a sense of emotion as spontaneous, and therefore authentic, rather than predictably pre-determined. Spontaneous or non-voluntary emotions have always been marked out as cherishable, and this has been especially true in art ever since Horace noted that the best speakers first conjure up, in themselves, the emotions they seek to stir among their auditors: 'si vis me flere, dolendum est / primum ipsi tibi' ('If you would have me weep, you must first feel grief yourself'). And the principle that practised, habituated words and gestures, in a theatrical setting, should capture and convey the more unpractised and less habitual nature of emotion in 'the universal life and body' outside the theatre was as central to early modern theories of acting as it remains to such theories today.[17]

The relationship between acting and emotional authenticity preoccupied Shakespeare throughout his writing life, and his plays often associate failures of onstage lifelikeness with a disorienting scattering of the natural self. At the Roman marketplace, for example, Coriolanus regrets how far out of kilter his true feelings are from his required actions as the plebeians put him 'to such a part which never / I shall discharge to th'life'. To take the part of the humble supplicant would be to allow his body to be scattered into nothingness: 'they to dust should grind it / And throw't against the wind' (3.2.104–7). Whereas a gifted actor communicates emotional synthesis, an imperfect actor experiences only painful self-fragmentation. In the context of acting, Shakespeare seems as interested

[16] Thomas Wright, *The Passions of the Mind in General*, ed. William Webster Newbold (New York and London: Garland, 1986), p. 214. This passage is discussed further in Joseph R. Roach, *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting* (Newark and London: University of Delaware Press, 1985), p. 33.

[17] Horace, *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, ed. H. Rushton Fairclough (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), pp. 458–9.

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

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

in the fundamental composition of the feeling subject as in the mappable forces and counter-forces which direct our inward lives once we have begun living them. Again, as Hamlet remarks, shoddy actors look like botched up versions of nature made by apprentices, with all their patches and joins still showing: 'there be players that . . . have so strutted and bellowed that I have thought some of nature's journeymen had made men, and not made them well'.[18] Unsuccessful acts of emotional ventriloquising again create vexing forms of self-separation, and emotional exposure maps onto theatrical exposure. But it would be inaccurate to conclude that Shakespearean theatre always privileges emotional naturalism, or even that natural-seeming emotion can be understood as the opposite of emotional artifice. The very fact that Shakespearean characters keep drawing notice to their constructed personhood suggests that there is something dramatically useful about emotional life*likeness*, on its own terms, as a way of exploring affective relationship and ethical life. As the following chapters demonstrate, Shakespeare holds in productive tension the difference between emotion as natural or artificial, improvised or systematised, spontaneous or predetermined, synthesised or piecemeal; in so doing, he puts pressure on the boundaries between dramatic representation and the 'universal life' outside the theatre. In this way, his works constantly reflect upon, and reimagine, the ways art can revitalise the way we experience the world.

II

Such is the current excitement around emotion as a thriving research area that it is easy to forget that ours is not a new project but rather a rediscovery of largely forgotten critical trajectories from the early to mid-twentieth century. Recent scholarship on early modern subjectivity, including the problem of authenticity, builds in important ways on 'old historicist' work from the 1930s and 1940s by Shakespeareans such as Lily Campbell, Hardin Craig and Herschel Baker – and, even earlier, by A. C. Bradley whose *Shakespearean Tragedy* was published in 1904.[19] Back then, however, Shakespearean emotion looked incontrovertibly natural and unproblematically recognisable. For Craig in particular, each

[18] *Hamlet*, 3.2.24–8.
[19] See Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes: Slaves of Passion* (Cambridge University Press, 1930); Hardin Craig, *Shakespeare and the Normal World: A Course of Three Public Lectures* (Houston, TX: Rice Institute Pamphlet, 1944); Herschel Baker, *The Image of Man* (New York: Harper, 1947); and A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear and Macbeth* (1904; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991).

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

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

Shakespearean character resembles an 'actual person' with a recognisably authentic inner life who could step off the page and into the world. Craig set out to uncover Shakespeare's 'inclusive and revealing picture of human life as we believe it actually is', and celebrated his characters as fully realised, emotionally engaging people. We know that their emotions are authentic because we recognise them as our own: Shakespeare tells us 'that there is sadness in being a man, but that it is also a proud thing; and makes clear what the pride of it is until we cannot help feeling it'. Craig regarded immersion in Shakespearean emotion as a reliable route towards improved (specifically Christian) community and connectedness. Since everyone feels and has always felt love, courage and pride, Shakespeare's works remind us what we have in common with each other and with those who lived before us, including our shared capacity to be redeemed.[20] The notion that the feelings expressed in the plays are our own, no matter who we are, offers a powerful sense of solidarity which sits readily with an attachment to Shakespeare's natural genius. But this begs the question of who 'we' are – not to mention whether we recognise ourselves as a community worth saving.

How recognisable *are* the emotions represented in or ignited by Shakespeare's works to students and audiences encountering them for the first time now? Who is able, without struggle, to adopt Shakespeare's account of emotional life as her or his own; and what are the cultural stakes involved in doing so, or in failing to do so? Whereas an earlier generation of scholars found enduringly recognisable, natural feeling in the plays, readers are more likely, now, to make links between authenticity and affective diversity. This permits an important acknowledgement of our differences from one another, and from past cultures – but also, perhaps, our difference from ourselves. As Patricia T. Clough has written, we are familiar in our own cultural moment with 'the subject's discontinuity with itself, a discontinuity of the subject's conscious experience with the non-intentionality of emotion and affect'.[21] It may indeed be that this prominent and disorienting aspect of contemporary experience lies behind the current resurge of interest in the emotions not only in Shakespeare studies but in a wide variety of scholarly disciplines including philosophy, theology, history, psychology and the social sciences. Shakespeare seems well

[20] Craig, *Shakespeare and the Normal World*, pp. 47, 2 and 9.
[21] Patricia T. Clough, 'The Affective Turn: Political Economy, Biomedia, and Bodies' in *The Affect Theory Reader*, eds. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2010), pp. 206–25 (206).

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

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

attuned to subjective 'discontinuity' – and perhaps it is *this* aspect of early modern affective experience, which resonates, now, most clearly with our own. The time is ripe for a re-theorisation of the *recognisability* of Shakespearean emotion in today's very different cultural moment.[22]

If it no longer seems possible to claim that the emotional complexity of Shakespeare's characters is equally evident to everyone who experiences an emotionally rich life – let alone everyone who experiences an emotionally abundant faith – recognising our indebtedness to earlier generations of scholars nevertheless helps us to grasp the ways our recent reinvestment in Shakespearean emotion is triggered by our own circumstances. It is no coincidence that emotion-led methodologies have re-entered the academy at a time when its structures are becoming accessible to much wider demographics of students and scholars. The doors are still far from fully open – but the diversity of Shakespeareans in terms of gender and social class, if not yet race, has changed beyond recognition since the 1940s and 1950s. Part of the challenge, then, for scholars working in the field of Shakespeare and emotion is to push back against the truism that the affective intensity of the poems and plays echoes unproblematically in and for everyone. Attending thoughtfully to emotion involves disturbing some long-cherished ideas about our natural, sympathetic affinity to Shakespeare, and acknowledging instead the different and challenging affinities made possible through affective difference. Shifting attention away from emotional naturalism and putting pressure on the idea of recognisability (or relatability) may disturb some of the cultural associations which still, inside and outside the academy, keep Shakespeare's works the preserve of the establishment. One particular aim of *Shakespeare and Emotion*, then, especially in the essays that focus on the legacy of his works in the present, is to advocate for an increased critical sensitivity towards where we are speaking from.

Opportunities are always arising for us to engage with one another through Shakespeare's works in today's increasingly connected (and divided) world. In the course of the twentieth century, as the Shakespeare industry gained momentum, the plays became one of England's most recognisable cultural exports. The important project of decolonising Shakespeare has subsequently begun through initiatives such as the Globe to Globe Festival, which presented the plays in thirty-seven different

[22] On 'relatability' as a new criterion of value in the arts, especially in the theatre, see Kirsty Sedgman, 'Audience Experience in an Anti-expert Age', *Theatre Research International*, 42.3 (2017), 307–22. I owe this reference to Rebecca L. Fall.

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

CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-41616-0 — Shakespeare and Emotion
Edited by Katharine Craik
Excerpt
More Information

languages, prompting reflection on Shakespeare's ability to open up questions of nation, region and the politics of culture. Research emerging from these productions has tended to focus on affect, rather than text, and has begun the project of 'decentring' the study of the emotions away from exclusively western perspectives.[23] This work has considered, among other important issues, the ways in which Shakespeare's works achieve different forms of emotional traction in different contexts, in different theatrical spaces, and among different audiences. The essays in the present volume contribute to this conversation by considering Shakespeare through a variety of media (theatre, print, film) and by exploring the affective content of his works from eastern as well as western points of view. Shakespeare's extraordinary ability to flourish across cultures surely has potential, in today's globalised world, to signal emotional fraternity of a different sort from that recognised by Craig in 1944. Even if the emotional crises explored in the plays and poems seldom transmit unproblematically from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries into our own diffuse, troubled geo-political realities, they may still usefully and compassionately highlight the obstacles which make such correspondence choppy or imprecise.[24] The continuing life of the plays indeed surely depends on our willingness to acknowledge the imbalances of power, privilege and gender which make accessing the emotional lives of others so difficult, and so important. This acknowledgement involves squaring up to our differences from the past – the recent past, as well as more distant ones – rather than settling complacently into what looks like affective sameness.

III

Shakespeare and Emotion is organised in two main sections. Part I deals with a variety of historical, social and cultural contexts, while Part II is devoted to discussion of particular emotions in the form of a series of case studies. In both parts, and in keeping with the content of Shakespeare's

[23] See for example Edward Reiss, 'Globe to Globe: 37 Plays, 37 Languages', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 64.2 (2013), 220–32; and Amy Kenny, '"A Feast of Languages": The Role of Language in the Globe to Globe Festival', *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance*, 11.26 (2014), 31–44. Walter Andrews provides one model of how this 'decentring' might work in practice in 'Ottoman Love: Preface to a Theory of Emotional Ecoology' in *A History of Emotions, 1200–1800*, ed. Jonas Liliequist (Pickering & Chatto: London, 2012), pp. 21–47.

[24] On the prospect of charting a history of the emotions, and the challenges involved, see Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, trans. Keith Tribe (Oxford University Press, 2015), esp. pp. 32–3.

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