

Renaissance and Reformation Renaissance et Réforme



Saenger, Michael, ed. Interlinguicity, Internationality, and Shakespeare

Josephine Hardman

Volume 38, numéro 2, printemps 2015

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1087531ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v38i2.25642>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (imprimé)

2293-7374 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Hardman, J. (2015). Compte rendu de [Saenger, Michael, ed. Interlinguicity, Internationality, and Shakespeare]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 38(2), 193–195. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v38i2.25642>

© Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies / Société canadienne d'études de la Renaissance; Pacific Northwest Renaissance Society; Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium; Victoria University Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies, 2015

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>

tell stories that follow Radisson himself in blurring the ethnic, linguistic, and national boundaries through which we have come to understand the period.

CHRISTOPHER M. PARSONS

Northeastern University

Saenger, Michael, ed.

Interlinguicity, Internationality, and Shakespeare.

Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014. Pp. xii, 278. ISBN 978-0-7735-4474-1 (paperback) \$32.95.

Interlinguicity, Internationality, and Shakespeare is concerned with points of contact and moments of exchange among languages, cultures, and time periods. The collection investigates the relationship between early modern language(s) and our own, focusing on the delineation and transgression of cultural and linguistic borders. The book's primary emphasis remains, however, on early modern culture: out of ten essays, only the final two move beyond the Renaissance to the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries. The collection's overarching question, posed by editor Michael Saenger, is: "how did linguistically marked social encounters affect the early modern international world, and how have they functioned since then in Shakespearean adaptation?" (12).

Contributors to the collection respond to this question in three sections. In the opening section, "The Meaning of Foreign Languages," Elizabeth Pentland offers a historical analysis of Navarre's geographical, political, and cultural situation in the sixteenth century to illuminate facets of the fictional (or pseudo-historical) Navarre of *Love's Labour's Lost*. Philip Schwyzer focuses on the problematic—or productive—empty spaces in Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part 1* where stage directions call for Welsh speeches not provided in the surviving texts; Schwyzer ultimately questions how much Welsh dialogue an "English-speaking audience [is] likely to absorb without shuffling and resentment" (56). In the section's third essay, Gary K. Waite moves beyond early modern English drama to discuss the curious lack of demonizing language in Dutch religious polemic. Waite attributes the Dutch approach to the language of controversy to "the merchant ethic and prosperity of the Dutch society" and the cultural emphasis on Spiritualism, with its tenets of toleration and inner religiosity (71).

Section 2, “Difference Within English,” shifts the focus from foreign languages to Shakespeare’s English. Scott Newstok’s essay on *Henry V* explores Shakespeare’s use of “twinomials,” which he defines as “two near-synonyms from different root systems,” in this case Germanic and Latinate roots (76). These twinomials reveal a fundamental hybridity in Shakespeare’s language and, more broadly, in early modern English. In one of the collection’s strongest essays, Robert N. Watson extends this turn to philology by examining Shakespeare’s coining of words. Watson draws a fruitful analogy between the coining of speech and the coining of currency, discussing the role of theatre in London’s emergent economic model. Patricia Parker turns to Shakespearean “sound effects,” including polyglot soundings—such as “all ways” and “always,” which require “hearing with the eye” but also “seeing with the ear”—and Shakespeare’s use of foreign words that are spelled one way but that sound like another word in English (109). Parker argues that these “polyglot sound jests” ultimately fashioned and determined culture and cultural definitions (115). Lauren Coker explores, through convincing close reading, the construction of lascivious and taboo Continental sexuality in *The Duchess of Malfi* and *Henry V*, arguing that Webster and Shakespeare use one particular pun, “horseman/whores-man,” to exploit the association of Continental horsemanship with bestiality, prostitution, and incest. In the section’s final essay, Paula Blank proposes an “interlinguistic” model for approaching Shakespeare: a way of reading that encourages modern English speakers to adopt an “anachronistic disposition” towards Shakespeare and, rather than stifling our historically erroneous impressions of Shakespeare’s language, allows them to tell a story of English “that includes us” (140).

The final section, “Shakespeare and Cultural Voice,” features two widely disparate essays. The collection’s most densely theoretical essay by Brian Gingrich discusses an early 1850s Swiss translation of *Romeo and Juliet*, focusing on roots, monuments, and mountains as figures of cultural and linguistic translation. Gingrich moves from discussing these figures on a conceptual level—the “monumental order” made up of a source text’s signifiers—to discussing them concretely—the actual Alps, for instance, which Goethe used to describe Shakespeare. The essay is partly a case study of a particular translation, but also more broadly a densely theoretical exploration of translation, cultural and conceptual “monuments,” and issues of literary patrilineage, influence, and legitimacy. The final essay by Alexa Huang shifts to performance, offering case

studies of John R. Briggs's intercultural production *Shogun Macbeth* (1985) and of the London Globe's multilingual World Shakespeare Festival during the 2012 Olympics. Drawing attention to performances of Shakespeare in languages other than English, or transplanted to foreign settings, or featuring multiracial casts, Huang suggests that one of theatre's most productive functions is as a testing ground for intercultural tolerance and exchange.

Saenger's introductory claim that the collection accords Shakespeare a "limited centrality" to look beyond the Shakespeare-centrism of early modern studies does not seem to hold up completely, given that nine of the ten essays are primarily about Shakespeare. In some ways, the volume reaffirms Shakespeare's cachet and exploits his commercial appeal, displaying his face prominently on the cover and including his name in the title. Many of the individual essays are fruitful and engaging in their own right, expanding the current turn to foreign influences on early modern English drama and literature, as well engaging with the renewed focus on England's place in a global world. The collection is methodologically eclectic, approaching the subject from textual, theoretical, linguistic, and performative stances. Perhaps the volume seems to define "internationality" somewhat narrowly, focusing on English, Dutch, and French languages and cultures (with the exception of Alexa Huang's investigation of multicultural and multilingual productions of Shakespeare in the final essay). Where do Spain and Italy, for instance, figure in this discussion, considering the significant influence of their languages and cultures on early modern English literature? Despite these quibbles, the essays succeed in contributing to a productive re-evaluation of Shakespeare's language and our modern understanding(s) of it, and in opening up further avenues for investigation.

JOSEPHINE HARDMAN

University of Massachusetts Amherst