

THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE



BROADCAST  
YOUR  
SHAKESPEARE

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE  
ACROSS MEDIA

Edited by Stephen O'Neill

B L O O M S B U R Y



# Broadcast Your Shakespeare

## RELATED TITLES

*Playing Indoors:  
Staging Early Modern Drama in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse*  
Will Tosh  
ISBN 978-1-350-01388-9

*Queering the Shakespeare Film*  
Anthony Guy Patricia  
ISBN 978-1-474-23703-1

*Shakespeare's Artists*  
B. J. Sokol  
ISBN 978-1-350-02193-8

*Shakespeare's Pictures:  
Visual Culture in the Drama*  
Keir Elam  
ISBN 978-1-408-17975-8

*Shakespeare and Greece*  
Edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou  
ISBN 978-1-474-24425-1

*Shakespeare's Fathers and Daughters*  
Oliver Ford Davies  
ISBN 978-1-350-03846-2

*Stage Directions and Shakespearean Theatre*  
Edited by Sarah Dustagheer and Gillian Woods  
ISBN 978-1-474-25747-3

# Broadcast Your Shakespeare

Continuity and Change  
Across Media

*Edited by Stephen O'Neill*

THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE

LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE  
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc  
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK  
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA

BLOOMSBURY, THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE and the Arden Shakespeare logo  
are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2018  
Paperback edition first published 2019

Copyright © Stephen O'Neill and contributors, 2018

Stephen O'Neill has asserted his right under the Copyright,  
Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as editor of this work.

For legal purposes the Acknowledgements on p. xiv constitute an  
extension of this copyright page.

Cover design: Irene Martinez Costa  
Cover image © Joss Barrat

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or  
transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical,  
including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval  
system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc does not have any control over, or responsibility for,  
any third-party websites referred to or in this book. All internet addresses given  
in this book were correct at the time of going to press. The author and publisher  
regret any inconvenience caused if addresses have changed or sites have  
ceased to exist, but can accept no responsibility for any such changes.

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

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-474-29511-6  
PB: 978-1-3501-1882-9  
ePDF: 978-1-474-29512-3  
eBook: 978-1-474-29513-0

Typeset by Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

To find out more about our authors and books visit  
[www.bloomsbury.com](http://www.bloomsbury.com) and sign up for our newsletters.

# CONTENTS

*List of Illustrations* viii

*Notes on Contributors* ix

*Acknowledgements* xiv

*Note on Procedures and Abbreviations* xvi

Introduction: 'Sowed and Scattered':  
Shakespeare's Media Ecologies 1  
*Stephen O'Neill*

## PART ONE The Politics of Broadcast(ing) Shakespeare

- 1 Broadcasting Censorship: Hollywood's  
Production Code and  
*A Midsummer Night's Dream* 27  
*Darlana Ciraulo*
- 2 Broadcasting the Bard: Orson Welles,  
Shakespeare and War 47  
*Robert Sawyer*
- 3 This Distracted Globe, This Brave New World:  
Learning from the MIT Global Shakespeares'  
Twenty-First Century 67  
*Diana E. Henderson*

- 4 'Once more to the breach!': Shakespeare,  
Wikipedia's Gender Gap and the Online,  
Digital Elite 87  
*David C. Moberly*

## PART TWO Genre and Audience

- 5 *Emo Hamlet*: Locating Shakespearean Affect in  
Social Media 107  
*Christy Desmet*
- 6 'It Is Worth the Listening To': The Phonograph  
and the Teaching of Shakespeare in Early-  
Twentieth-Century America 123  
*Joseph Haughey*
- 7 Juliet, Tumblr: Fan Renovations of  
Shakespeare's Juliet on Tumblr 141  
*Kirk Hendershott-Kraetzer*
- 8 'Certain o'er uncertainty': *Troilus and Cressida*,  
Ambiguity and the *Lewis* Episode 'Generation  
of Vipers' 161  
*Sarah Olive*

## PART THREE Broadcast the Self: Celebrity and Identity

- 9 Vlogging the Bard: Serialization, Social Media,  
Shakespeare 185  
*Douglas M. Lanier*



- 10 Tweeting Television/Broadcasting the  
Bard: @HollowCrownFans and Digital  
Shakespeares 207  
*Romano Mullin*
- 11 'Somewhere in the world ... Someone  
misquoted Shakespeare. I can sense it': Tom  
Hiddleston Performing the Shakespearean  
Online 227  
*Anna Blackwell*
- Afterword: Special Affects:  
Performing Resistance Through  
Narrowcasting 247  
*Courtney Lehmann*
- Notes* 256  
*Index* 307

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- 1.1 ‘Oberon, King of the Fairies, rules the Fairy Kingdom’ from *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1935), directed by Max Reinhardt and William Dieterle (Warner Brothers). Reprinted with permission of ‘The Cleveland Press Shakespeare Photographs: 1870–1982 Collection’, Special Collections, Michael Schwartz Library, Cleveland State University 29
- 1.2 ‘As the two couples continue their quarrelling, Oberon causes night to fall in the forest’ from *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1935), directed by Max Reinhardt and William Dieterle (Warner Brothers). Reprinted with permission of ‘The Cleveland Press Shakespeare Photographs: 1870–1982 Collection’, Special Collections, Michael Schwartz Library, Cleveland State University 43
- 6.1 ‘Mark Antony’s Curse’ recording, 1895. Photo courtesy Michael W. Sherman, Monarch Record Enterprises 124
- 6.2 The Victor Record Company advertisement in the *English Journal*, February 1923. Copyright 1923 and 1941 by the National Council of Teachers of English; reprinted with permission 130

# NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

**Anna Blackwell** is an Early Career Academic Fellow working in the Centre for Adaptations, De Montfort University. She has published on the topic of the contemporary Shakespearean actor in *Critical Survey* and *Adaptation*, and her continuing research on the intersections between Shakespeare and popular digital culture can be seen in edited collections including, *Shakespeare's Cultural Capital: His Economic Impact from the Sixteenth to the Twenty-First Century* and the forthcoming *Routledge Companion to Adaptation*. She is currently writing a monograph for inclusion in the Palgrave Studies in Adaptation and Visual Culture series.

**Darlena Ciraulo** is Professor of English at the University of Central Missouri, where she specializes in Renaissance literature, especially Shakespeare. Her work on Shakespeare and appropriation has appeared in *Philological Quarterly*, *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation* and *Philosophy and Literature*. Her passion for visual culture has led to research on Shakespeare, art and film; she has in this area written an article on botanical illustration in *Romeo and Juliet* (2015) and on Shakespeare in Western films (*Multicultural Shakespeare*, forthcoming). She is currently working on a book-length project that explores Shakespeare in the mythic American West.

**Christy Desmet** was Josiah Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor at the University of Georgia. She is the author of *Reading Shakespeare's Characters: Rhetoric, Ethics, and Identity* and co-editor of *Shakespeare and Appropriation* (with Robert Sawyer), *Harold Bloom's Shakespeare* (with Robert

Sawyer), *Shakespearean Gothic* (with Anne Williams) and a volume on Helen Faucit, the nineteenth-century Shakespearean actress and critic. With Sujata Iyengar, she co-founded and was co-general editor of *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation*. Her work focused on Shakespearean appropriation and on Shakespeare in new media and digital contexts.

**Joseph Haughey** is Assistant Professor of English at Northwest Missouri State University, where he teaches courses in literature and pedagogy. His current research projects trace Shakespeare's ever-evolving role in American secondary curricula, from the early nineteenth century – when excerpts from his plays appeared in readers not as literature but as exemplars for teaching public speaking – to the present, focusing particularly on its historical intersections with educational technological advancement and progressive teaching methods (e.g. web- and performance-based approaches), as well as the influence of wider theoretical and critical underpinnings in the teaching of Shakespeare's plays and poetry over time.

**Kirk Hendershott-Kraetzer** is Professor of Humanities and Co-Director of the Global Citizen Honors Program at Olivet College, where he teaches Shakespeare, film, creative writing, composition and rhetoric and literature. His long-standing research interest is performances of Shakespearean texts in film and television, with more recent forays into the construction of knowledge and identity and into representations of Shakespeare in social media. His work has appeared in *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation* and *The Selected Papers of the Ohio Valley Shakespeare Conference*.

**Diana E. Henderson** is Professor of Literature and MacVicar Faculty Fellow at MIT, co-editor of *Shakespeare Studies* and a former president of the Shakespeare Association of

America. Her publications include *Passion Made Public: Elizabethan Lyric, Gender and Performance*; *Collaborations with the Past: Reshaping Shakespeare Across Time and Media*; *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare on Screen*; and *Alternative Shakespeares 3*, as well as over forty Shakespeare-related articles. She has worked with the Royal Shakespeare Company, the Actors' Shakespeare Company, the Potomac Theater Company, the New York Theater Workshop, the Huntington Theater Company and the Central Square Theater as consultant, featured speaker or dramaturg.

**Douglas Lanier** is Professor of English at the University of New Hampshire; for 2016–17, he served as Fulbright Global Shakespeare Center Distinguished Professor at Queen Mary University of London and University of Warwick. His book *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* appeared in 2002. He has published widely on Shakespeare in mass media, as well as on Shakespeare, Jonson, Milton, the Jacobean masque and literature pedagogy. He is currently working on two book projects, a study of *Othello* on screen and a book on *The Merchant of Venice* for the Arden Language & Writing series.

**Courtney Lehmann** is the Tully Knoles Professor of the Humanities at the University of the Pacific. She is the author of *Shakespeare Remains* (2002) and *Screen Adaptations: Romeo and Juliet* (Methuen Series in Drama, 2010), as well as co-author of *Great Shakespeareans, Volume XVII* (Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013) and co-editor of *Spectacular Shakespeare: Critical Theory and Popular Cinema* (FDU Press, 2002) and *The Reel Shakespeare: Alternative Cinema and Theory* (FDU Press, 2002). In 2016, she was the recipient of the Distinguished Faculty Award, the highest honour a faculty member can achieve at the University of the Pacific. She has published more than thirty-five articles and essays on Shakespeare and cinema and is currently completing a book on women directors of Shakespeare films.

**David C. Moberly** is completing a dissertation at the University of Minnesota entitled *Taming of the Tigress: Gender, Shakespeare, and the Arab World*. His publications include an article in *Critical Survey* on the first Arabic *Taming of the Shrew* and a chapter on the Irene myth in *Dialectics of Orientalism in Early Modern Europe* (2017). Global Shakespeares, Shakespeare translation, adaptation, and the digital humanities make up his core research interests. He is also a co-author with Margaret Litvin of the *Shakespeare in the Arab World* blog. He has presented his work at the World Shakespeare Congress and the Shakespeare Association of America.

**Romano Mullin** teaches English Literature at Queen's University Belfast, where he recently completed his PhD on the cultural afterlives of the Renaissance in the twenty-first century. His research interests include Shakespeare in film and digital cultures.

**Sarah Olive** is Senior Lecturer in English in Education at the University of York. She is also a Visiting Lecturer at the Shakespeare Institute, University of Birmingham. Her monograph *Shakespeare Valued: Education Policy and Pedagogy, 1989–2009* was published by Intellect in 2015. She is also the Chair of the British Shakespeare Association's Education Committee, the founding editor of *Teaching Shakespeare* and the founder of the Education Network blog. Her research interests are in Shakespeare in popular culture and education, primarily in the UK and East Asia.

**Stephen O'Neill** is Senior Lecturer in the Department of English, Maynooth University-National University of Ireland Maynooth. He is the author of two books, *Shakespeare and YouTube: New Media Forms of the Bard* (Arden Shakespeare, 2014) and *Staging Ireland: Representations in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama* (2007), and co-editor with Janet Clare of *Shakespeare and the Irish Writer* (2010). His articles and book chapters include work on Shakespeare and Ireland, Hip-Hop

Shakespeare, social media Shakespeares and Shakespeare and quotation. With Maurizio Calbi, he co-edited the special issue of *Borrowers and Lenders* on 'Shakespeare and Social Media' (2016).

**Robert Sawyer** is Professor of English at East Tennessee State University, where he teaches Shakespeare, Victorian Literature and Literary Criticism. Author of *Victorian Appropriations of Shakespeare* (FDU Press, 2003), he is also co-editor of *Shakespeare and Appropriation* (Routledge, 1999) and *Harold Bloom's Shakespeare* (Palgrave, 2001). His most recent publication is a book chapter entitled "'A Whirl of Aesthetic Terminology": Swinburne, Shakespeare, and Ethical Criticism' in *Shakespeare and the Ethics of Appropriation* (Palgrave, 2014). His book entitled *Marlowe and Shakespeare: The Critical Rivalry* was published by Palgrave in 2017, and his next book project, *Shakespeare Between the World Wars*, will be published in 2018. He is currently co-editing a special issue of *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance* entitled 'Shakespeare in Cross-Cultural Spaces'.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would sincerely like to thank all of the contributors for their hard work and patience, as they responded to suggestions and to what was hopefully not an overly demanding editorial process. Multiples of emails and track changes later, they can now see how their chapters combine to broadcast Shakespeare. The idea for this collection first emerged from a seminar I convened at the 43rd meeting of the Shakespeare Association of America, held in Vancouver, 2015. Thanks are due to the original set of participants, some of whom are among the contributors here, as well as to Mark Thornton Burnett for suggesting the idea of such a seminar and to Katherine Rowe and the SAA board for supporting it. Indeed, the SAA's continuing support and development of research on adaptations and media approaches to Shakespeare is both encouraging and valuable. Other individuals need to be mentioned here because they variously enabled, assisted and helped frame the shape of the volume: Pascale Aebischer and Peter Kirwan each gave terrific feedback and encouragement on the original proposal; Robert Sawyer, in addition to supplying a chapter, offered sage advice and suggestions; Courtney Lehmann generously agreed to give of her time to write the Afterword; and Maurizio Calbi kindly offered comments on the Introduction. Thanks are also due to colleagues closer to home; to the supportive research culture at Maynooth University, where humanities research and scholarship continues to be valued in and of itself; and to my colleagues in the Department of English. Thanks to my partner Andy Whelan for listening to me talk about this book for more time than he would have cared for, and for helping with the index. I would also like to thank Margaret Bartley at Bloomsbury for her support of the volume throughout; to



Susan Furber for her careful management of the project into completion; to the peer reviewer for insightful, productive and detailed feedback; and to those individuals who worked on the cover art and the book's production, especially Manikandan Kuppan at Integra. It is a privilege to be published by the Arden Shakespeare and to contribute a media focus to its rich history of Shakespeare scholarship and criticism.

It is with sadness that, since the publication of the hardback edition and this paperback, one of the contributors Professor Christy Desmet passed away. Her essay in this volume is one among her host of publications that made such a formative contribution to Shakespeare studies. The editor and publisher extend their sympathies to Christy's partner, David, her colleagues Sujata Iyengar, Robert Sawyer and Darlena Ciraulo, and the network of Shakespeareans that will continue to use and appreciate her work.

*Stephen O'Neill, December 2018, Dublin.*

# NOTE ON PROCEDURES AND ABBREVIATIONS

All Shakespeare quotations are from the Arden Shakespeare Third Series and, where not yet available, from the Second Series.

OED    *Oxford English Dictionary*

SQ    *Shakespeare Quarterly*

SS    *Shakespeare Survey*

SSt    *Shakespeare Studies*

# Introduction: ‘Sowed and Scattered’

## Shakespeare’s Media Ecologies

*Stephen O’Neill*

Shakespeare studies is experiencing a media turn. This is evident in the way that scholars in the field are giving serious critical attention to the proliferation of vernacular produced Shakespeare materials online. It is evident in the increasing interest in Shakespeare’s media histories or, more precisely, in how Shakespeare – here understood as an assemblage of texts – finds iteration through specific, yet interconnected, media technologies such as radio, TV, film and digital platforms. It is evident too in the recognition of how Shakespeare has so often been mobilized to legitimate a new technology or serve as its launch content.<sup>1</sup> To such well-known examples as Alexander Graham Bell quoting ‘To be or not to be’ in the earliest demonstrations of the telephone might be added

the uncanny reappearances of Shakespeares in vlogs, tweets, memes, computer games and other stand-out media genres of the early twenty-first century.<sup>2</sup> The present volume builds on work in the field around the related areas of adaptation and appropriation across literary, popular cultures and digital cultures, as well as Shakespeare's media histories.<sup>3</sup> A media-consciousness has asserted itself in international Shakespeare studies, although more recent work owes much to scholarship on Shakespeare in performance, as well as to Shakespeare and film. The nature of this volume's contribution to the field and to what is an ever-evolving understanding of what Shakespeare constitutes is captured in its title: *Broadcast Your Shakespeare* aims to examine and critically reflect on the intersection of each of its terms. The particular word combination recalls Cole Porter's 'Brush Up Your Shakespeare', from the musical *Kiss Me Kate* (dir. George Sidney, 1953). This citation provides a figure for media iterations of Shakespeare more generally, where what is discovered is a repetition of Shakespeare the cultural icon as a seemingly stable property (as in the case of Porter's lyrics, where Shakespeare is the epitome of high culture and, more problematically, traditional masculinity, making women 'kow-tow'), but also repetition with a difference, as the texts return in potentially new guises. As *Kiss Me Kate*, a seemingly post-'proper' Shakespeare text, becomes entangled with Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, which is already bound up with Shakespeare's cultural capital, it becomes difficult to draw clear lines of demarcation between Shakespeare/'Shakespeare(s)'. Such media crossovers powerfully suggest that mediatized survival has long been an intrinsic part of the 'living-dead' Bard, rather than some ex-post-facto addition.<sup>4</sup> This dimension alone makes the turn to media within Shakespeare studies engaging and signals new ways of thinking about Shakespeare's (re)appearance in writing and cultural productions.

## Sowings: 'Broadcast' and other terms

'Broadcast' is firstly understood to entail transmission on a large scale as with radio and TV, but also to denote forms of vernacular media production, as captured in YouTube's original strapline 'Broadcast Yourself', with its connotation of empowered individual media users as the 'broadcasters of tomorrow'.<sup>5</sup> It is precisely in such connections between older and newer media that this volume is interested. The connections that emerge are neither casual nor incidental but instead reflect the condition of the contemporary mediascape as comprising a variety of coexisting media technologies and platforms that remediate aspects of each other and perform their social functions.<sup>6</sup> Chapters are arranged thematically rather than chronologically, and move between traditional media and newer forms such as the database and social media networks, with no one medium prioritized. Foregrounding how Shakespeare is sowed and scattered, this arrangement should enable readers to attend to the continuities, sometimes surprising, between old and new media iterations of Shakespeare. As such, this volume unfolds a deep understanding of the history of Shakespeare in media, one that challenges that relation as linear or as progressing towards some end point of absolute sophistication.

The volume takes its cue from recent media-oriented approaches to Shakespeare. It considers Shakespeare as situated in and informed by a complex media ecology, which Ingo Berensmeyer defines as 'the networked, interlocking structure of different media and media configurations'.<sup>7</sup> Proposing media ecology as a critical paradigm for interpreting the Shakespeare phenomenon, Berensmeyer argues that attention to media in Shakespeare's own works and in the texts' media afterlives allows for a dialectic rather than a binary of difference and continuity, bridging the gap between the apparent extremes of historicist and presentist interpretations of Shakespeare. This dialectical approach involves recognizing the newness

or difference of the most recent media refashionings of Shakespeare and, at the same time, attending to these as accretions: 'new media configurations', Berensmeyer suggests, 'add new layers of meaning to texts from the past by inserting them into new contexts'.<sup>8</sup> They are, furthermore, performative accretions, in that they 'do not imitate or replicate something given; they actively shape reality', and do so in the context of other media.<sup>9</sup> The emphasis on contextual relationality is a reminder not to overstate medium specificity, since the attributes, appearance and operations of one medium can only ever be understood in relation to other media. As Richard Burt and Julian Yates argue, media-specific experiences of Shakespeare are in fact 'a series of variable frame effects predicated upon other media'.<sup>10</sup> A pure, linear sense of Shakespeare's progression through successive media (this might look something like from theatre-to-book-to-radio-to-film-to-TV-to-social media) is a fallacy that belies the entanglements of media platforms within the media ecology.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, interpreting Shakespeare's media histories as a set of entanglements or interruptions need not be a deficit – as Alan Galey cautions, in desiring 'purity in transmission we can overlook the pleasures of contamination', limiting the potential of media to regenerate or renew Shakespeare for successive audiences.<sup>12</sup>

To think further about how Shakespeare *becomes* through media, one can look to a second understanding of 'broadcast', that is its use, dating from the late 1700s and early 1800s, in agriculture, as in to 'sow by scattering'. Tracing the term, and its application to radio and TV, James Hamilton explains how the farmer progresses through a field, scooping a handful of seeds from a seed bag and casting them through the air in the hopes that they germinate and grow into crops to be later harvested.<sup>13</sup> The practice establishes a key dynamic about the relation between the human user and media. Shakespeare himself draws on harvesting metaphors, most notably in *Coriolanus*, where Coriolanus figures the plebeians' discontent as a function of patrician appeasement: the 'very

cockle of rebellion', he claims, has been 'ploughed for, sowed and scattered / By mingling them with us'.<sup>14</sup> Without using the word, Coriolanus speaks of things being broadcast by individuals, by a collective, but also, he implies, by nature's hidden operations, as the seeds of rebellion take root. It is this connection between human action and the workings of nature that renders broadcasting as agricultural practice especially significant as a metaphor for 'media broadcasting', a term whose 'trajectory', Hamilton argues, 'can be understood as a complex historical process of mystification and naturalization – the transmogrification of a human muscle-powered activity into a non-human, invisible force of nature'.<sup>15</sup> In this metaphor, media objects entail volitional human action but also processes that come to function semi-automatically, acquiring a technological or non-human agency, so that Shakespeare is the seed that is scattered not merely by human hands but by the very processes of media technologies themselves.<sup>16</sup> This resonates with debates about the hidden algorithmic operations of new media platforms but, as the following chapters demonstrate, there is a longer history of medium agency in the constitution and experience of Shakespeare.<sup>17</sup>

The volume puts forth a sense of a Shakespeare as something that is sowed in the media ecology and scattered through it. This second understanding is conceptually useful for Shakespeare studies. It complicates universalizing claims about Shakespeare's 'presence throughout the world as the common currency of humanity', recently made by Stephen Greenblatt, and instead interprets Shakespeare as something that is disseminated, dispersed or cast abroad through a complexity of networks in which, as humans, we are situated.<sup>18</sup> 'Broadcast Shakespeare' as a concept – and critical paradigm – thus provokes several issues. It raises the question of a medium's role in the production of Shakespeare as global. It further provokes concern about media iterations of Shakespeare as forms of dilution and loss, a leaving behind of the 'thing itself' in favour of a copy, derivation or perhaps a 'mingling' (to recall Coriolanus' pejorative phrase) of Shakespeare with

other media objects, although media adaptations may just as readily forge a sense of Shakespeare's proximity to us as they do an impression of Shakespeare's historical remoteness. A third and related sense comes into play, of broadcast as 'volume', or as the amplification of Shakespeare through and across media. This sense of a proliferation, or even a surfeit of Shakespearean content, bears comparison with the digital age of the twenty-first century as characterized by not so much information flow as 'infoglut'.<sup>19</sup> Yet older media such as radio and the phonograph, discussed in Robert Sawyer's and Joseph Haughey's chapters, respectively, in their own ways contributed to the spread of Shakespeare to audiences on a mass scale.

The title's possessive pronoun – 'your Shakespeare' – may seem to contradict this massification of Shakespeare to an amorphous collective audience, and to leave aside the individual respondent, producer or viewer. However, all of the chapters in various ways address the human agent involved in the production and consumption of Shakespeare within and through specific media. In fact, and to borrow from Burt and Yates's interpretation of the First Folio's appeal to the reader, 'the phenomenon that was, is, and will be "Shakespeare"' is a function of the dynamic between text, media and the reader, the latter being the necessary 'biosemiotic motor that enables "Shakespeare" to go viral'.<sup>20</sup> What further emerges is an understanding of Shakespeare as constituted by human actors as they variously use, respond to or repurpose media or find themselves habituated by a medium's properties and its politics. This expands or reframes what is meant by authenticity vis-à-vis Shakespeare since, as Romano Mullin notes in his chapter, each user's recognition and deployment of Shakespeare comes to be considered authentic on its own terms. Moreover, the contributors to this volume can each be understood as producing their own Shakespeare in the process of critical analysis and in the context of the interpretive community that is Shakespeare studies, its critical paradigms and parameters. Writing and speaking across professional fields are themselves



forms of broadcasting, as Diana Henderson notes in this volume, and the imagined 'your' of the volume title will no doubt resonate differently among participants in the field of international Shakespeare studies. How the personal enters into Shakespeare studies – or how personal Shakespeare becomes for us as critics and writers – is, as Arthur Little Jr argues, bound up with historically valorized claims for Shakespeare as unmarked white property.<sup>21</sup> As critics, readers, theatregoers or viewers of media screens, 'we' (that collective postulated in scholarly writing) share and sustain Shakespeare again and again but also, and from varying degrees of access and privilege, broadcast our identities as these are informed by such categories as race, class, gender and sexuality. In a sense, then, the personal is always already part of the conversation about Shakespeare, about what we do in and through that signifier.

So to 'Shakespeare', the final term in the title, which may appear to require the least elaboration, although one that still proves contentious, even within early-modern studies itself.<sup>22</sup> Some glosses or explanations have already been suggested – Shakespeare as an assemblage; Shakespeare as a proliferation (signalled in the field through the increasingly normative use of the pluralized form); Shakespeare as historical process or phenomenon, as in something that has an origin or fixed point ('sowed') *in*, but is also recurrent *through*, history ('scattered'). None of these operate in isolation. Nor is a Shakespeare play regarded in the following chapters as an entirely relativist formulation bereft of its own internal logic or agency. Shakespeare is sufficiently capacious to provide for a range of significations. To return to 'Brush Up Your Shakespeare', in addition to interpreting Porter's lyrics as an appropriation of Shakespearean value for *Kiss Me Kate*'s assertion of heterosexual masculine desire, they can be read as appropriations in another sense, that is as arrogating value on to the individual such that Shakespeare becomes an agential property, one available not just to the song's protagonist, but to all.

## The politics of broadcast(ing) Shakespeare

The example of 'Brush Up Your Shakespeare' alerts us to broader questions about what Shakespeare signifies, how Shakespeare's cultural capital is deployed and the politics of popular culture and media adaptations of Shakespeare. Part One addresses these questions in its focus on the politics of broadcasting Shakespeare, although politics is a thread that runs through all of the contributions. It leads off with Darlena Ciraulo's chapter, which plays with broadcast as a conceptual tool in order to interpret Max Reinhardt and William Dieterle's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1935) in the context of Hollywood's Production Code, a censorious set of guidelines that sought to spread moral values through the industry. Ciraulo uncovers competing understandings of the ideological affordances of Shakespeare as broadcast or remediated through the filmic medium. The studio, Warner Brothers, regarded Shakespeare as a high-art icon that could legitimate film and provide an appropriate morality but also as a repository of recreational material for movie houses in the Depression era. Warner Brothers even commissioned *Shake, Mr Shakespeare* (1934), a short film (available on YouTube) that served as a promotional for the representational capacities of the motion-picture industry. The film features a troupe of Shakespearean characters and iconic scenes that are interrupted by Shakespeare himself, who angrily asks, 'Was it for this I spilled such magical ink?', to which the reply is, 'ah listen Bill, times have changed, this is different'.<sup>23</sup> Here sounding a recognition of different media effects, the troupe then break into full song, urging Shakespeare to 'shake' along to the music and to go with the times. Media, *Shake, Mr Shakespeare* recognizes, bring their own affordances and assert the distinctiveness of their effects. In directing *Dream*, Reinhardt and Dieterle used the pastoral world of Shakespeare's play, richly conveyed on the big screen, to subtly assert their artistic vision. As Ciraulo argues, film

in this context was less about a politics of containment, in the sense of providing pleasing spectacles to mass audiences, than about an aesthetics and politics of provocation, as the directors used Shakespeare's dream world to cast forth new possibilities.

How Shakespeare, as a site of possibility, combines with the affordances of media to become an agential force is further explored in Robert Sawyer's chapter, although here the focus is on the medium of radio. Examining Orson Welles's 1938 radio broadcast of *Julius Caesar*, which Welles had directed for the Mercury Theatre the previous year, Sawyer details how Welles deployed and clearly understood radio's broadcast affordances, not least its capacity to generate a theatre of the mind. Radio brings Shakespeare into the contemporary moment, as in Sawyer's example of NBC's promotion of its 'Streamlined Shakespeare' radio broadcasts as 'the words of William Shakespeare' spoken by 'the voice of John Barrymore', and does so politically, as Welles's production overtly addressed the rise of fascism. Yet, even as it claims to ventriloquize Shakespeare's words and make them audible through star voices like Barrymore's, the medium also displaces Shakespeare as the radio networks and the medium itself become *the* story. The politics Sawyer identifies are, then, on a large scale as he demonstrates how Welles used radio not merely to broadcast his cherished Shakespeare but also as an artistic weapon by amplifying his own voice to articulate opposition to fascism and to tyranny of all kinds. Equally, however, Sawyer turns his reader's attention to subtle shifts in cultural values and hierarchies occasioned by radio Shakespeare in the 1930s, as the medium fostered a convergence of Shakespeare with other markers of cultural distinction such as the celebrity of the radio presenter, or the corporate branding of broadcast networks like CBS or NBC. The chapter thus invites us to consider the deployment and circulation of Shakespeare's cultural capital as a function of technological developments, the demands of the contemporary moment and, in the case of Welles, dynamic individual agency.

This triad features in Diana Henderson's chapter, which addresses the dispersal of Shakespeare's cultural value on a global scale through the Global Shakespeares Video & Performance Archive. The site has significantly contributed to a broadly cast Shakespeare, providing scholars and practitioners with access to an extraordinary range of Shakespeare theatre productions and films from around the world. Henderson addresses the politics at work when, as scholars and students, we access Shakespeare through online platforms. She applies a 'SWOT' analysis – borrowed from the business world – to assay the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the MIT-based archive. This allows for a reflective critical approach in which Henderson foregrounds the achievements of the archive, from its emergence out of scholarly collaboration to its logic of deprived inclusion and a decentring of the traditional Anglophone epicentres of the Shakespeare industry. She also notes the archive's limitations in realizing a comprehensively global sample of Shakespeare performance. The latter is for reasons that are at once technological, practical and legal. The politics in question here are those of a medium, in the sense that archives entail back-end processes of selection as well as the front-end arrangements of material as viewed and accessed on the interface itself. This is one of the ways the archive *produces* Shakespeare, or comes to inform what Shakespeare is understood to encompass. However, the politics Henderson uncovers are also those of the academy, as it grapples with the desirability of Open Access and the limits of copyright, and of humanities scholarship too, as it strives to sustain an ethical commitment to facts and complexity of thought in the digital age. Henderson's chapter invites the field to think critically – and hopefully – about how as teachers, researchers or practitioners, we use digital resources.

The politics as well as ethics of media use are among the issues explored in David Moberly's chapter on Shakespeare entries on Wikipedia. Urging Shakespeare studies to think critically about the online, hyperlinked encyclopaedia and the Shakespeares that are broadcast in this setting, Moberly

finds that editors or Wikipedians regard themselves as policing the boundaries of Shakespeare. At work here is a form of agency indicative of digital participatory cultures in which, theoretically at least, all digital denizens can make their own interventions into the information flow or, in this instance, regard Shakespeare as their property. As a radically participatory website, Wikipedia enables a broad spectrum of people to see themselves as part of Shakespeare discourse in a way hitherto impossible. Yet Moberly complicates this scenario by foregrounding Wikipedia's gender gap: more men than women participate as editors. Despite constant editing and revision, entries for Shakespeare continue to reflect a male-centric construction and, as Denis Austin Britton has highlighted elsewhere, a white bias too. Britton cites the example of the Wikipedia entry 'Shakespearean scholar' where, of the 164 scholars listed, 'only three non-white scholars make the cut', leading him to suggest that 'not everyone who works on Shakespeare gets to be considered a Shakespearean'.<sup>24</sup> The platform's biases need, then, to be urgently contested and, while not minimizing the inequities within the field of Shakespeare studies itself, Moberly calls upon Shakespeare scholars to become Wikipedians in order that more accurate, balanced and diversified accounts of Shakespeare might take root online.

## Genre and audience

'A Shakespeare play is no cadaver, useful for an autopsy. It is a living, vibrant entity that has the power of grasping us by the hand....' This claim for Shakespeare's vitality and immediacy, made by Orson Welles and Roger Hill in an article for the *English Journal*, invites us to think of Shakespeare as effortlessly bringing forth audiences and resonating with them. 'His words', Welles and Hill continue, 'march like heartbeats'.<sup>25</sup> As captivating as these sentiments are, they

risk positing an ahistorical understanding of audience, the ‘us’ who receive and respond, as well as of Shakespeare’s affective resonance. Although as audiences across time ‘we’ share the commonality of being sentient humans, this does not guarantee a commonality or universality of feelings or emotions. The chapters in Part Two suggest different ways for interpreting and understanding Shakespearean affect. They do so through a consideration of audience and genre as a crucial dynamic, with the former being constituted by the latter and its set of culturally specific and historically situated conditions. Arranged so that we move between new and old media – YouTube, the phonograph, Tumblr and TV – the chapters suggest media-focused, contextually informed approaches to Shakespeare audiences. Such attention to the historicity of audiences resists what can be, in the twenty-first century, a dismissal of the nature and power of past audiences in favour of a privileging of today’s audiences as more thoroughly engaged.<sup>26</sup> Yet, more recent technological innovations that turn audiences into participant producers can foster a greater awareness of the potential ‘modes of reception’ in older media that might otherwise be overlooked.<sup>27</sup>

Among the platforms that has generated new Shakespeare-inspired genres and audiences is YouTube and, in her chapter, Christy Desmet extends existing work on YouTube Shakespeare to identify the genre ‘emo Hamlets’.<sup>28</sup> Influenced especially by Ethan Hawke’s portrayal in Almereyda’s *Hamlet* (2000), these vernacularly produced videos and media register a particularly postmodern and post-millennial alienation and disaffection. It is a sense of *Hamlet* that has a long history – is Hamlet not the original emo? – but one that, as it circulates and accumulates on social media platforms, also appears to spread like a contagion. Through the lens of affect theory, Desmet interprets these emo-styled Hamlets as a set of feelings that accumulate without fully manifesting, such is the disembodied, dematerialized nature of social media itself. It evidences ‘structure of feeling’, to borrow Raymond Williams’s linkage of the shaping power of literary genres and forms on

emotions, in that the videos reveal a shared aesthetic or 'look' but also appear grouped and connected on the platform.<sup>29</sup> Emo Hamlets suggest the appearance or promise of connection. With Alemeryeda's film as an intertext, and with its interest in older or soon-to-be obsolescent technologies, and thus the perils of mediation, emo Hamlets locate in the Shakespearean text social media's possibilities for connection, and its deferral or failure. Desmet's chapter here demonstrates the value of a media studies approach to Shakespeare, inviting us to regard YouTube as the intermediary between Shakespeare and us that forges a relatedness and, at the same time, interrupts that relatedness by making us conscious precisely of its work as an intermediary.

How technology functions as an intermediary in the Shakespeare classroom is the focus of Joseph Haughey's chapter. He examines the technological classroom of early-to mid-twentieth-century America, where the phonograph, a technology developed in the 1890s, afforded teachers the opportunity to bring professional actors' voices into the learning environment, and to turn students into an audience of participants rather than passive readers. Delving into the media ecology of the period, Haughey uncovers the critical and pedagogical debates surrounding the phonograph. Among the voices to be heard, both on the phonograph recording itself and in appraisals of it, was that of Orson Welles. His claims about Shakespeare's vitality have already been noted, but in the piece with Roger Hill for the *English Journal*, Welles advocates the use of the new technology as an effective means to engage students. For Welles and Hill, text-based learning was impeding students' appreciation of Shakespeare: the phonograph brought performed Shakespeare, frequently accompanied by music, into the classroom. Haughey sifts through the *English Journal*, the central publication of the National Council of Teachers of English, to provide an historical examination of how teachers thought about and incorporated the phonograph in their Shakespeare instruction. Where some teachers embraced the new multimedia approach, others regarded it as a displacement

of more traditional approaches grounded in close reading. The ghost in the machine, as Haughey's analysis reveals, is Shakespeare as cultural icon: the concern is about precisely the kind of Shakespeare that is being broadcast, especially where it seems too accessible, too popular or unscholarly and insufficiently text-based. These debates resonate with those in the twenty-first-century Shakespeare classroom. Identifying such patterns and continuities, Haughey argues for a broader historical conceptualization of technology, one that can inform its present and future applications.

While recognizing continuity between media, acknowledging specificity is equally important and revealing. Earlier media such as the phonograph had participatory elements: the students of the classrooms Haughey's chapter addresses may have been less passive recipients of text than hitherto, but their experience of Shakespeare through technology remained bounded by the classroom setting. With more recent participatory media platforms such as YouTube, Pinterest and Tumblr, each characterized by low barriers to entry, the contemporary student of Shakespeare has a surfeit of opportunities, both as consumers – thus occupying a more traditional sense of audience – and also producers. It is this media ecology that Kirk Hendershott-Kraetzer's chapter explores, as he undertakes a thick description of iterations of Shakespeare's Juliet on Tumblr. Although Shakespeare studies has turned its critical attention to social media as the site of feminist and queer adaptations of Shakespeare's heroines, thus far this social media and micro-blogging platform has been overlooked, perhaps because it includes more risqué content than other sites.<sup>30</sup> Hendershott-Kraetzer's chapter demonstrates that Tumblr warrants close attention from a Shakespeare studies perspective. This is a Shakespeare by and for 'prosumers' in that seemingly stable distinctions between content producer and audience become blurred. The Juliets constructed in this setting are the collective work of producers and consumers, with the latter playing their part through such participatory actions as reblogging or liking posts. Interest-driven, the texts are a form of narrowcasting



with the aim being to connect with the fan community but, as digital objects on a self-described 'global platform', they carry within them the potential for broadcasting. Even though connection may be remote and dematerialized, as in Desmet's chapter on emo Hamlets, each Tumblr user posts with the expectation of an audience – somewhere, out there. Furthermore, it is a Shakespeare driven by the convergence of fan cultural practices with the affordances of the Tumblr platform. Tumblr Juliets bear the hallmarks of traditional fan behaviour (such as borrowing from canonical texts, or those of mass culture; identifying with character; and actively producing new meaning through alternate narratives or plots), as well as those of the platform, in that they tend to be multimodal, combining word, image, sound and GIFs. As Hendershott-Kraetzer argues, the agency associated with the fan here, as he or she intervenes, remedies or renovates an iconic character like Juliet, is performed within and through the affordances of the platform, such that the non-human technological entity can itself be understood as an agential actor in the network of Juliets. From this perspective, Tumblr and other social media Shakespeares can be interpreted not just as vernacular broadcastings that signal new forms of audiencehood but as spaces where users and technologies cohabit.

Newer media like Tumblr do not replace older technologies; instead, these coexist within the contemporary mediascape. This volume conveys something of this convergence in its arrangement: so Hendershott-Kraetzer's medium-specific analysis of Tumblr is followed by Sarah Olive's chapter on the intersection of Shakespeare and TV, in this instance the detective show *Lewis*. As with the discussion of Tumblr, what emerges is a sense of medium pleasure, a realization about the technology itself as satisfying, fulfilling and rewarding. In her chapter, Olive addresses the pleasure that genre especially can instil and sustain in audiences. *Lewis* and its predecessor *Morse* are known for their literary allusiveness, which variously construct, engage and reward a knowing audience. Olive focuses on the use of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* in the episode 'Generation

of *Vipers*' (the title is a quote from the play), and carefully maps the connections between the Golden Age detective genre, the play and its critical reception. Shakespeare's play informs plot and characterization, while selective quotation is used in the episode to, for instance, articulate the perils of social media; here Shakespeare is implicitly figured as a residual medium, the repository of moral values. Olive's approach provides for close attention to the politics of genre, and of appropriation too, with an unfolding understanding of the rhizomatic relation between the texts.<sup>31</sup> However, if the effectiveness of popular culture appropriations and adaptations is judged on their capacity to enact a 'conceptual transformation' of the Shakespearean intertext, the *Lewis* episode constitutes something of a missed opportunity.<sup>32</sup> As Olive argues, where popular culture appropriations broadcast Shakespeare in the sense of producing a more progressive, contemporary politics, 'Generation of *Vipers*' is ultimately retrogressive in its use of *Troilus and Cressida* to underpin and valorize the gender conservatism of the detective genre: the TV show lags behind critical reappraisals of the play. Olive's analysis highlights the delimiting effects of generic conventions on the kinds of Shakespeare that are intelligible in such a mass medium like TV but also identifies deeper interconnections between the politics of genre and audience pleasure.

## Broadcast the self: Celebrity and identity

The chapters in Part Three continue the volume's thematic interest in the interplay between old and new media, between medium specificity and continuity, but elaborate on the identities that are mediated in the process. Douglas Lanier examines the emerging genre of the Shakespeare web series as a new mode of Shakespeare-inspired, character-and-personality driven storytelling. His chapter includes an appendix listing over fifty