

*Mihaela Irimia*

## *Shakespeare and the 'Long Modernity'*

*University of Bucharest*

About a quarter of a century ago 'the long eighteenth century' was growing into a topos of American-devised academic readers for the use of students, meant to make study handy, perception nuanced, and reading consistent. For one thing, it brought cultural context into the focus of 18th-century literary studies. At the time, deconstruction was making forays into traditional barricades, opening the field of textual enclaves to paratextual areas, making of all cultural object a text. Derrida's 'il n'y a pas de hors-texte' made of the tertium datur logic of our late modernity a case for what we could call 'the long modernity'.

The Fall of the Wall, midway, brought in memory, an unavoidable guest to the banquet of history, a meal at once too rich and too scanty. With some embarrassment, it came escorted by two millennia of postlapsarian oblivion of bliss. 'The long eighteenth century', this now professionalized syntagm, seems part of a wider 'long modernity' today. Our freshly started third millennium is already fraught with world war anxieties, where it should have wisely grown out of such worries. Evidence that modernity does not necessarily stand in perfect equation with progress (the Horkheimer-Adorno thesis), it marked its own fissure on September 11 of its very first-born, only to widen the gap in the fabric of rationality, a couple of years later. The more so a case for memory studies: 'Memory (...), so pervasive in academic circles today (...) in an attempt to recuperate presence in history (...), has displaced deconstruction as the lingua franca of cultural studies'.

So here we stand in the year 2003, far from having superseded, let alone come to an end of, history. Involved in a myriad operations of memory retrieval, we are more than ever specializing in anamnestic procedures, eager to dig out what has silted up in our collective remembrances and got enmeshed in our collective recollections. Inhabited by an unquenched desire to undo the folds of the long human adventure, we pursue our scavenging in the dustbin of time, should some miraculously unwasted treasure end up in our hands. And they do, if tended with patience, as a latter-day confirmation of Nietzsche's assumption that 'only what has no history is definable'. Whence the temptation to look at history with a doctor's eyes investigating a living and diseased organism in need of diagnosis, before a cure is prescribed. Likewise, in his epoch-making analysis of 'enemies of the Enlightenment', the late Sir Isaiah Berlin refrains from deductive, to the benefit of inductive, manoeuvres, since '[i]deas are not born in a vacuum, nor by a process of parthogenesis', but in the 'interplay and impact of social forces at work in particular times and places, and (through) the problems that these generate'.

In broad lines, our familiar modernity is patented, patterned and fleshed out in the 'long eighteenth century'. Written in letters of the English alphabet, it extends between 1660 - the restoration of the theatre of the monarchy and of the theatre - and 1820 - the threshold beyond which a lunatic monarch leaves the throne and the world. The theatre and the world, the theatre of the world are equipped with the furniture of 'classic modernity', if with no few pieces left as legacy from the 'early modernity': at one end, the public sphere, with conversation as a modern 'art', or else, 'clubbability' in Dr. Johnson's urban and urbane vocabulary, the ultimate separation of powers in the state, the public garden and public park, the victory of the novel - that utterly modern genre to be enjoyed in privacy; at the other end, privacy - that utterly modern way of being that pays all the respect in the world to the individual qua indivisible civic entity, an ultimate reading of habeas corpus.

The British eighteenth century sees a spectacular reenactment of that so very Shakespearean topos of 'the world (as) a stage'. It is the 'long' eighteenth century, after all, that builds up the edifice eventually fashioned as the English literary canon. Held as the first professional English critic, Thomas Rymer leaves us *A Short View on Tragedy* (1703), at once a theoretical stance and a position against Shakespeare's linguistic extravagances, just a couple of years after the

coronation of Augusta . Yet, it is Dryden that, freshly after the Restoration, puts it black on white, in *An Essay of Dramatick Poesie*, that he admires Johnson, but loves Shakespeare. This commitment validates the Classic-Romantic opposition deep into our post modernity, where a 'new baroque' and a 'new Romanticism' launch a couple of extra bridges between high and late modernity. The year of Dryden's assessment is 1668. In 1694, Addison's *Account of the Greatest English Poets* criticizes Spenser and Milton, 'but cannot exclude them' . A number of poets had been buried near Chaucer, in the gradually developing Poets' Corner, with Beaumont and Ben Jonson completing the Elizabethan trio, followed by a bust of Milton and a cenotaph to Shakespeare, in the 1730's - 1740's, full Georgian times.

A somewhat systematic project of 'intelligent annotating and textual editing of Shakespeare and Milton (...) by scholars' stabilizes the two leading canonical figures of the British classic modernity of belles lettres. They single out philological ethos on a par with the devotion of Scriptural editors. The parallel is suggestive in more than one sense. As it underlines the 'sacred' quality invested in texts of ultimate cultural prestige, it focuses on a topos of modern identity: unlike the Catholic view of the magic worth stored in the revealed Word of God, the Protestant emphasis on the rational interpretation of the text relegates the whole debate to the public sphere. With the religious service held in the vernacular, the 'holy text' left as legacy by the great Will will be pruned of unavoidable flaws due to the fallen condition of its language. Telling negotiations between the Bible and its secular substitutes had already been contracted, with *The Pilgrim's Progress* holding pride of place from the late 17th century. This novel-like narrative, a modern tale in its own rights, combined for Mr. And Mrs. Average the teachings of the world 'up there' with circumstances of life 'down here'.

Adaptations of 'our divine Shakespeare' multiply as the works are collected and channeled into a growing market: Rowe (1709), Pope (1725), Theobald (1733), Warburton (1747), Dr. Johnson (1765), Capell (1768). Already in 1678, Tonson had introduced the fashion of publishing a reprint jointly with a contemporary text. It was 'a new marketing strategy' subtly promoted by *The Tatler*, one advertising 'the classic' and 'modern' stuff in a package sui generis. A process of bourgeoisification is already at work that will result in the Shakespeare industry of our long modernity. Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo and Juliet* of 1996, set in Baudrillardian Los Angeles, is only its last, or, rather, latest, consequence. Classic modernity sees 'theatrical Shakespeare', with its undeniable 'loss of royal enthusiasm between Charles II and George I', replaced by 'coffeehouse Shakespeare', with the 'immoral' and 'atheistic' passages versatily smoothed out, while 'marketplace Shakespeare' comes as a current display of insignia of national identity. Serialized in some form or another, Shakespeare sneaks into the nooks and corners of the public sphere. Trimmed on stage for pleasurable consumption, merchandised as easily recognizable citations in periodicals, and put together in compact volumes, it travels across the ample space of Britishness as a ??µß???? halved between provider and customer, there for the taking. Who is Shakespeare? What is he? It is both hand, and foot, and arm, and face, and any other part belonging to a man. And it travels incognito, because it is everywhere. It is Everyman. It is us. The peremptory statement does justice to Harold Bloom, 'the' defender of the venerable canon in our times of late modernity and canonical revisionisms: Shakespeare is our myth-maker, he is 'not only in himself the Western canon, he has become the universal canon' , 'the first universal author replacing the Bible in the secularized consciousness' .

Learnt by heart and turned object of repeated readings in the early 19th century, Shakespeare is exported to the Continent, via Wilhelm Meister, a self-sufficient Grand Tour, with protagonist and itinerary as one entity. It becomes a paragon of moral learning in Arnold's hands, a repository of children's narratives in Charles and Mary Lamb's, a topic for extensive debates and 'disintegration' through textual hermeneutics encouraged by Furnivall's New Shakespeare Society, founded in 1873. Some dozen years before, it is the 'great expectations' of such miserable souls as Pip, who arrive 'in Denmark' to find 'the king and queen of that country elevated in two arm-chairs on a kitchen-table', and to be haunted by the disordered stocking of the prince 'called upon unanimously for Rule Britannia' , at the end of the show, when the Danish slides into the British court at home. In the actors' backstage room, Pip can take to pieces the cardboard illusion on stage with the simple tools of common sense. Hamlet, now merely a sweating lad, peels off his stockings to the boy's olfactory disgust and referential suspicion. What is Shakespeare? Where is it?

At home on various rungs of the social ladder, Shakespeare is a 'figure of auctoritas and quasi sacred status', and 'nature's darling' writing with 'gothic ignorance and carelessness'. He is perfect and perfectible, flawless and flawed, son of God and son of man. This liminal condition secures him a place of its own in the pantheon of British 'founding fathers' and bestows upon him a multiple identity that one could hardly fail to grasp as modern. He is Vico's cultural offspring investigating the forest of civil social symbols, but also Herder's savage forest personage. His 'new centrality as the yardstick for each emerging scholarly criticism and poetic category' becomes ever clearer and more imbricate, as the century advances: 'one Shakespeare boosts the stock of a national literature (...), [a]nother Shakespeare (...) heralds (...) a new critical-creative, scholarly-popular art, which is both authentically primitive and absolutely modern'.

As the central interval of 'the long modernity', the 18th century looks to us now as pulling backwards and forwards with more or less assumed balance, yet with equally assumed apprehension. Its amphibious historical condition delights the astute critic of late modernity, while it must have placed the 'neo-classic' critic in a problematic situation. Let us take King Lear - the one big success in Samuel Johnson's London, in which Garrick shapes Drury Lane, which shapes Shakespeare. Commended as 'the best [Shakespeare] commentator', Garrick has come down to us in a painting for which he had sat leaning against a bust of Shakespeare. He also erected a Temple of Shakespeare on his estate and, as his wealth increased on a consistent basis, so did his stature as 'our Shakespeare' on stage. 'He do Shakespeare in several voices', one is tempted to paraphrase Dickens, in order to render the modernity of the Shakespeare figure the more modern.

In 1681, Betterton appears as Lear in a performance based on Nahum Tate's 'improved' text, in which the tragic denouement is replaced by a happy ending, Cordelia is merrily united to Edgar, the Fool is dropped, and the apotheotic resolution makes of a smiling Lear a loving father of his youngest daughter only, a solacing father-in-law to his patriotic son-in-law, and of '[o]ur drooping Country' a power 'erect[ing] her Head' and a place where '[p]eace spreads her balmy Wings, and Plenty blooms'. It would be difficult to locate this mythicized substitute for an ever flourishing Britain. Is it the illusory earthly paradise of Carolinian Frenchification before Catholic turmoil and eventual Glorious Revolution manoeuvres? Is it early Augustan times of growing imperial might? Or is it Georgian times of settling prosperity? We find the same 'improved' version acted 'at the king's Theatres' in 1749, when the last Catholic upheaval has just been quieted. Tate's rewriting knows successful circulation till the 1840's, when modern reforms have been recently voted in.

The Tatean intervention divides the spirits. On one side of the fence sits Addison to protest against the outrage on 'our genius'. On the other, Johnson acclaims the restoration of poetical justice! He, the accurate instiller of order in the English language and Rabelaisian bon vivre, could not witness the death of Cordelia. Like his famous dictionary, this text had to be pruned of aberrant expressions, disciplined and classified according to decorum. This, too, is perpetuated into the early 19th century, in anticipation of Victorian emotionalism. Bowdler's Family Shakespeare (1818) raises the moralizing tone to heights worthy of Collier's indictment of Restoration bawdy. Shakespeare's plays, we are told, contain 'much that is vulgar and much that is indelicate (...), in compliance with the taste and the age in which he lived'. In formulations echoing downright postmodern observations on the culture-specific uniqueness of artifacts, and on how they are imbued with material from reality 'out there', the preface compares salon 'delicacies of decorum' with 'obscenity (...) and barbarity' blamable in all ages, yet more so in this age of refinement, for which rough primitivism is long-forgotten history.

Malone's edition of the plays had made the same point, giving the floor to Dr. Johnson at some pedagogical length: Lear's conduct is altogether improbable here and now. Judged from the then and there of their commitment to paper, they appear as 'histories at the time vulgarly received as true'. The 'barbarity and ignorance' of the age 'would yet be credible, if told of a pretty prince of Guinea or Madagascar'. Such are the chronotopes of our enlightened modernity, that we could not possibly find ourselves at ease in premodern times, and/or in non-European places. Woven into the fabric of modern identity is the Enlightenment promise of progress, with its Messianic drive only proportionally attenuated in Habermas' thesis of the incomplete project. Johnson's

argumentation overstates the case: truly, Shakespeare has given us the idea of 'a life regulated by softer manners' by the mention of earls and dukes; we cannot accuse him of social myopia, yet he infelicitously 'confounds the characters of ages, by mingling customs ancient and modern, English and foreign'. A homebred variant of Anglomania accompanies the Continental *lumieres* craze for everything English. To be modern and English, unlike ancient and foreign, is 'the' thing. A taxonomic grid sifts the chaff from the wheat. The sieve is made in Europe, and made in England. The wheat comes from Stratford. Of it loaves will be baked able to feed so many diners sat round the tables of modern conviviality in the Old World and elsewhere.

Of how modern beyond local habitation and his name Shakespeare has been perceived since his day no end of assessments have been produced. In recent years they have increased immeasurably. Few interrogate labels stuck on 'our national genius' in the age of Enlightenment, when George III called Johnson and asked him to write a literary biography of his country. The ensuing Prefaces, Biographical and Critical, to the Works of the English Poets (1777) have stayed a 'loose gathering of individuals [functioning as] a pantheon' of modernity. They consecrate the 'Shakespeare child of nature' emblem, the 'Shakespeare holds the mirror up to nature' myth, the 'Shakespeare our contemporary' assumption.

The last may sound anachronistic to those that automatically associate the syntagm with the name of Ian Kott. And yet, a myriad sea changes of Shakespearean texts and performances point to sustained adapting/adopting practices in the 'long 18th century'. Harlequin shows, burlesque masks, sentimental tirades attached at the end or interlarded at critical points in the action, pantomimic entertainments, patriotic innuendos (ranging from Thomson's Alfred to Glover's *Bodicea* and Crips's Virginia) and folklore tales like *Queen Mab*, adaptations of *Gulliver's Travels* played in tandem with chinoiserie acts, musical trifles, May Day romances featuring little Gypsies, and funny farces, but, most of all, operas staged with pomp and circumstance, all this offers us a Shakespeare for bourgeois consumption, and the type of consumption that is the easiest to emulate. Cooperating with Shakespeare, all these inscribings of Englishness produce a compendious national intertext. Interpolated in the text of 'the great Will', they interpellate it and leave us to interpret a Mr. Text whose modern copiousness is far from having been exhausted.

It had been Eliot's conviction, in the mid-30's, that Shakespeare criticism cannot be appreciated without 'some understanding of the time and place in which it is written'. That rather unexpected assessment by the father of autotelic criticism flows into a typical modernist conclusion: Shakespeare is the touchstone of European identity, whose elitist quality could not have found a more felicitous paragon. 'The views taken of Shakespeare by different men at different times in different places form an integral part of the development and changes of European civilization during the last three hundred years'. Like Pessoa on Shakespeare, Eliot voices the praise of high culture, 'whose worth's unknown, although [its] height be taken'. As if hardly anything changed, the Eliotesque historical sense nuancedly rearranges its components each time novelty does occur. As if its classic dignity were beyond modernity - that time-haunted rush to the accompaniment of a panicked voice: 'modo, modo'.

'But at [our] back [we] always hear/ Time's winged Charriot hurrying near'. No marvel Eliot disliked Marvell. Modernity has been famously defined as pathetic time-awareness. It is fairly often referred to as the one spectacular rupture in the history of the race entailing rocketing irreversible shifts. Its birth certificate is commonly admitted to have been signed in the West, to the effect that 'Occidentalism' - the other face of Orientalism - is 'the becoming-West of Europe and the becoming-modern of the world'. Part of this Western metanarrative of narratives, modernity has been in the making a long long time. The French Annalysts are not the only school to have reconsidered the length of the process. Daniel Milo, like, reputedly, Jacques Le Goff, opines that the Middle Ages could be the beginning of such modern institutions as the merchant and the intellectual, at a time when the Western world covers itself in the white marble mantle of cathedrals. Curtius does not stray from this path in locating European identity in the Latin Middle Ages. But Frankfurth School critics had already seen the modern enterprising spirit - our Enlightenment meliorism and progressivism - burgeoning in Odysseus. Compared against each other, these particular views invite to stirring reconsiderations of periodization - a modern

mania par excellence. It had been the Enlightenment that had given the rather vexing appellation of 'Middle Ages' to a lapse of time falling between the Classic Antiquity and its own renewed resort to the light of reason, to reason as light. Hence the alternative - in fact synonymous - name of the 'Dark Ages' ascribed to this unfortunate time of magic, mystic, mystified lack of rationality, as if the presence had been declared an absence *avant la lettre*, albeit in the name of the Father.

Such ironic rewritings of our modern sense of history abound in the current critical debate. The Renaissance, that overtly recognized time of 'early modernity' - the time of William Shakespeare - is no less vexingly a time of back reference, after all, given that it is deemed a rebirth of some more dignified past. But this fails to rivet the critic's attention. Part of the human, too human topos of 'the past is another country', and a fairyland, at that, this narrative of the past-gearred present forks off into: the retrograde Middle Ages vs. the progressive Renaissance. The rule is to circulate the latter as a time that 're-read, re-invigorated, and, to some extent, redefined those authors whom it recovered', with focus on recovering as bringing to light, saving from the darkness of the past, as of the depth of oblivion. It is a valorization running in the face of reiteration, which it thoroughly erases. The Renaissance is a re-nascence, inasmuch as it is a moving forward, a future-gearred process, rather than a regurgitation of tradition. Set in a median position, between an exemplary past and a future desiring to shape itself as exemplary, it is coextensive with modernity.

The dispute brings to the fore with renewed energy the continuity-discontinuity issue in the overall discussion of modernity, in which the modernism-postmodernism pair is certainly part of a wider set of oppositions. In a study of the early 90's, Hugh Grady, author of several seminal books on Shakespeare and/as modernity, rightly notices that '[o]ur Shakespeare, until quite recently, has been very much a Modernist Shakespeare'. Following suit after this statement is the remark that 'Shakespeare is so large, that he can contain every literary-cultural criticism'. To regard Shakespeare as coextensive with criticism, a typically Enlightenment-born cultural institution, is, in itself, to look at Shakespeare and the long 18th century with an extra pair of glasses, and it may not be a facile coincidence that Gulliver is the first bespecked character in English literature. Gulliver, the relatively gullible Mr. Middleclass educated at Oxford, is, after all, 'our contemporary' for being the professional globetrotter who does not learn too much beyond the surface of things, yet does not tire of going places.

The modernist Shakespeare himself is a timeless allegory, and Grady readily provides the *Jetztzeit*, the *hic et nunc* necessary to push him into open-air modernity. In so doing, he equips 'our genius' with the historical sense, which, for any 'Western subject enthralled by rationalized technology', must include some awareness of the modern paradigm shift. Modernizing Shakespeare is as much as witnessing the rise of professionalism in the critical business. 'Long' enough to have instantiated and in-stated 'lit. crit.', the 18th century laid the foundations for our cult. crit. Grady observes with meticulous care the spread of 'critical paradigms' within the 'public sphere', and adroitly places the Kuhnian in conjunction with the Habermasian discourse. The practice of critical commentary hosted, since the 18th century, in coffee-houses, newspapers, the academia - that massively modern sense of wrestling with possibilities by engaging in conceptual agonistics - underlies our 'long modernity'.

Rational and purposive Enlightenment critical discourse flows into elusive Romantic language. They sediment as institutionalized bureaucratic criticism in the 19th century, to settle down as autotelic work in Modernist discourse. Work in context supersedes it in Postmodern times. This lengthy process reads as spatial hermeneutics in the Modernist critical paradigm promoted by Wilson Knight. Knight identifies patterns living in reiterated images - ????? incarnated as ????? - which find equivalents in the French Analysts' *longue durée*. The American New Critics come up with their own variant - the 'age of Donne and Shakespeare' - as something modern, yet not dissociated yet, cf. Eliot. The Tillyardian world picture falls under the same heading, if tinged by a sense of national identity. As a beneficial sign of mid-20th century modernity, it paves the way to Greenblatt's New Historicism, in which the diorama of culture encompasses the literary, by the side of the economic, religious, juridical, political and any other societal discourse in a comprehensive vocabulary of cultural identity. Grady is not alone in remarking that the

'theoretical ferment' of the last two decades has penetrated deep into Shakespeare studies, with the textual question reiterating the Folio dispute, Derridean wordplay stepping in the track of Shakespearean punning, Bakhtinian heteroglossia paralleling Shakespeare's comic moves and feminist views carrying on the male/female roles in Shakespeare .

In the last four hundred years, another recent study alerts us, 'the archive of writing about Shakespeare has repeatedly used the word modern (...), a term only briefly devalued in the mid-20th century' . But modernity, 'a qualitatively new kind of anti-traditional society which arose in the West' , and whose inceptive phase may still be subject to consideration and reconsideration, yet whose maturation is by unflinching consensus the 18th century, meaningfully looks us in the face, while looking for props in Shakespeare's age. As a system, modernity originates in Hegel's philosophy to migrate into latter-day secular messianism, whether as the Marxist dream or as, more at hand, economic prosperity and media-supported illusionism. Hegel sees in Shakespeare the inaugurator of modernity owing to his sense of individualized character, epochal new individualism and subjective construction of identity. Much the kind of argumentation that Burckhardt feeds his 'long modernity' thesis in *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860). For Burckhardt, like for us today, the Renaissance marks the beginning of modern selfhood by its cogent division between the political and the aesthetic. As a category conceptualized in the 18th century, the aesthetic is phenomenally modern in pre-Enlightenment times like the Renaissance. A 'longer long 18th century' is proposed us, with the Renaissance foreshadowing Enlightenment rationality, yet preserving its aesthetic independence - an ambivalent nature placing it in concordance and discordance with Modernism. Take the case of *King Lear*, again, with reified Machiavellian power disclosing later Realpolitik performativity, and the *Edgar* story embodying Enlightenment progressive ideology.

From our vantage point, and with our late modern culturalist perspective, things appear marked by a presentism that could scarcely be denied or ignored. Nay, the case is rather one of "'presentist" studies' , which could be briefly defined as literary classics and cultural phenomena being conceptually projected in later periods, especially in our contemporary days. 'Shakespeare, our contemporary', as it were, a syntagm penned in postmodern ink, this time. It is a way of saying that 'all our knowledge of works from the past is conditioned by, and dependent upon, the culture, language, and ideologies of the present' . At the face of it, this is merely another manner of implying some identification fallacy. It is more than this, for sure, for it implies that 'historicism itself necessarily produces and implicit allegory of the present in its configuration of the past' . A question of mentalité, in that it requires a recontextualization of the past as 'an interpretive translation to a late 20th century idiom' . A very recent volume dedicated to Stephen Greenblatt draws together cultural anthropology, literary theory and historicist theory by way of saluting the master, and of recognizing in the Renaissance, again, the adumbration of fully-fledged modernity, with its cult of middle-class leisure and pleasure, fashion and idleness, conspicuous consumption and public participation . All of that did start in the modern 18th century, too long a century for it either to start or to end within its own boundaries.

Stephen Orgel, *Imagining Shakespeare*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003  
'Who is Shakespeare? What is he?' = textual scholarship, performance study, social history, history of art, local readings ~ Central-Eastern European readings, stagings, adaptations (e.g. fall of Ceausescu ~ Saddam = Sh. tragedy + romanticized melodrama)

Pascale Aebischer (ed.), *Remaking Shakespeare: Performance Across Media, Genres and Cultures*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003  
- postcolonial, performance, cultural studies in various media, geogr. locations, hist. moments [chronotope of (long) modernity]

Jane Kingsley-Smith, *Exile in Shakespeare*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003  
- exile as amatory trope ~ rambling, getting lost, seeking alternative locations (of cult. ident.): Catholics, Gypsies, vagabonds ~ nomads < Numidia = ethnic as ethic of human condition

Douglas Bruster, *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture: Early Modern Literature and the Cultural Turn*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003

- move: text à culture è interdisciplinary approach: representativeness of materials of 'culture' [~ Ecole des Annales material culture & 'histoire totale']

Gail Marshall (ed.), *Victorian Shakespeare* (Vol. 1: Theatre Drama and Performance, Vol. 2: Literature and Culture), Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003

- Shakespeare as author and text(s) = badge of identity widely circulated in a new mass culture à artistic vs. industrial production; racial & sexual difference; individual & national identity (e.g. Shakespeare in panto shows, children's books, illustrations, posters, burlesques and parodies)

Loreen L. Giese, *Treacherous Attempts: Women, Shakespeare, and Marriage Law*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003

- court & stage: women's autonomous, not only subordinate roles  
- court depositions: legal, like literary texts = sources for retrieval of cult. ident.  
(= a new New Historicist view)

Siobhan Keenan, *Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002

- recuperating cult. ident. from various spaces ('topoi') of the early modern public sphere, e.g. town halls, inns, market squares, school houses, colleges, country houses, provincial theatres

Bruce Boehrer, *Shakespeare Among the Animals: Nature and Society in the Drama of Early Modern England*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002

- the cultural order underlying the natural order of the early modern age in England: femininity, masculinity, ethnicity in terms of animal metaphors [how culture 'reads' and (re)inscribes nature, providing it with a taxonomic grid = a 'supplement' for easier consumption ~ Renaissance topoi, e.g. *Volpone et comp.*, medieval bestiaries, or, indeed, ancient fables ~ Mentalités analyses of lycanthropy, witchcraft, hauntology & postmodern extensions, e.g. Derrida's 'spectres', Greenblatt's 'Hamlet in Purgatory']

Christy Desmet & Robert Sawyer (eds), *Harold Bloom's Shakespeare*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002

- how Bloom's Shakespeare has read into 'our' Shakespeare, and, indeed, into Shakespeare, 'our postmodern contemporary', disrupting culturalist stances & reinforcing 'humanist' ones: the author as literary origin, the persistence of character, the new secular humanism as cultural development and victory in our Western world

Chantal Zabus, *Tempests After Shakespeare*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002

- comparative lit. & postcolonial studies = alleys into reading Shakespeare afresh  
- The Tempest itself as interpretive grid for 3 'post-' readings: postcoloniality, postpatriarchy, postmodernism è critique of the 'postmodern condition'

Joe Nutt, *An Introduction to Shakespeare's Late Plays*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002 - text analysis immersed in historical & cultural context

Roland Knowles, *Shakespeare's Arguments with History*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001

- importance of argument in Renaissance culture [~ role and function of 'prise de position' as modern (Montaignian) attitude]  
- the nature of political morality & truth grounded in the history of 'the day' [~ Machiavellian anchorage in Realpolitik]  
= modern dismantlings of utopia & recognition of performatively useful moves on the stage of history = cynicism of/as modernity, after the

fall of the 'isomporhic model'

Susan Doran (ed.), *The Myth of Elizabeth*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003  
- monarchic celebrations & adorations = 'the' public spectacle of the day = stuff for interdisciplinary study of image & myth in 'mythic Elizabeth'

Erica Sheen & Lorna Hutson, *Literature, Politics and Law in Renaissance England*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003  
- study on the edge of new historicism & book history è topics: libel/slander, literary debate, legal textual production, authorship, authorial attribution

Jonathan Hart, *Columbus, Shakespeare and the Interpretation of the New World*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003  
- Spanish, French & British presence in the New World à creation fo new empires across the Atlantic = a story of 'the intellectual and ideological scramble for America'  
- European reception & interpretation of the New World à cultural & voice appropriation [America = topos & tropes of European identity]

Mark Thornton Burnett, *Constructing 'Monsters' in Shakespearean Drama and Early Modern Culture*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002  
- metaphorical significance of 'monstrous' forms in early modern exhibition spaces: fairground displays, 'cabinets of curiosities', court entertainment

Daniel Viktus, *Turning Turk: English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002  
- English encounter with the exotic on stage = factor in shaping national identity  
- impact of: religious conversion, foreign trade, miscegenation = forms of inter- and intra-cultural contacts

Rhonda Lemke Sanford, *Maps and Memory in Early Modern England: A Sense of Place*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002  
- maps & mapping conventions in the service of memory & memorialization of the places (topoi) of England and of England's place in the early modern world

\*

Terence Hawkes, *Shakespeare in the Present*, London & New York: Routledge, 2002  
- 'presentism' = critical manoeuvre using relevant aspects of the contemporary as a trigger for its investigations [reading back into cultural identity in time, in order to see forwards = boustrophedon view < proleptic as analeptic + cataleptic readings]  
- performing & refocusing interest on what the early modern theatre meant by 'playing'

Ewan Fernie, *Shame in Shakespeare*, London & New York: Routledge, 2001  
- Mentalités approach to the 'cultural institution' called shame è reclaiming shame as part of 'our' modern identity, in context

Wes Folkerth, *The Sound of Shakespeare*, London & New York: Routledge, 2002  
- Mentalités and historical perspective approach: how attitudes, beliefs, practices & discourses are informed by sound & hearing in Sh.'s culture  
- listening to Shakespeare listening [the Henry Higgins topos of retrieval of cultural identity] = resonating ~ sonnet as ren. form par excellence

Kathleen McLuskie, *Shakespeare and Modern Theatre: The Performance of Modernity*, London

& New York: Routledge, 2001

- film, video & live performance have superseded books à how 'culture industries' have repositioned Shakespeare since modernist times

Philip Armstrong, Shakespeare in Psychoanalysis, London & New York: Routledge, 2001

- close rel. bet. Sh.'s texts & psychoanalysis [~ Bloom's Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human: Sh. invents Freud!!!]

- Freud's theory & Parisian intellectuals & Hollywood & PC virtual space = new 'spaces' of Shakespearean presence & interpretation [~ Baz Luhrmann's 1996 Romeo and Juliet based in contemp. grater LA]

John Joughin (ed.), Philosophical Shakespeare, London & New York: Routledge, 2000

- Shakespeare = still articulator of central problems of our intellectual inheritance: value, meaning, justice

Christy Desmet & Robert Sawyer (eds), Shakespeare and Appropriation, London & New York: Routledge, 1999

- Shakespeare's cultural afterlife: efforts to imitate, contradict, compete with, And reproduce Shakespeare = forms of 'cultural conversation' [the 'speaking with the dead' topos ~ Machiavelli, Petrarch, Dante, Greenblatt, Hamlet, Aeneas, Orpheus]

Daniel Fischlin & Mark Fortier (eds), Adaptations of Shakespeare: AN Anthology of Plays from the 17th Century to the Present, London & New York: Routledge, 2000

- a series of 'Sh. "our" contemporary' appropriations of cult. ident. by specific (chronotopically-specific) views

e.g. Nahum Tate's King Lear

Stephe Orgel, The Authentic Shakespeare and Other Problems of the Early Modern Stage, London & New York: Routledge, 2002

- theatre as social phenomenon [Menalities perspective]

- stage as cultural institution

- theatre & political life = spaces of the 'public sphere'

Dale Coyle, Pronouncing Shakespeare's Words: A Guide from A to Zounds, London & New York: Routledge, 2002

- alternative pronunciations = badges of cult. ident. (geographically, socially, professionally) [~ Wes Folkerth, The Sound of Sh.]

David Scott Kastan, Shakespeare After Theory, London & New York: Routledge, 1999

- counter the 'Sh. our contemp.' theory = how Sh. is distanced from us!

Lynda E. Boose & Richard Burt (eds), Shakespeare, The Movie, London & New York: Routledge, 1997

- Sh. circulating across 'our' culture

Linda Jardine, Reading Shakespeare historically, London & New York: Routledge, 1996

- how Sh. 'moves' in history, as we do!

Thomas Cartelli, Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations, London & New York: Routledge, 1998

- Sh. as badge of modern identity from nationhood to postcolonial

(re)configurations of 'imagined communities'