

The Master of the Rebels:
Teenage Encounters with Shakespeare
1944-2012.

Darragh Martin

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
under the Executive Committee
of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
2013

© 2013

Darragh Martin

All rights reserved

Abstract--The Master of the Rebels: Teenage Encounters with Shakespeare, 1944-2012.

Darragh Martin

This dissertation tells the story of Shakespeare's role in the invention of the teenager and teenagers' roles in re-inventing Shakespeare. In post World War II England, Australia, and the United States, Shakespeare's plays became one arena where competing versions of teenage identity were defined, with Shakespearean characters and teenage subjects cast as rebels or romantic consumers. I argue that a narrow canon of School Shakespeare has emerged, with *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* recast as plays about romantic consumption, limiting the political roles of teenagers to onlookers rather than rebellious actors. Attending to what I term *double reply*, I contend that teenagers can resist their interpellation as romantic consumers, carving a powerful alternative discourse through parody and non-verbal performance.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Shakespeare and Teenagers, 1944-2012.	1
Chapter One. Supposing a Blackboard to be a Bear: Touring Shakespeare to Teenagers.	30
Chapter Two. Excellent Dumb Discourse: Shakespeare in Perimillennial Classrooms.	75
Chapter Three. “Youth to itself rebels”: Teenage encounters with <i>Hamlet</i> .	114
Chapter Four. Kissing Beyond the Book: Romance and Rebellion in <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> .	157
Afterword. The Moons of Miranda and the Orbit of Teenage Shakespeare.	212
Bibliography	218
YouTube Filmography	247

List of Illustrations

Figure 1: Balthasar (Jesse Bradford) and Romeo (Leonardo di Caprio) in 5.1.	192
Figure 2: Balthasar (Jesse Bradford) in 3.1.	195
Figure 3: Benvolio (Dash Mihok) in 3.1.	196
Figure 4: Balthasar (Jesse Bradford) in 3.5.	198
Figure 5: Romeo (Leonardo di Caprio) and Juliet (Claire Danes) in 3.5.	198
Figure 6: Juliet (Claire Danes) and Romeo (Leonardo di Caprio) in 5.3.	198
Figure 7: Balthasar (Keith Skinner) and Romeo (Leonard Whiting) in 3.5.	202
Figure 8: Fig 8. Balthasar (Keith Skinner) in 3.5.	202
Figure 9: Ferdinand (Reeve Carney) and Miranda (Felicity Jones) in 4.1	212
Figure 10. Opening credits, <i>The Tempest</i> (2010).	214
Figure 11. Miranda (Felicity Jones) in <i>The Tempest</i> (2010).	214

Introduction: Shakespeare and Teenagers, 1944-2012.

Verona, Italy 1873. A new starlet shines in Verona. Fourteen year old Eleonora Duse has opened as Juliet in the same town in which Shakespeare's play is laid, is hailed for her fresh talent and remarkable speaking voice. No neophyte she, Eleonora was born in Lombardy on parent's theatrical tour, carried to her christening in a gilded property box. Critics predict a gilded career. Simple and unaffected, the young actress adores goat-milk colas and, when not engaged in rehearsals or performances, wears plain hoop skirts, just like every other teenage girl ("Teens in the News" 112).

I just don't see what's so marvelous about Sir Laurence Olivier, that's all. He has a terrific voice, and he's a helluva handsome guy and he's very nice to watch when he's walking or dueling or something, but he wasn't at all the way D.B. said Hamlet was. He was too much like a goddam general, instead of a sad, screwed-up type guy (Salinger 117).

As the term "teenager" stretched its legs in Post-World War II American culture, vying with other terms to describe a new generation of 13-19 year olds with increased autonomy, cultural sway and discretionary income, Shakespeare was called upon to play a subtle but significant role in defining what this new noun meant.¹ For *Seventeen* magazine, "teenager" described a budding consumer citizen and from its launch in 1944, the magazine helped to sculpt this definition, using their market research to invent Teena, the typical teenage girl who "wants to look, act and be just like the girl next door" (*Seventeen* Promotional Flier). The inclusion of Eleonora Duse as one of Teena's ancestors in their segment "Teens in the News" drew on Shakespeare's cultural capital - Duse was known for playing Shakespearean heroines and was exclusively associated with Juliet here - to situate Teena's habits within a wider history of skirt-buying, cola-slurping and conformist consumerism.² Holden Caulfield, the alienated narrator of J.D. Salinger's *The*

¹ The first recorded use of "teen-ager" was in *Popular Science Monthly* in 1941, though, the comic, *Harold Teen*, circulated in the 1920s; other contenders included the terms "sub-deb," "bobby-soxer," "teener," and "teenster." See Jon Savage's *Teenage: The Creation of Youth Culture* (442-465).

² "Teens in the News" was a playful feature which refashioned other historical figures, including John Keats, Cleopatra, Pocahontas and Mozart, as contemporary teenagers.

Catcher in the Rye (1951), was no reader of *Seventeen* and used Shakespeare to reflect a different vision of teenage identity: the counter-cultural rebel. Seeing a smack of Hamlet in himself rather than Sir Laurence Olivier, Holden imagined the disaffected Dane as a “sad, screwed-up type guy” out of joint with the material world that *Seventeen* celebrated.

These two versions of teenage identity, the consumer and the rebel, are useful in mapping out teenagers’ encounters with Shakespeare in the United States, England and Australia; Shakespeare,” as “author-function” in Foucault’s terms (125), became an arena where competing versions of teenage identity jostled, with many adult-mediated uses of Shakespeare generating a vision of teenagers as what I call *romantic consumers*, teenagers encouraged to use the romantic glamour of consumerism in service of a heterosexual romance that would sustain consumer culture.³ A narrow canon of School Shakespeare helped to shape this definition with two plays, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, especially influential in sculpting a teenage identity that emphasized the personal and the romantic over the political. However, if Shakespeare serves as a disciplinary force, as a master of the rebels, teenagers can also resist the subject position of romantic consumer, rebelliously *talking back* to Shakespeare to use Martha Tuck Rozett’s term, through parody and performance.⁴ I argue that by making Shakespeare a space of revelry, teenagers expand their encounters with Shakespeare beyond ones that interpellate them as

³ In *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism* (1987), Colin Campbell argues for a link between Romanticism and consumerism: I use “romantic consumerism” here independently of this argument and of the Romantic movement.

⁴ Rozett principally discusses student responses to Shakespeare in a classroom setting in *Talking Back to Shakespeare*, but also recognizes a connection between adaptation and teenagers, describing an adaptation as “like an assertive adolescent, visibly and volubly talking back to the parent in iconoclastic, outrageous, yet intensely serious ways” (5).

romantic consumers and move towards a definition of teenagers that allows for political expression.

Teenagers' exposure to consumer culture and Shakespeare is especially pronounced in the perimillennial period, a term that Denise Albanese uses to describe the years around 2000 (5). My use of the term refers to the years 1989 - 2012 as the educational, cultural and technological changes in this period enable the talking back to Shakespeare by teenagers that I wish to explore.⁵ "English for Ages 5-16," the report by Brian Cox in 1989, enshrined Shakespeare's status as the only compulsory writer in the new National Curriculum in the United Kingdom, ensuring compulsory encounters between Shakespeare and teenagers in England (Irish 10). Moreover, the performance-based pedagogies that the Report endorsed, coupled with the growth of Education Departments in theatre companies, meant that the way in which teenagers encountered Shakespeare in the classroom shifted. The enormous success of Bell Shakespeare Company's Education Department in Australia, and the federal funding it received, marks a similar shift in Australia. This perimillennial period also saw the emergence of a small canon of Shakespearean films and young adult novels which capitalized upon this teenage market as well as significant technological changes, most especially the expansion of the internet and the emergence of "participatory culture" (Kavoori 5), which changed the manner in which teenagers responded to Shakespeare. My project is limited to countries where English is a first language, as Shakespeare in translation offers fascinating but very different challenges for educators. Using a case studies model, I examine teenagers' interactions with Shakespeare in three countries:

⁵ The publication of the Cox Report, following the Education Reform Act of 1988, makes 1989 a sensible starting point for my definition of perimillennial. I have chosen 2012 as an end date as the Shakespeare Reloaded project which I discuss in Sydney serves as a useful bridge to an alternative model of pedagogy (Shakespeare Reloaded originally ran from 2008-2010, but was extended for another two years). Certainly, some trends which I discuss as perimillennial will likely continue beyond 2012. Equally, this period could be sub-divided based on the different modes of encounter: much of the canon of Shakespearean adaptations in young adult novels that I discuss was published after the millennium.

Australia, the United States and England. My inclusion of Australia is an important contribution to the field: as an early site for touring companies for teenagers, Australia has a crucial but neglected position within the wider history of Shakespeare in Education. Though my primary focus is on the perimillennial period, I also consider some earlier examples of Shakespeare's encounters with teenagers as a way of foregrounding Shakespeare's evolving role in the creation of teenage consumer culture.

This recruitment of Shakespeare to create a consumerist teenage culture can be situated within the wider process through which people “mean *by* Shakespeare” in Terence Hawkes's formulation (*Meaning by Shakespeare*, 3, original emphasis). Cultural materialist critics in the 1980s were attuned to the ways in which “Shakespeare” was called upon to generate capital, both cultural and otherwise; Graham Holderness's description of Shakespeare's appearance on the British twenty pound note illustrates the apotheosis of bardolotry and Bardbiz: “the currency of Shakespeare as a cultural token enhances the material worth of the promissory note; while the high value of the note itself confers a corresponding richness on the symbol of high art and national culture” (xi). Scholars following Gary Taylor's argument in *Reinventing Shakespeare* (1989) - that the meanings produced by Shakespeare vary with successive generation - have found the Shakespeare proffered by perimillennial culture to be a distinctively young one: the writers of *Shakespeare and Youth Culture* (2006) argue that “the current generation has a very young, hip and extreme Shakespeare” (Hubert, Wetmore Jr. and York 37) and Denise Albanese posits that “the mass culture with which Shakespeare ought most tellingly be linked is a culture of *mass education*” (7, original emphasis). Indeed, when Jan Kott was embracing Shakespeare as our contemporary in the 1960s, the breadth of his *our* was somewhat limited: Kott's vision of Hamlet as a “young rebel” with “something of the charm of James Dean” anchored

Shakespeare's contemporary qualities in the nascent youth culture of the period (200). Cultural materialist critics also saw the culture of mass education which Albanese refers to as one of the critical arenas for interrogating Shakespeare's cultural work: Alan Sinfield's polemic essay, "Give an account of Shakespeare and Education, showing why you think they are effective and what you have appreciated about them. Support your comments with precise references," mapped out the terrain for a struggle over Shakespeare's function in the curriculum between the cultural materialists and right wing guardians of cultural heritage, which bubbled into what *The Observer* termed "The Battle of the Bard" in 1993, when John Major, the Tory Prime Minister, lambasted cultural materialist critics who had protested his educational policy (Irish 5).

My aim is to re-animate this conversation, using Shakespeare's language as a critical site for the negotiation of teenage identity among the primary modes of encounter that I consider: performance-based pedagogies, adaptations of Shakespeare on film and in young adult literature, and videos created by teenagers on YouTube. Clearly, language is a rather capacious noun, housing Shakespeare's use of metaphor, rhetorical techniques, dramatic verse, linguistic inventions and early modern archaisms. Though prose is part of Shakespeare's vocabulary, it often seems as though "Shakespeare's language" could be translated as "Shakespeare's verse": doubly distanced (with strange words to be glossed and dramatic techniques to be explained), Shakespeare's language becomes a code to be translated, a skill to be mastered like trigonometry or irregular French verbs. Equally, "Shakespeare's language" is principally English, a loaded heritage in Australia where celebration of the English language comes at the expense of silenced Aboriginal languages or in contemporary classrooms with large populations of non-English speakers.⁶ I am using a limited definition of "Shakespeare's language" as "quotations from

⁶ See Irving, Maunders and Sherrington for a discussion of the increasing population of non-English speakers in Australian youth from the 1970s. 236-243.

Shakespeare's plays".⁷ Shakespeare's language becomes a fetishized and parodied commodity in Teenage Shakespeare: italicized and indented in young adult novels, Shakespeare's language becomes a kind of fantastic discourse, conveying universal truths in an unstable modern world; spoken to a seemingly indifferent dog in a YouTube parody, this same language becomes the medium to suggest what Douglas Lanier terms the "incommensurable distance between Shakespeare's language and the popular vernacular" (*Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* 57).⁸ Exposure to Shakespeare's words is frequently presented as one of the principal reasons for teenagers to study Shakespeare: England's Cox Report in 1989 stated that Shakespeare "uses language in a way beyond that of any other writer" (qtd. in Leach 22) while the donation of one million dollars to the Bell Shakespeare Company's Education Department was justified by Australia's Federal Minister for Education "so that students can gain a better understanding of the rich diversity of the English language, while exploring timeless themes of humanity" (*Bell Magazine* Vol. 15). The performance-based pedagogies that both governments recommended encourage students to "develop a genuine ownership of the play" by treating it as a script to be repossessed through performance (Gibson, 1998, 52). This rhetoric of ownership is often used by advocates of teaching Shakespeare through performance: exercises should "allow students to 'own' their final products" (Flynn 66) while student actors "must own the performance" and "have an ownership of their learning" (Crozier 63; 67); by owning Shakespeare's language,

⁷ Though several of the works I discuss present an image of Shakespeare as Romantic genius, I do not mean to endorse that vision by depicting words as "Shakespeare's" language: I am conscious of the multiple agents involved in the production of this language. Equally, it is important to acknowledge the instability of Shakespeare's language, especially as the primary works which I discuss here, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, exist in three different versions, including "bad" quartos.

⁸ I use "fantastic discourse" in John Stephens's terms here as a discourse which constructs a world where "there is a 'real presence' in verbal signs...these signs are thus grounded in transcendent meanings" (263). I will discuss fantastic discourse in relation to Shakespeare's language in Chapter Three.

students resolve a tension between “timeless themes” and the words Shakespeare used to express them, wrinkled with time’s trough and crinkled with anachronisms.

The capitalist rhetoric of ownership suggests the limited way in which students are encouraged to own Shakespeare, one which stresses the personal over the political. Situating childhood studies within other “minority studies,” Kate Chedgzoy argues that as “children lack public agency and a political voice” they “differ from other oppressed groups in ways that crucially limit their capacity to write their own histories” (20).⁹ Often spoken *for*, Jean Baudrillard argues that children, like animals, are conscripted into an adult-mediated “empire of meaning” which displaces the threat of their silence: “In a world bent on doing nothing but making one speak, in a world assembled under the hegemony of signs and discourse, their silence weighs more and more heavily on our organization of meaning” (137). Una Chaudhuri uses this passage to consider the evocative silence of children and animals in contemporary performance as a way of resisting an empire of meaning that suffocates them in symbolism (45-57). Following Chaudhuri, I am interested in how teenagers resist a similar conscription within Shakespeare’s meaningful empire, one which severely limits the vocabulary with which they can write their own histories. To this end, I track three main forms of resistance: *double reply*, *excellent dumb discourse*, and *jouissance*. Double reply is a response to Barbara Wall’s influential account of narrative strategies in children’s and young adult literature. Wall describes three forms of address in children’s fiction: *single address* (directed at a child implied reader), *double address* (directed at child and adult implied readers by shifting between two different registers) and *dual address* (the simultaneous address of child and adult implied readers) (1991,

⁹ Chedgzoy is sensitive to temporal distinctions within childhood studies: although adolescents, and later, teenagers, do have a greater capacity to write their own history, adolescents are included within the “occlusion of power relations” that some childhood studies seek to redress (20).

9). I suggest double reply as a useful term to consider the manner in which teenagers respond to their encounters with Shakespeare to adults and other teenagers, using registers not accessible to the other. This is especially prevalent in several teenagers' school projects posted on YouTube: made for an adult audience to meet the demands of a school project, they simultaneously communicate to a teenage audience in a different register. Double reply allows teenagers to encode Shakespeare's language with a different subtext, a strategy often used by fictional teenagers in young adult novels. *Excellent dumb discourse* exploits the silence given to young people and the many dumb shows that performance-based pedagogies encourage teenagers to stage, communicating around Shakespeare's language through silence and non-verbal performance.¹⁰ I use *dumb* here to suggest both an aesthetics of silliness appropriate to a text of pleasure and a non-verbal means of communication set in opposition to Shakespeare's language; in this way, we might read YouTube videos as trivial parodies for serious people. Double reply and excellent dumb discourse communicate in different ways across multiple media - through "inappropriate" laughter in performances, through student "misreadings," through YouTube parodies - but might be related to a teenage *jouissance*, a liberation of the subject through an erotics of language and performance; signification and "Shakespeare" slung to the side. In one of his evocations of *jouissance*, Roland Barthes chooses the cinema as an apt space to "capture the sound of speech close up" (67); looking closely at the exuberance of Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* or to the mock-ups and mash-ups of teenagers' Shakespeares on YouTube might also lead to the crackling, caressing and coming of bliss, revealing a space

¹⁰ This quotation is taken from *The Tempest*, 3.3, 37. Unless otherwise indicated, all Shakespeare quotations are from *The Norton Shakespeare*, eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard and Katherine Eisaman Maus (New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1997). I am appropriating Judith Buchanan's use of this phrase in the title of her account of Shakespeare in silent film, *Shakespeare on Silent Film: an Excellent Dumb Discourse* (2009), however, I am using this quotation to mobilize the dual sense of "dumb".

where “rebels” twists back toward “revels”, with Shakespeare the anarchic arena of teenage revelry.

It is important to foreground some caveats. Although I was a teenager in the perimillennial period, I am conscious that I am no longer one and cannot claim to be a specialized decoder of secret teenage meanings. I use “double reply” not as a way of fixing meanings into those that *only* teenagers or adults can attend to, but instead to point out moments where different audiences appear to be addressed. Equally, while I offer alternative readings of students’ “inappropriate” laughter in performance, I am aware of the limitations of reader-response criticism: I do not mean to suggest that the student responses I discuss must be read as resistance to consumer culture, but rather that adults often narrow their reading of student responses as “wrong” or “inappropriate,” and that we might consider a wider range of potential readings. Negotiations between Shakespeare and teenagers are also highly complex and while I suggest that the majority of adult-mediated Shakespeare that I discuss produces a version of teenagers as romantic consumers while teenage responses offer more room for rebellious readings of teenagers, it must also be acknowledged that teenage responses can talk back to Shakespeare without talking back to consumer culture and that not all adult-mediated iterations of Shakespeare produce teenagers as romantic consumers. Lastly, the world of Teenage Shakespeare is especially broad and wide and while I consider a range of texts and media, selected for the provocative way in which they engage Shakespeare’s language to construct teenage identity, there are many equally provocative or relevant works which I do not discuss.

My hope is that my interest in both pedagogy and performance will allow this project to enter into several conversations currently circulating in Shakespeare studies and thus engage with other texts. This project builds upon cultural materialist scholars’ work on Shakespeare’s

dialectical interactions with contemporary culture (Terence Hawkes; Graham Holderness; Gary Taylor) and recent work that considers the relationship between the classroom and youth culture: Richard Burt's *Unspeakable ShaXXXpears: queer theory and American kiddie culture* (1998), Denise Albanese's *Extramural Shakespeare* (2010), Christy Desmet's and Ayanna Thompson's work on Shakespeare and YouTube, and the essay collection *Shakespeare and Youth Culture* (2006). My particular focus on how the emergence of the teenager defines Shakespeare's role in youth culture and a consumerist relationship with language, expands this conversation and directs it towards ways in which teenagers do speak, both through and back to Shakespeare. This focus on the teenager, and my interest in pedagogy, also brings a new perspective to the emerging field of Shakespeare and Children's Literature, a field dominated by two essay collections - *Reimagining Shakespeare for Children and Young Adults* (2003) and *Shakespeare and Childhood* (2007) - and one monograph, Erica Hateley's *Shakespeare in Children's Literature: Gender and Cultural Capital* (2009). Hateley's work is very useful in bringing Australian literature to the forefront of discourse on children's Shakespeare and in highlighting how modern appropriations of Shakespeare construct gendered subjects. Her work focuses on plays with supernatural elements (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Macbeth* and *The Tempest*) which means that she doesn't consider *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*; my treatment of young adult appropriations of these works finds a similarly gendered construction of subjects, but also suggests ways in which teenage readers can potentially subvert this structure.

My exploration of teenage encounters with Shakespeare begins in the classroom, with the first two chapters focusing on theatre in education and drama in education techniques respectively. Chapter One tracks the paths of two theatre companies who brought Shakespeare to teenagers in Australia: The Young Elizabethan Players (1958-1971) and the Actors at Work of

the Bell Shakespeare Company (1991-present). My structural analysis of the particular form of school adaptations - a mixture of the greatest hits of Shakespeare's plays with interpolated contemporary narration - reveals the different ways in which both companies interpellate students as consumer citizens through Shakespeare's language, with teenagers asked to conjure a rich materialist scenography by the Players and Shakespeare providing the vocabulary for romantic consumerism for the Actors at Work. I argue that the shift from Players to the Actors sees an increasing political and linguistic disenfranchisement of their audiences, with the interpolated narration of the Actors at Work pieces emphasizing the inability of young people to impact the world. I conclude by considering how students have used double reply to talk back to these productions, using student laughter and disruption as a way of exploring potential resistance to their roles as teenage consumers.

These strategies of talking back to Shakespeare are the focus of Chapter Two, which explores Shakespeare's role in contemporary classrooms through Rex Gibson's Cambridge Schools Shakespeare textbooks, classroom observations, and student projects posted on YouTube. I contend that while performance-based pedagogies often distance students from Shakespeare's language, teenagers can talk back through an excellent dumb discourse of their own, using parody to resist an ownership of Shakespeare's language that casts them as romantic consumers and mobilizes teenage *jouissance* to satiric ends. I also argue that performance-based pedagogies allow the creation of "Shared Shakespeare," facilitating student enjoyment but also allowing sculpting a community of critical thinkers.

Chapters Three and Four examine of two of the most popular works in Teenage Shakespeare, *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, and the different myths of the teenager they have been called upon to sculpt. Chapter Three argues that the rebellious attitude that Holden

Caulfield and productions of the 1960s ascribed to Hamlet is diluted in perimillennial iterations of *Hamlet*, which use a teenage sensibility to present Hamlet and Ophelia as romantic consumers. Looking closely at young adult novels, I contend that it is the specialized status of Shakespeare's language, presented as a fantastic discourse, that enables this reading of Hamlet and also presents a very limited version of gender and especially female autonomy, with Ophelia "empowered" as a romantic consumer in *Dating Hamlet*. Ophelia's relative silence within *Hamlet* also gives her access to a powerful dumb discourse, and I trace more rebellious iterations of Ophelia in the perimillennial period and that by resisting Shakespeare's language perimillennial Ophelias also subvert an empire of meaning chained to consumer culture.

Romeo and Juliet is the focus of Chapter Four, where I chart the central couple's surprising use as rebels as well as romantic consumers. Reading Stephanie Meyer's enormously popular Twilight Series as the apotheosis of romantic consumption, I illustrate the ways in which Shakespeare's language is subtly re-punctuated and repossessed by the series and its fans to transform Romeo and Juliet into suburban vampires. Looking at Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* and teenage responses to it, I argue that Romeo and Juliet can equally be cast as rebellious figures, focusing on their specialized access to Shakespeare's language in this film and the use of music as an alternative and complementary discourse. I also consider the function that the expanded role of Balthasar suggests here, illustrating how Balthasar might be considered a *dumb teen*, a marginal textual character who becomes a visually prominent presence and whose freedom from Shakespeare's language allows for the creation of an alternative narrative. This alternative narrative hints at a queer reading of *Romeo and Juliet*, and a more expansive vision of teenage identity, a topic I consider by looking briefly at *Private Romeo*. A brief afterword traces the appearance of other *dumb teens* on contemporary stages and

screens, looking at the use of Miranda in Julie Taymor's *The Tempest* and considering the worrying role models such representations suggest for perimillennial teenagers faced with environmental and political challenges.

The remainder of this introduction provides an overview of the wider context that my argument is situated in, charting Shakespeare's role in the emergence of the teenager and the shifting educational and cultural landscape in Australia, England and the United States which led to the dalliance between Shakespeare and teenagers. Returning to the birth of the "adolescent" in the early twentieth century reveals the important role romance and language had in refashioning twentieth-century ideas about youth and Shakespeare.

*"Tetchy and wayward was thy infancy": The Pre-history of Teenagers and Shakespeare.*¹¹

In his seven ages of man, Jacques does not mention a teenage phase and with good reason, as the word and concept did not gain purchase until the 1940s. Yet, there is a clear distinction between childhood and adulthood, one common to other contemporary and classical iterations of the ages of man. Examining this genre of "age" speech from the classical period onwards, Paul Griffiths documents that "no matter how many ages they discussed as they fetched people from the cradle to the grave, contemporaries nearly always distinguished a stage of life between childhood and adulthood which they usually called youth" (20). The differences many differences between early modern youth and twentieth century teenagers, as well as the varieties of youth based on class, race, and gender, are outside the scope of this project.¹² The critical point is that

¹¹ *Richard III*, 4.4. 169.

¹² Griffiths argues that a series of rituals and festivals, including sporting competitions between married and unmarried people, youth feasts, and the youth holidays of May Day and Shrove Tuesday - helped to determine youth as a distinct phase in early modern Europe (Griffiths 22-27). Griffiths cautions that pinning a temporal boundary on youth is tricky: the potential analogy that apprenticeship offers to schooling is undermined by the continuation of

Shakespeare's characters are not teenagers and the values that this modern word holds are anachronistic when placed within the early modern world.

The most important difference between early modern youth and the modern conception of adolescence is the compulsory schooling introduced in the 19th and 20th centuries. While much of Philippe Aries's argument about the development of childhood in Western culture has been questioned, particularly his claim that children in medieval Europe were essentially adults in miniature, his insight that it was compulsory schooling that prompted a modern distinction between adulthood and childhood has been influential in contemporary studies of youth and childhood.¹³ As Hugh Cunningham puts it:

there is little doubt that the introduction of compulsory schooling, normally in the late nineteenth century, did more than any other factor in these five centuries to transform the experience of childhood by removing children, in principle if not immediately in fact, from the labour market, now reserved for those who were no longer 'children'. It was this which eventually brought about in the twentieth century an emotional valuation of children much greater than anything accorded to them in previous centuries. (17)

For the breadth of his survey, Cunningham defines children as under 15, a categorization that includes younger teenagers. We might refine this observation further, to think about how the introduction of compulsory mass education defined not just childhood, but also teenagers. One of the important shifts in the post World War II period was the increasing amount of young people who stayed in secondary school education, enabled by shifts in government policy: the 1944 Education Act in England established comprehensive schools and remodeled the examination system to cater for a greater population; in Australia, more teenagers stayed in school beyond 14

some apprenticeships for 16-20 years and through marriage (Griffiths 33). Equally, reaching puberty, generally thought of as between 13-15 for girls and 16 for boys, did not guarantee a passage to the next stage.

¹³ Aries, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, 1962. See also Cunningham, 1995, 1-19, for a discussion of responses to Aries: Aries' argument that the Latin terms for child and adolescent (*puer* and *adolescentia*) were often used indistinguishably has been comprehensively challenged.

in the 1940s and 1950s, spurred by the Federal Education Act of 1945 and State initiatives such as The New South Wales Youth Welfare Act of 1940, which raised the leaving age to 15. The mass education of the latter 20th and 21st centuries meant that Australian and English youths spent the majority of their teenage years in school, marking a big difference between early modern youth, particularly in terms of class and gender.¹⁴ This is not to say that no early modern youths were educated but rather that a critical part of the teenage experience, compulsory attendance at school, was not as definitional in the early modern concept of youth.

The segregation of youth from adulthood that compulsory schooling produced prompted a search for refined language to describe this phenomenon, with Shakespeare called upon to help. If a distinct phase of youth can be seen throughout Western literature and history (from Telemakhos' rites of passage onwards), the early 20th century was the period when this phase gained a more definitive phrase. G. Stanley Hall's magisterial work *Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion, And Education* (1904) popularized "adolescent" as the preferred noun to classify the distinct category of youth.¹⁵ For Hall, the adolescent period (between the ages of 15 and 25) was a time of "storm and stress," where the biological upheaval of puberty led to psychological duress (1: xv). This psychosomatic shift led to an intensity of linguistic expression - a "loquacity which becomes almost verbigeneration" - as adolescents feverishly scribbled in diaries, letters and notebooks (1: 318). This flurry of expression was a necessary stage for Hall, who saw an increasing maturity in thought and expression as adolescents headed towards adulthood:

¹⁴ By 1991 in Australia, schools had 71.3% retention rates to year 12 (roughly the age of 18), doubling from 34.5% in 1980.

¹⁵ As noted above, the Latin *adolescencia* was in use throughout the medieval and early modern period but Hall's work refined its meaning, classifying it as a time of biological and psychological turbulence.

We often observe, too, an inverse relation between thought and speech, so that as the former becomes scatty and indefinite the stream of words flows more copiously and smoothly; and conversely, as meanings deepen the vocabulary becomes more select and the lapse of speech and pen more restrained. (1: 318)

Though Hall used Goethe to suggest the storm and stress of adolescence, he purported to reject Shakespeare as a useful intertext, noting that “Lamb was perhaps right that much of Shakespeare is obsolete and hardly suited to represent modern life on the stage” (2: 440).

Despite this assertion, Hall used Hamlet as a touchstone to articulate adolescent experience. Telemakhos is re-imagined as a proto-Hamlet, having “Hamlet-like musings by the hearthstone of his mother” while Louisa May Alcott’s predilection to “transform herself into Hamlet and declaim in mock heroic style” is evidence of her creative abilities and move towards maturity (2: 521; 551). Both these instances configure Hamlet as a way of accessing Hall’s vision of adolescent experience - tormented musings about one’s mother or dramatic speech - and this association is compounded by a critical passage where Hall uses Hamlet’s language to voice the anxiety of adolescence:

As the child’s absorption of objects slowly gives place to consciousness of self, reflectiveness often leads to self-criticism and consciousness that may be morbid. He may become captious and censorious of himself or others. Ultimate questions that present the mysteries of things - why was I born? Who made God? What is soul, matter, good? press for answers. Conscience becomes so oversensitive that “anxiety about doing right exhausts the energy that should go to action, trifles are augmented to mountains, or debate with oneself as to what is right is carried so far as to paralyze decision,” and the “natural hue of resolution is sicklied o’er with the pale cast of thought” (1: 314).

Hall reaches Hamlet through G.A. Coe’s “The Morbid Conscience of Adolescents” (1898), which provides both the first quotation and the reference to *Hamlet*. While Coe is sensitive to the distance between *Hamlet* and adolescents, noting that he uses “thought” in “a non-Shakespearean sense,” Hall folds Shakespeare’s words into his own, so that Shakespeare appears to articulate adolescence (Coe 99). Moreover, unlike Coe, Hall misquotes Shakespeare, substituting “native” with “natural,” perhaps revealing his naturalizing narrative that recasts Hamlet as anxious

adolescent. Whatever the provenance of the quotation, the important point is that Shakespeare is conscripted to articulate adolescence and that this definition, unlike Louisa May Alcott's cathartic play as Hamlet, emphasizes the inarticulate nature of adolescent expression: Hamlet's thought is *unnatural* and his internal debate is problematic rather than profound. This reading of Hamlet, as epitomizing the problem of adolescence, is also advanced by M.F. Libby who sees Hamlet as the "perfect case study of 'an over-intellectual adolescent'" (191).

With self-expression and philosophical thought constructed as *unnatural* intrusions upon a resolute character, a stable romantic union was imagined as the solution to too much thought. Libby's 1901 paper on 'Shakespeare and Adolescents' (referenced by Hall in *Adolescence*) offers a useful insight into other ways in which Shakespeare was commandeered to define an adolescence that was definitively heteronormative and white. By his own account, his calculation of twenty-five per cent of Shakespeare's characters as adolescents and his selection of thirty for particular study is unscientific and "very arbitrary" (163). Nonetheless, Libby's decision to principally focus on two couples (Romeo and Juliet; Hamlet and Ophelia) proved prescient, with *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* becoming the definitive Shakespeare plays used to discuss twentieth-century youth culture. A belief in adolescence as a stage of romance and biological turbulence governs his selection of the other "typical adolescents", chosen because of "direct references to their age, or because of their love stories, or because they show the emotional and intellectual plasticity of youth" (163). Though sensitive to the distinction between early modern youth and a modern idea of adolescence, Libby nonetheless offers Shakespearean characters as both perfect case studies and as pedagogical lessons for young people, casting the sonnets as an example of perfect Platonic love:

The whole series culminates in sonnet 116 in which the poet declares emphatically that pure love is the sole beacon of humanity; and it cannot be too often said that he here refers to that fervent adoration which may occur between

persons of one sex. One might say that a straight line connects this sonnet with the best teachings of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, and that in it humanity picked up the clew which it had lost in the refinements and turmoil of the great interval: though in reality the Italian poets and others had perceived the truth with almost equal clearness (165).

However, the line that Libby traces isn't straight, it's queer; or rather, the bent line from Plato through Shakespeare's sonnets has been straightened into shape. This is not to deny a reading of the sonnets as homo-social friendship rather than homosexual desire, but to contextualize Libby's idea of adolescence (as a time of fervid heterosexual tumescence but placid "platonic" connections) within an Edwardian frame of reference. His interpretation of Ferdinand and Miranda seems similarly dated:

Education may set right the evils of the environment, but natural selection, and for humanity that means romantic selection, is needed to set right the evils of heredity...If we take Prospero's pedagogy seriously we may say that no education which does not control selection, irradiation of passion through work and sympathy, and marriage, is likely to cure all ills that flesh is heir to; or in other words, that the function of education is to control life at its source, and the development of the race through selection. And this is why the true romance always ends with a wedding (205).

Libby's eugenicist view of Miranda's and Ferdinand's "romantic selection" as the apotheosis of adolescence certainly limits the definition of the term, excluding any aberrant categories (Caliban; Ariel) from its classification. Miranda and Ferdinand - white, straight, dutifully silent spectators of the masque - are posited as the solution to the linguistic and somatic storms of adolescence. Libby views Miranda and Ferdinand not just as ideal adolescents but as the epitome of Shakespeare's style, lauding their wooing scene in 3.1 and suggesting that if "Shakespeare's philosophy is best expressed in any one speech or scene, perhaps this is the one" (205).

This eugenics of Shakespeare can be traced through the twentieth century, where the canon of school Shakespeare narrows to foreground romantic comedies and couples, with *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* enshrined as key texts of Teenage Shakespeare and the worlds of

these plays often narrowed scenes depicting personal turmoil. Furthermore, several of the adaptations of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* which I discuss rewrite Hamlet and Ophelia and Romeo and Juliet as versions of Libby's Miranda and Ferdinand: happy couples who survive to propagate and consume. Certainly, not all iterations of Teenage Shakespeare share this focus and it must be acknowledged that Shakespeare's role in Hall's text is ultimately minor. Nonetheless, the version of Shakespeare that Hall and Libby present is a critical stage in Shakespeare's role in producing teenagers as romantic consumers and useful to consider how certain factors in the definition of adolescence via Shakespeare (unnatural thought; linguistic struggle; natural romance) were refined when, forty years later, Shakespeare was called upon to help define the teenager.

*"I have a beard coming": The Invention of the Teenager.*¹⁶

adolescence, n. The period following the onset of puberty during which a young person develops from a child into an adult; the condition or state of being adolescent. Also: an analogous stage of an animal's life ("adolescence").

teenager, n. One who is in his or her teens; loosely, an adolescent ("teenager").

These contemporary definitions offered by the Oxford English Dictionary offer a clear distinction between adolescent and teenager - the temporal markings of "adolescence" are defined by biological development while age determines who fits within the category of "teenager" - while also pointing to their similarities, an adolescent can "loosely" be a teenager. The rough boundaries that Hall offers for adolescence - the ages of 15 to 25 - offer a further contrast to the narrower boundaries of teenage years, those between 13 to 19. However, the loose similarity between the terms belies their ideological differences: if "adolescent" carries the

¹⁶ *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 1.2. 39-40.

whiff of science and Victorian fears of sexual development, then “teenager” pings with the novelty and brightness of twentieth century consumerism. Jon Savage sees the ascendancy of “teenager” in the 1940s as a Darwinian process where multiple youth cultures were usurped by one dominant version of youth, that of the burgeoning consumer citizen:

In contrast to fascism, the American future would be ordered around pleasure and acquisition: the harnessing of mass production to disposable leisure items like magazines, cosmetics, and clothes as well as military hardware...Defined during 1944 and 1945, the Teenage had been researched and developed for a good fifty years, the period that marked America's rise to global power. The postwar spread of American values would be spearheaded by the idea of the Teenager. This new type was the ultimate psychic match for the times: living in the now, pleasure-seeking, product-hungry, embodying the new global society where social inclusion was to be granted through purchasing power. The future would be Teenage (465).

Launched in 1944 to enormous success, *Seventeen* helped sculpt this teenage future, identifying an untapped market of \$750 million. Initially, *Seventeen*'s energies were directed towards producing the “postwar American values” that Savage discusses, with the first editorial informing readers that “You're going to have to run this show - so the sooner you start thinking about it, the better. In a world that is changing as quickly and profoundly as ours I, we hope to provide a clearing house for your ideas” (qtd. in Massoni 49). This mission was reflected by the “Your Mind” section of the magazine, which ran articles on topics such as the atomic bomb, inflation and the importance of democratic student government. Readers responded to this call to thought with one reader asserting that “we teen-agers are trying to prove that we are growing up and can make grown-up decisions” (S.K. 4) and another thanking *Seventeen* for treating teenagers as citizens in the making:

Whatever did I do for good reading and information every teen-age gal needs to know, 'til I discovered 'Seventeen'? Though I'm only fifteen going-on-sixteen - I still think your - I mean “our” - magazine is super swell. It improves with every issue. Thanks oodles for looking upon us teen-agers as future women and Americans instead of swooning giggling bobby-sockers, and helping us grow up to be the kind of women America will be proud of (Quinlan 1).

The awkward ownership that Quinlan took of the magazine - “your - I mean ‘our’ magazine” - suggests the strained position *Seventeen* occupied; attempting to be a clearing house of ideas, it was also responsible to advertisers. Indeed, *Teena* had been created more for advertisers than readers, making the radical dismantling of the “Your Mind” section and the dominance of fashion and beauty sections by the 1950s perhaps inevitable. Charting the early history of *Seventeen* Kelley Massoni notes that shift in tone after initial editor Helen Valentine left: “In marching ‘ahead’ into the 1950s, *Teena*, 17’s teen girl ideal, left the world, entered the home, and lost her mind” (169).¹⁷

Shakespeare helped *Teena* fill this home, with several references to Shakespeare in *Seventeen* illustrating his role in the creation of teenagers as romantic consumers. Franco Zeffirelli’s 1968 film of *Romeo and Juliet* targeted a teenage audience and prompted a *Seventeen* interview and photo shoot with its teenage stars, who posed in “current versions of those Renaissance riches” (“Velvet Couples: *Romeo and Juliet*” 108). Advertisements also capitalized on the film, with Olivia Hussey’s Juliet recast as a spokeswoman for Yardley perfume:

Oh! Romeo, Romeo
 Oh! Falling in Love
 Oh! Happy dizzy wonderful world
 Oh! Rapture
 Oh! de London.
 (Yardley 52)

The initial closeness of Shakespeare’s words to an exuberant language of a flower-power counterculture (which both Zeffirelli’s 1968 film and the colorful bubble font of the copy suggest) is swiftly rejected as Shakespeare’s language is subsumed into a glib celebration of consumerism, which replaces hippie colors with bold black text. This was echoed by the other uses of Hussey-as-Juliet in *Seventeen*. In other advertisements, where Hussey sold watches,

¹⁷ This shift was one applauded by many readers, with Massoni reporting that “impassioned letters pleaded for more articles on beauty related products” (184).

skirts, and jewels, Shakespeare's words were almost comically repurposed, so that an ad could speak of a top "soul-mated to a skirt of rayon pretend-fur" and trumpet that said skirt "suggests such lines as 'but soft what light through yonder window breaks' " (Best & Co. 27). Although these examples might not seem so different from other examples of Bardbiz, the distinctive relationship between teenagers and Shakespeare's language gives the co-option of Shakespeare's language into consumer culture a particular importance. In fact, Juliet's appearances in *Seventeen* are defined by romantic consumerism: just the name "Juliet" proved sweet enough to market a "dreamy" fashion style ("Show Us Your Style" 60) while the description of Claire Danes's discussion of her romantic life blurred the boundaries between her teenage idiom and the character she played in Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet*: "Oh, Andrewwww. I just don't know anymore what's going on. I love him deeply. I probably always will," sighs Claire in true Juliet fashion" (M.Thompson 157). What "true Juliet fashion" means here is "true teenage fashion" or at least true *Teena* fashion, quite literally, as the interview also marketed the Urban Outfitter clothes that Danes sported. Juliet's commodification was complete with *Seventeen*'s recipe for a signature summer drink, the "Orange Juliet" (M. Williams 244).

Shakespeare was called upon not just to elevate the tawdry business of selling things but to help direct inarticulate teenagers towards romance, illustrating his dialectical relationship with teenage culture: as Juliet could be imagined to speak in a "true" teenage fashion, so teenagers could adopt the language of love. Asked by a moderator what language they would use to describe girls (with the suggestions of groovy, cool and beautiful), a group of teenage boys in 1969 asserted a distinction between modern girls ("a cool girl is the type you see in James Bond - in those fancy sports cars") and the classical beauty of a Shakespearean heroine ("One girl who attracts me terrifically is Olivia Hussey in *Romeo and Juliet*. She is one of the most beautiful

girls”) (“What Boys Look for in Girls” 152-153). By association, Shakespeare’s language could provide a more profound vocabulary of love than groovy slang. Language was especially important in defining teenage culture: the new-fangled word “teenager” bred further words to categorize trends (such as *bodgie* and *mods*); *Seventeen* promised to translate Teena’s specific “language” to advertisers (*Seventeen* Promotional Flier); in 1983, Kenneth Hudson published *A Dictionary of the Teenage Revolution and Its Aftermath*, noting that youth culture had “produced its own language, made up partly of new expressions and partly of old words used in a different way” (ix).¹⁸ Shakespeare’s words were “used up” to provide a romantic language inaccessible to teenagers, with another article from 1969 crystallizing this connection:

But what if words don’t come easily, if your speech resembles sturdy cotton rather than lace? To thine own self be true. If it goes against your grain, don’t force a flowery love letter. If you can’t convey your love in your own words, it’s perfectly acceptable to use someone else’s. Why not copy a poem that expresses all you feel - a Shakespearean sonnet (“Let me not to the marriage of true minds admit impediments...”), something by Elizabeth Barrett Browning or Leonard Cohen, or any poem that strikes you as the embodiment of your own emotions (“How to Write to a Boy” 184).

Shakespeare’s superiority as the poet of love is stressed by his position and the use of quotations, both from the sonnet and the embedded line from *Hamlet* that recasts Polonius’s advice as a sort of self-help maxim. Imagining Shakespeare as the author of teenage selfhood bridges any perceived gap between difficult Shakespeare and modern teenagers and the ultimate focus of the article - what kind of bright stationery would be most appropriate for a love-letter? - collapses the difference in language that the article stresses: written on groovy stationery, Shakespeare’s antique words become part of consumer culture. This love letter offers a useful example of romantic consumerism, illustrating both the romanticized nature of consumable

¹⁸ More recently publications such as dictionaries of ‘teenglish’, *Pimp Your Vocab* (2009), and oral histories of teenagers, *A Totally Alien Life-Form: Teenagers* (1996), continue to pitch teenagers as having their own brand of customs and language.

goods (the stationary; Shakespeare's language) and their use to propel a romance that, for Teena at least, is one of future consumption, with babies, house and car the imagined end.

Seventeen's vision of a teenage culture based on consumption was also evident in Australia and England. A comprehensive history of the emergence of the teenager in Australia and England is outside the scope of this project, but as youth sub-cultures morphed through different iterations - hair and jeans becoming long, short, and long again - certain characteristics of a teenage culture remained relatively constant: assertiveness, a debt to America, a distinctive local look and language, and an association with consumerism, buoyed by advertisers that targeted this teenage style and plundered its language for copy. Favorable economic conditions and the increased number of young people in part-time employment led to the emergence of a lucrative teenage market in Australia and England, with trends for teens impacted by American fashions: Irving, Maunders and Sherrington note that "the American presence during the War had left a legacy" with Australian youth "exposed to American popular music, dress and style" in an unprecedented manner (9). The distinctive look of Australian teenagers was modeled on American fashions, with the male "bodgies" (wearing long hair and suit-coats with trousers pegged at the cuff) recalling the similarly styled American "zoot-suiters," and female "widgies" (with sleeveless blouses and gabardine skirts with a split up the back) styled after jitterbuggers. The English Teddy Boys of the 1950s were also styled after zoot-suiters and the term 'teenager' was imported into Britain and in common circulation by the 1950s (Osgerby 35). It is important to note that while both Australia and England developed distinctive youth sub-cultures, with their own fashions, lingo and popular texts, the influence of American culture in defining teenage identity continued: Christopher Koch's *The Boys in the Island* (1958), one of the first works of young adult fiction in Australia depicted young

Australian teenagers as “deliberately choosing all things American and new” (qtd. in Irving, Maunders and Sherrington 14) and Australia’s identity became increasingly tied with America, from Prime Minister John Curtin’s influential declaration in 1941 that “Australia looks to America” reaching beyond foreign policy to define an Australia that Robin Boyd scornfully termed “Austerica” (Davidson 90). Meanwhile, the Mods and skinheads in England in the 1960s reached to American soul music and black American culture for their style (Osgerby 65-67). The association of teenagers with consumerism was compounded in the 1960s when it was an older youth - the radical student - who embodied the countercultural space previously occupied by the younger juvenile delinquent. (Irving 125; Osgerby 64-82).

If teenagers in Australia and England were increasingly exposed to Americanized culture after World War II, they were also increasingly exposed to Shakespeare in the classroom with the assertive teenage rhetoric facilitating a transfer of ownership of Shakespeare: from a single authoritative voice (schoolteacher or Shakespeare) to multiple young bodies. The Cox Report in 1989 enshrined Shakespeare as the *only* compulsory author in the United Kingdom’s new National Curriculum, building on previous reports which lauded Shakespeare’s value (especially The Newbolt Report of 1921 and The Newsom Report of 1963) and solidifying his canonical place in the curriculum after a period in the 1980s where he fell out of favor in English classrooms (Irish 14). Admiring the richness of Shakespeare’s language and the universality of his themes, Cox was also a fan of Rex Gibson’s Shakespeare in Schools project of the 1980s, and his report encouraged the use of performance-based pedagogies in the classroom. These pedagogies built on the increasing interest in performance in twentieth century classrooms: the work of educational theorists and practitioners in the 1960s and 1970s - including Dorothy Heathcote, Gavin Bolton, Paulo Freire and Augusto Boal - brought a returned interest in child-

centered learning (drawing on the educational theories of John Dewey and Rousseau), with two related movements emerging in the 1960s: drama-in-education (where students are active participants in drama workshops designed to teach a variety of subjects) and theatre-in-education (where companies performed pieces designed to address social issues with students). Though some had been calling for a widespread performance-based approach to teaching Shakespeare since the beginning of the twentieth century, it was in the 1990s that a major incorporation of performance-based pedagogies occurred, influenced by Gibson's project and the editions of Cambridge School Shakespeare that emerged subsequently.¹⁹ What was different about teaching Shakespeare through performance was his language, with theatre practitioners cast as specialists who could decode the rules of iambic pentameter and explain obscure words with games, ultimately leading to student *ownership* of the plays. This rhetoric directly tapped into an assertiveness and acquisitiveness that was distinctly teenage: as *Seventeen* readers were encouraged to own "your magazine", so students were directed to repossess Shakespeare's language (Massoni 52). The confidence with which the Royal Shakespeare Company asserted its "Stand up for Shakespeare" campaign in 2008 testifies to an educational climate supportive of performance-based pedagogies; the RSC's success at bringing high school students and teachers in contact with Shakespeare allowed them to launch a national campaign and expand their audience to primary school children.

Post World War II Australian students were also asked to stand up for Shakespeare, being called upon to value the richness of his language and to bridge their double-distance (geographic and temporal) from this language through performance-based pedagogies. The enthusiasm that

¹⁹ An English Association pamphlet from 1908 warned of the dangers of "forgetting what drama really means, and bringing the poet beneath a mass of commands, conundrums and morals" (Blocksidge 4) and Caldwell Cook's *The Play Way* in 1917 outlined methods for getting student on their feet in 1917.

the 1921 Newbolt Report expressed for Shakespeare increased his role in the English curriculum and, as Richard Fotheringham notes, “this pedagogy was quickly echoed in Australia at a time when secondary schooling itself began expanding rapidly, and since the old free-enterprise aphorism ‘If the public don’t want to come, nothing will stop them’ requires a codicil when applied to performances of Shakespeare: ‘But the teachers may make them’” (“Shakespeare in Queensland” 219). Fotheringham’s reference to student attendance at performances reflects the ready market they represented for touring companies and theatrical companies - including Allan Wilkie in the 1920s, Oscar Asche in the 1940s, the Young Elizabethan Players in the 1950s and 1960s - took advantage of the paucity of theatrical activities in many rural Australian towns to tour Shakespeare plays. The Young Elizabethan Players, discussed in Chapter One, had an explicit educational imperative, staging condensed versions of the Shakespeare plays on the curriculum for secondary school students, who typically studied a comedy for the Junior examination and a tragedy for the Senior examination. Though state control of which play texts were examined in Australia has diminished, making it harder for companies to co-ordinate tours - the 1970 Radford Report allowed schools to choose which texts they wanted to perform and Australia moved towards a National Curriculum in 2012 - the interest in Shakespeare as a dramatic text has increased, with the enormous success of Bell Shakespeare’s education program a testament to the market for standing-up Shakespeare in Australia.

The relatively limited repertoire of the Players illustrates the narrow canon of School Shakespeare that emerged in the 20th century. A list of these plays, which were the plays examined in the 1950s and 1960s, helps to determine this canon: *Henry V*, *Hamlet*, *Henry IV Parts One and Two*, *Richard III*, *Richard II*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Julius*

Caesar, Twelfth Night, A Midsummer Night's Dream, As You Like It, The Tempest, The Merchant of Venice and *The Taming of the Shrew*. The Bell Shakespeare Company's perimillennial version of this canon is even narrower, with *Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Macbeth, A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Othello* their core texts (Edgerton).²⁰ A similar trend can be seen in the US and the UK: for example, *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Tempest* were the 2009 set texts for Key Stage Three in the UK and a recent Folger survey revealed the most taught plays in American High Schools to be *Romeo and Juliet, Macbeth, Hamlet* and *Julius Caesar*, with *A Midsummer Night's Dream* the most frequently performed (Irish 13; LoMonico 26).²¹ In fact, this canon is somewhat narrower given the way that plays are examined - by set scenes - leading concerned pedagogues to worry that "in practice pupils would often only study the set scenes rather than a whole play" and that often "for many people exposure to the plays was often only in the form of electronic versions" (Monk 59-60). Within the canon of School Shakespeare, overtly political plays (*Richard II; King John*) have diminished in importance from the early twentieth century while *Romeo and Juliet* has become increasingly popular; hinting at the importance of romance, and romantic verse, in defining both Shakespeare and teenage identity.²²

Some of the plays that were part of the canon of School Shakespeare that emerged also became central texts in Shakespeare's absorption into youth culture. Indeed, it is hard not to see

²⁰ Alongside the touring Actors at Work, the Bell Shakespeare Company offer a range of drama-in-education workshops which cover a wider range of plays, expanding from the core of School Shakespeare to include the other plays the Players presented as well as *The Comedy of Errors* and *Much Ado about Nothing*.

²¹ LoMonico lists the other most popularly taught plays in the US in 2009 as: *Othello, The Taming of the Shrew, Much Ado about Nothing, Twelfth Night, The Tempest, King Lear, The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It* and *Richard III*.

²² Albanese documents how the College Testing Exam determined a canon of school Shakespeare in the US, with plays previously taught for their rhetorical excellence - King John - slowly diminishing in status. Albanese notes that: "A handful of plays, most frequently *Julius Caesar* and *Macbeth* but also often *Hamlet, A Midsummer Night's Dream* and, more recently, *Romeo and Juliet*, have become pervasive in the experience of Americans who have completed a high school degree" (69).

a relationship between this process: Zeffirelli's 1968 film of *Romeo and Juliet* became a standard school text and also helped create a ready-made market of school students studying *Romeo and Juliet* for subsequent plays and film adaptations, which would then become taught as part of the school curriculum.²³ The two plays that I will discuss at length - *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* - are core texts in the teening of Shakespeare. The stage and screen versions of *West Side Story* (1957 and 1962) and Zeffirelli's *Romeo and Juliet* (1960 and 1968) cemented the play's status as a text for the now generation, with its central couple equally at home among a milieu of juvenile delinquents and flower-powered teenagers. The 1960s could be seen as a veritable "Age of Shakes-quarius," with Shakespeare used to sculpt youth culture and *Hamlet* at the centre, a disillusioned subject surveying political corruption and ecological uncertainty: Hamlet's "what a piece of work is man" speech provided the lyrics for one of *Hair*'s numbers (1967); Peter Hall's influential 1965 production presented Hamlet as a student radical; productions such as Charles Marowitz's *Hamlet* (1965) and Joe Papp's *Naked Hamlet* (1968) radically dismantled the text and presented alienated princes in tune with the time of the joint; Tom Stoppard's play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* (1967) moved the romantic prince to the margins of the play and recast two minor spies as absurdist heroes.

This short, eventful history covers a small portion of Shakespeare's dialectical encounters with teenagers: the next four chapters fill in this story, exploring the manner in which Shakespeare's language and characters are used to sculpt visions of teenagers as romantic consumers and counter-cultural rebels. I begin at the site of many first encounters with Shakespeare, the school.

²³ A 1998 report in England credited Luhrmann's 1996 film for "the huge improvement in 14-year-olds' performance in Shakespeare's test" and noted that 62% of 14 year olds studied *Romeo and Juliet* (Irish 15).

Chapter One.

Supposing a Blackboard to be a Bear: Touring Shakespeare to Teenagers.

Julius Caesar is a picture to stir the spirits and open wide the floodgates of the imagination, and, of course, remind us again and again of the enormous contribution to our language made by the Elizabethan. Next time you say “It’s Greek to me” remember Shakespeare’s Casca who said it first!
 (“Shakespeare as You Like It” 74)

If Australian teenagers proved modern Cascas, categorizing the archaic language in front of them as no more familiar than ancient Greek, troupes of young actors hoped to be adept translators, touring abridged versions of Shakespeare plays from the latter half of the 20th century onwards. As the feature on *Julius Caesar* in *Seventeen* presented the cinema as an apt medium to crank open imagination’s floodgates and translate Shakespeare’s words, so too did touring companies aim to work on the imaginary forces of their teenage audiences, promising that if they labored hard enough their imaginations alone could furnish Shakespeare and magically create meaning out of a muddle of strange words.

Responses from teenagers and children testify to this alchemical process and to the language barrier that Shakespeare poses. Barbara Braithwaite’s 1961 letter frames her attendance at a performance by the Young Elizabethan Players as revelatory: “I am thirteen years old and previously Shakespearian plays were a lot of mixed up bosh to me, but after your performance I realize the beauty of them and will try to improve my knowledge of Shakespear ” (1).²⁴

Comments left on The Bell Shakespeare Company’s Education homepage present similar narratives in the 21st century, with several recent responders applauding the Actors at Work for

²⁴ Original spellings from student commentators are used throughout: I have not substituted “Shakespeare” for “Shakespear” or used “sic” in order to preserve commentators’ voices: I follow this model when quoting from teenage commentators throughout this dissertation.

their fusion of ancient and modern languages and positioning themselves as enlightened contemporary Cascas: “Now that you put modern and old english together, the story isn't so Greek to me anymore!” (Jennifer); “I absolutely adored the play "Midsummers Madness" as it incorporated Shakespeare's old english and our morden English” (Tran).²⁵ Tran’s use of “incorporated” is especially revealing, echoing the language from Bell Shakespeare Company’s initial mission statement that it would attempt to “incorporate Shakespeare as an essential part of our contemporary Australian culture” (qtd. in Kiernander 239). Part of this strategy of incorporation - and the modernity of the English that students responded to - is the unabashed use of Australian accents in performance, set in opposition to a “traditionalist or British approach to the canon” (239). Another part of this process, one less celebrated by Bell Shakespeare, is the corporatization of Shakespeare’s language. Certainly, this is not the sense in which either Tran or the Bell Shakespeare Company are using “incorporate” but the word hints at an important part of the story that this chapter tells: the teening of Shakespeare enriched student vocabularies while loading Shakespeare’s words with consumerist values.

This chapter tracks this process by examining two national touring companies: the Young Elizabethan Players (1958 - 1971) and The Bell Shakespeare Company’s Actors at Work (1991 - present). The dramatic differences between the two companies tell the wider story of Australia’s shifting sense of national identity and the changing place of Shakespeare in the curriculum, with the Players’ “proper” English accents in productions celebrating British history replaced by the Actors’ Aussie brogues in productions emphasizing an Americanized teenage culture in the perimillennial period. Institutional changes complement this narrative, with the state-sponsored

²⁵ The number of similar responses from the same school which comment upon this mix of “modern” and “old” English (and refer to the Casca quotation) suggest that these responses might have been prompted by a school assignment.

educational activities of the Players replaced by the corporate funded Bell Shakespeare Company. My primary focus is on how these two touring companies can be used as a case study to examine teenage encounters with Shakespeare. To that end, I focus on three main issues: the role of Shakespeare's language; the political questions posed by these productions; and the reactions of student audiences. I am particularly interested in the manner in which "Shakespeare's language" becomes narrowed to "Shakespeare's verse," an emphasis which can lead to an impression of Shakespeare's language as prettily phrased linguistic wallpaper. This use of speech as primarily descriptive becomes especially problematic when considering the political contexts that these productions engage with, with teenagers constructed as descriptive witnesses of atrocities that they are unable to stop. Overall, I argue that while Shakespeare's language is increasingly incorporated into a vocabulary of youth culture that hinges upon consumerism and denies young people political agency, student audiences can set up their own interpretative communities that talk back to Shakespeare and resist some of these narratives.

A brief survey of touring Shakespeare in Australia helps to contextualize this argument and accounts for the extraordinary significance of these two companies. Both the Players and Actors owed a debt to Allan Wilkie, who toured his minimalist productions of Shakespeare across Australia in the 1920s. Wilkie established several important precedents: that there was a market for Shakespeare and theatre in rural Australia (with many towns far from a city or theatre); that state sponsorship could help mitigate the large costs of traversing Australia's geographic expanse (Wilkie negotiated large discounts on train travel); and that schoolchildren constituted a readymade audience for Shakespeare, with the discounted rates that Wilkie offered to children helping to attract school groups. Further encouragement was offered by 1921's Newbolt Report in England, which celebrated Shakespeare as "our greatest English writer,"

cautioned against anything that made Shakespeare “dull or distorted,” and ensured Shakespeare’s place in the Australian high school curriculum of the 1920s (Irish 4; “Shakespeare in Queensland” 219). An astonishing one million schoolchildren looking for interesting and undistorted Shakespeare attended Wilkie’s performances in the 1920s (one seventh of the population). The Shakespeare they witnessed was both rooted in British and Victorian tradition - Wilkie’s company produced “purified” texts that Bowdlerized the plays for family audiences, proudly presented Shakespeare’s English history plays as part of its canon and performed in the grand grounds of Government House in Perth (Golder and Madelaine 6). Such surroundings clearly embedded Shakespeare’s words in a quite literal empire of meaning and placed Wilkie’s work within a wider history of art and performance in Australia that re-imagined the local climate as England as Arcadia, such as the lavish production of *As You Like It* in 1863, which, as Kate Flaherty argues, used Arden “to establish English pastoral on Australian soil and to cancel the dissonance of the Australian physical context” (*Ours as We Play It* 97).

However, the minimalism of the company’s performance style (simple cloth backdrops and costumes, abridged texts) and their willingness to perform in less imperial settings (a range of smaller rural towns) paved the way for a less imperial Shakespeare in Australia. The Young Elizabethan Players continued Wilkie’s educational mission, departing from the glamorous style of British touring companies and Wilkie’s most prominent Australian successor, John Alden’s company, who toured Shakespeare in the 1950s but discouraged rather than courted school audiences, with a sign for *Measure for Measure* announcing that it was “NOT SUITABLE FOR CHILDREN” (Gay, “International Glamour” 185). Like Alden’s company, the Players received their funding from the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust (AETT), formed in 1954 in an

attempt to promote Australian art and herald a new Elizabethan age.²⁶ The Trust's ambition to make theatre "the same dynamic force in our culture that it had been in late-sixteenth century England" hinted at some of its problems in programming a new Australian theatre that simultaneously aimed to replicate English culture and step out of its shadow (qtd. in Madelaine 31). The Young Elizabethan Players bore testament to some of these tensions: many of the fresh-faced actors trained at the new National Institute for Dramatic Arts (established by the AETT in 1955) but some members of the Arts Council desired trained British actors, wondering if "possibly some actor can be persuaded to come out from England to lead" (James Mills 1). Though the Players wore jeans - earning them the moniker "Shakespeare in Jeans" - they did not use Australian accents, interpolated narration stressed the plays' historical difference rather than contemporary similarities and the names of troupes traversing different parts of the country - The Curtain, Rose and Globe - hearkened back to Elizabethan England. Although some schools banned the troupe fearing the corrupting influence of denim, most were welcoming and the Players grew considerably from a season in 1958 with five actors performing two plays throughout New South Wales to three different companies juggling the different plays set by school boards in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia in the 1960s.

Several aspects of the Players' productions set up important precedents for touring Shakespeare to teenagers in Australia. Given financial constraints, the actors' salaries were small (33 pounds a week during tours; 10 pounds a week for rehearsals) and, coupled with the demanding schedule, this meant that the proposition was typically attractive to younger actors,

²⁶ The initial idea for the Trust came from a businessman, Dr. H.C. Coombs, the governor of Commonwealth Bank. Joining forces with Charles Moses (the general manager of the Australian Broadcasting Company) and John Douglas Pringle (the editor of *The Sydney Morning Herald*), Coombs sought to rectify the lack of national arts policy by establishing The Trust, modeled after The British Arts Council. Federal management of the Arts was taken over by The Australian Council for the Arts in the 1960s. See Madelaine 29-32.

frequently freshly-minted NIDA or college graduates.²⁷ While the inexperience of some actors bothered Arts Council staff yearning for British stars, it helped connect them to their younger audience, with one young fan tellingly wishing all the “students” good luck (Mobris 1). John Trevor, the silver-haired director who approached the AETT with the initial idea for the Players, served as a bridge between the young actors and antique Shakespeare, editing the truncated versions of the plays and writing the interpolated narration to connect scenes. It was Trevor who resisted performing *Romeo and Juliet*, fearing it would be “a complete ‘send-up’ with kids and demands better actors than I think we could find” (Letter to Neil Hutchinson). As Trevor’s influence dwindled in the mid 1960s, new director Malcolm Robertson added the popular *Romeo and Juliet*, explicitly pitching its youth culture credentials by categorizing the production as “alive with youthful vitality” (Robertson 2). The Players’ evolution through the 1960s shows the group moving from one anchored in Elizabethan names and verse to one at home in The Age of Shake-squarius: the 1967 season featured a 17 year old Player, Garry Gray, who claimed that the young and attractive Players received “a Beatle type reception” from some schools (“Shakespeare...with a dash of hep”).

Tactics that the Players gradually adopted - a celebration of rather than an apology for the youthful vitality of their actors; narration that stressed contemporary relevance rather than historical difference; a willingness to engage with *Romeo and Juliet* - were enthusiastically embraced by the Bell Shakespeare’s Actors at Work, the primary inheritors of the Players’ mantle. When the Players disbanded in 1971, economic, educational and cultural factors in the 1970s and 1980s mitigated against the formation of a national touring Shakespeare group: a lack of government funding, schools’ increased freedom to set their own plays in some States, and a

²⁷ Revenue came from the AETT, the Arts Council of Australia and tickets (students paid minimal amounts: 2-4 shillings for tickets and 3 pennies for programs).

shift in interest to theatre in education dealing with contemporary political issues.²⁸ Launched in the middle of a recession in 1991, the Bell Shakespeare Company's success was partially due to a happy mix of capital and chutzpah in the figures of Tony Gilbert and John Bell. A retired businessman and Shakespeare fan, Gilbert prompted Bell to set up a national Shakespeare company in the late 1980s, fronting a large part of the initial expenses and helping to secure corporate sponsors when the AETT (which had promised some funding) collapsed in 1990. Bell was a clear choice to front an Australian Shakespeare company. An important player in Age of Shakes-quarius productions - playing Rosencrantz in Peter Hall's 1965 *Hamlet* at the RSC and Henry V in a landmark production in Adelaide in 1964 - Bell had developed a distinctive style as a Shakespearean director for his Sydney company Nimrod (1970-1985), helping to a Shakespeare closer to Australia and youth culture through productions such as his 1975 *Much Ado About Nothing* (which used Italian immigrant accents) and 1979 *Romeo and Juliet* (which featured a Mad Max Romeo in Mel Gibson). Bell's brand of modern Shakespeare partially hinged upon the use of Australian accents, which, as Richard Madelaine notes, he imagined as a way of enriching Australian vocabulary: "There are aspects of contemporary Australian culture that trouble Bell, its loss of feeling for language, its emphasis on monosyllabic and modish observation. For him Shakespeare offers a way to revitalise our culture with a sense of the importance of language, especially in loquacious form" (35).

If Australian language was to be revitalized through contact with Shakespeare, the casualness of Australian diction was also seen as a way of rejuvenating Shakespeare, particularly in the classroom. Education was a critical part of the BSC's initial mission and economic survival, with Bell admitting that the financial impetus behind the initial session of Actors at

²⁸ See Fotheringham, "Shakespeare in Queensland": some companies continued to bring Shakespeare to schools on a state level, such as Grin n' Tonic (1969-present) in Queensland.

Work in 1991: “I was determined to find a way to keep at least some of the fourteen actors together as a company” (222). The first season kept half of the actors employed, as they toured 73 schools in New South Wales to perform scenes from Shakespeare. As this program expanded alongside the BSC, its initial loose framework (where actors improvised in response to student requests) was honed to a model very similar to the Players: truncated versions of plays from the canon of school Shakespeare (with contemporary narration courtesy of Ned Manning from 2002) performed by clusters of young NIDA graduates travelling across Australia in mini-vans. Shakespeare’s plays were plumbed to examine teenage relationships and rebellion, with popular youth culture references acting as sugar to ease the edge of unfamiliar language. The success of this strategy is testified by its rapid expansion (by 2010, the Actors were visiting 297 schools and performing to 59,000 teenagers) and the \$1 million granted to the company to expand this educational policy in 2008, a testament to the exposure to the “rich diversity of the English language” that encounters with Shakespeare bring. (Julie Bishop, qtd. in *Bell Magazine* 15). “Rich diversity” is another meaningful phrase: if the BSC expanded the diversity of Shakespeare’s language to include an Australian accent and idiom (presented as an enriching process for both discourses, as well as the BSC) it also folded Shakespeare’s language within corporate discourse, sculpting Shakespeare as a language and vocabulary of richness. Returning to the Players is helpful in mapping out this shift and in exploring how the teenager became incorporated into this vocabulary and created as a romantic consumer.

Fancy Shapes for Fancy Words: A language of things for love-struck kings.

The richness of Shakespeare's language was firmly situated in his verse for the Players, who assured teachers that "care is taken to preserve the best of the verse" ("Young Elizabethan Players Promotional Flier"). Part of this reverence was to deflect anxiety from teachers, suspicious about the jeans that the Players wore, with a Wairoa Principal offering a representative worry: "I always suspect people use these modern costumes because they're not good enough to perform Shakespeare in the proper way" (qtd. in "Jeans' Views Differ"). In fact, Trevor's edits seemed at pains to avoid "improper Shakespeare," both in his resistance to bawdy material and his care to preserve beautiful speeches. This led to some curious edits of the plays: Trevor's edit of *Macbeth* excised 2.6, 4.2 and 4.3 entirely but retained Banquo's speech about the house martlet in 1.6. Banquo's poetry about the night sky in 2.1 was also awkwardly sandwiched between two sentences of narration: "(narrating) Banquo is with his son Fleance, in the great hall. (in character) There's husbandry in Heaven, their candles are all out. He encounters Macbeth (enter Macbeth) and agrees to speak at some time about the witches" (*Macbeth* 13). Certainly, Banquo's speech about the extinguished stars does help establish the claustrophobic mood of the scene that follows, but it was a curious inclusion, especially as so little of the interaction between Macbeth and Banquo was kept. The shift between verse to narration illustrates Trevor's desire to have his Shakespeare expressed beautifully, an impulse which reaches its apotheosis in 3.3. Although this scene is narrated rather than staged, Trevor included the murderer's meteorological observations, clearly of the opinion that Shakespeare could make the sun and stars shine like no other:

'The murderers await Banquo and his son't[sic] return to the Palace'
 (in character)
 The West yet glimmers with some streaks of day.
 Now spurs the lated traveler apace,
 To gain the timely inn, and near approaches

The subject of our watch.

In the fading light, Banquo secures his son's escape - Fleance will live and can fulfil[sic] the witches[sic] prophecy - but Banquo is murdered. (*Macbeth* 24)

Curiously, Actor D breaks from his role as narrator to deliver Shakespearean verse “in character” as the third murderer. However, the third murderer does not appear in the rest of the play and the above passage constitutes Trevor’s treatment of this scene. What does it mean then for Actor D to slip into character when the Third Murderer does not really have a character in this version? As with Banquo’s speech above, “in character” essentially meant “in verse” and the concept of character was partially effaced to ensure reverence for the verse. Furthermore, 3.3’s dramatic moments - the suspense as the murderer’s wait for their victims, the grisly onstage murder of Banquo - were strangely elided in favor of a poetry recitation about the glimmering sun. A similarly manufactured opposition between verse and drama can be seen in a Victorian exam paper from 1966 which asked students to “describe and discuss a scene which you regard as a fine one chiefly because of its poetry, and a scene which you admire chiefly for its dramatic qualities” (Victoria Universities and Schools Examinations Board 8). Poetry and drama are positioned as almost mutually exclusive and it is assumed here that students will select different scenes to discuss. Significantly, the passages that were excised in *Macbeth* were some of the major prose sections in the play (the Porter’s scene; Lady Macduff’s conversation with her son) and edits of most other plays replicate a similar pattern (the understandable exceptions being *As You Like it* and *The Story of Prince Hal*). “The best of Shakespeare” was for Trevor at least equated with “the best of the verse”, casting the Players as conscientious archaeologists, pruning “the occasional deadwood which burdens the texts” and throwing “the inspired verse...into higher relief” (“Press Release for New South Wales Tour”). Imagined as both a historical and theatrical code with words that need to be glossed and dramatic rules that need to be explained,

Shakespeare's language had to be translated through theatre - and received pronunciation - for it to make sense.

The interpolated narration also stressed the otherness of Shakespeare's language, with Trevor's edits rendering the plays into mausoleums of sorts, appropriate tombs for archeologically preserved verse. An emphasis on historical context highlighted the antiquated otherness of Shakespeare's stories, with the audience educated about the customs of the Elizabethans and others. For example, the narration in 3.4 stressed the importance of the Lords leaving by degrees: "As the guests settle themselves in the 'degree' of their importance - an essential in the times to proper order and respect - Macbeth learns that Banquo is indeed dead, though Fleance has escaped" (*Macbeth* 24). Expressed parenthetically, the history lesson was important enough to be included, although the question of degrees is not essential to an understanding of this scene. Similarly, in *The Story of Prince Hal*, attention was called to the subject of drawers, surprising as most of Hal's business with Francis was cut. The stable, hierarchical view of early modern England could have been taken from Tillyard, with the narrator taking on the tone of a schoolteacher - rather than that of a cohort - to establish a calm picture of Elizabethan order.²⁹ Although the Players did not perform in imperial settings like Government House, the narration continually denied the dissonance of the Australian physical context that their plays were performed in - the red reality of dusty outback towns and the cramped spaces of small school halls - in favor of imagining a "proper" Shakespearean environment.

Students were conscripted to construct this environment, with their imaginations centrally important in conjuring an appropriate world for each play. The Chorus from *Henry V* served as a

²⁹ See *The Elizabethan World-Picture*, E.M.W. Tillyard, 1944.

template for the Players, with all early programs using a quotation from the chorus's first speech to frame an appeal: "*Let us... 'On your imaginary forces work'*" ("Young Elizabethan Players 1959 program," original emphasis). The first program, for the 1958 production of *Henry V*, twinned the chorus's vision with the players, with Hugh Hunt, the Director of the AETT, telling students that: "*For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings*" (qtd. in "Young Elizabethan Players 1958 Program," original emphasis). It was the decking of kings that students were asked most frequently to imagine: their imaginative labor was directed towards envisioning Shakespeare's plays as imperial pageants, supplying the scenic finery that the budget didn't allow for. All of the Players' canon was situated within the imagined splendor of *Henry V*, with students consistently called upon to imagine lavish locations: "Shakespeare's words with an occasional explanation and, above all, your imaginations must supply the vast stone Castle of Elsinore, the colourful Rialto in Venice, the Mediterranean beauty of Illyria and the heraldic magnificence of Richard's Court" ("Young Elizabethan Players 1960 Program"). While many of Shakespeare's plays do take place in lavish and imperial settings (in courts and castles), the emphasis placed on this world by the narration was extraordinary, especially considering the tight time constraints that the Players were under. Consider the segment introducing 1.5 of *Macbeth*:

Now the scene moves to Macbeth's castle near Inverness - the Castle of Dunsinane. Strongly fortified, the outside perhaps sombre and forbidding, but the great hall, in which most of the following scenes take place, is rich[sic] with trophies - furs and hangings, and the dull gleam of polished metals. A staircase leads to a balcony and further apartments, one of which will be Duncan's when he arrives. There is a great stone fireplace in which huge logs flame and crackle brightly (*Macbeth* 8).

This narration oriented its audience in space rather than story, expending most of its energy on conveying an appropriately ancient Dunsinane. The Dunsinane that the audience was encouraged to imagine was a castle not out of place in a "proper" or appropriately spectacular full-stage

Shakespeare production of the period, populated with stone slabs, gleaming trophies and crackling fires and “rich” with largesse. Many of Trevor’s narrative segments worked to paint very traditional settings for the plays: more logs crackled alongside cured bacons in The Boar’s Head; Venice gleamed with “clear soft blue sky and sparkling sunlight on a canal; an elegant bridge perhaps and the striped poles for the gondolas” (*The Merchant of Venice* 1) and Westminster was paved with vivid adjectives, “a great throne set in the midst; soft-coloured light filters through the tall stained-glass windows drawing a flash from jewels here, a gleam from rich fabrics there, and spread throughout the ominous glint of steel armour and weapons” (*Richard II* 24). Trevor seemed determined to recreate the Victorian pictorial tradition of Shakespearean staging, conjuring up a conservative vision where everything from logs to jewels shimmered with nostalgia for Merry Old England; even the plays that were set on the continent became inscribed within an English context for Trevor, who introduced Padua as “Italy as Shakespeare thought it to be, sunny, cloudless and gay... his characters are really very English - full of the glittering bravado and swank of the young English nobles whom he knew and admired” (*The Taming of the Shrew* 1). Much like Quince, the Players seemed to emphatically state “we are not here” (*MND* 5.1. 115) inviting their audiences to transcend the familiar here of their school surroundings to conjure up a more appropriate English world; the distinctive Australian spaces that the plays were anchored in were effectively erased as audiences were encouraged to imagine a determinedly English elsewhere.

This process is especially notable in Trevor’s descriptions of exterior locations, which imagines pastoral European landscapes at a remove from Australia. Belmont is presented as a rich landscape, focalized through Portia’s possessive gaze: “Now we must move to Belmont to meet the rich heiress Portia, in her beautiful country house. She is on the sweeping marble

terrace overlooking the sun-drenched lawns and part[sic] with Nerrisa [sic] her servant [sic] and friend” (*The Merchant of Venice* 3). The description - sweeping marble, grand country house, lawns soaking up the sun - could almost match Government House in Perth and is another example of the erasure of Australia via Arcadia-Arden. Portia’s panoramic possession is a perspective denied to the students: they travel to “meet with the rich heiress” rather than to identify with her and the rich world that she looks out over is at a remove from the reality of most of the towns the Players performed in. Similarly, Olivia’s garden in Illyria was presented as a fantastic space that relied on the tropes of aristocratic England:

You’ve probably seen pictures of clipped box hedging - they cut box into all sorts of fantastic shapes - and that’s what our setting is meant to suggest to you. A part of Olivia’s garden where, perhaps, a hedged walk leads to a collection of box trees, trimmed and clipped into fancy shapes (*Twelfth Night* 20).

These “fancy shapes” were constructed as appropriate settings for Shakespeare’s fancy words, the hedges trimmed carefully into precise shapes as Shakespeare’s verse was pruned and clipped by Trevor. The production of *Twelfth Night* relied on more than students’ imaginations to suggest this rich environment, with the Players bringing in properties to construct an aristocratic garden on stage. Critically, even spaces that might have been imagined as a tad less fancy were clipped into shape, with *The Tempest*’s locale emphasizing the triumph of civilization over an unruly natural world:

Rocky, with an opening to a carefully civilized cave used as a dwelling place. In spite of the rock shelves, like steps and platforms, there are trees, perhaps windswept and twisted, in the gnarled trunks of which one could imagine queer sprites and woodland elves. There would be tangles of flowering creepers, rock-roses and pale anemonies [sic] - a scene of delicate, magic-coloured beauty. Here is the master of the island, Prospero, with his daughter Miranda; she has known no other person than her father nor any other life than alone with him on the island.
(*The Tempest* 2)

Though rebellious trees attempt to thwart an ordered, anthropocentric vision of the environment here (twisting “in spite of” the rock shelves, helpfully arranging themselves as steps for humans),

this picture ultimately presents stability and civility, a “carefully civilized cave” and a delicately beautiful environment, where roses bloom out of rocks. The island is also carefully situated, located firmly “in the Mediterranean,” eliding potential collocations with Australia (1). Befitting a production from the early 1960s, the island is imagined as a home for a civilized Prospero and Miranda, producing delicate roses to mirror Miranda’s delicate beauty, rather than as a home for the masked and monstrous Caliban. Indeed, Caliban is not granted personhood in this text, with the island depicted as an “unpopulated” *terra nullis* (5). While it’s perhaps unfair to criticize this production in the light of postcolonial criticism and *The Tempest*’s subsequent use as a text to explore Australian encounters with Shakespeare, it’s useful to situate the role Shakespeare played in the linguistic cultivation of Australia.³⁰ When names were being debated for Australia’s planned capital city in the early twentieth century, “Shakespeare” was one of the chief candidates (Golder and Madelaine 16). The ultimate choice, Canberra, reflected aboriginal rather than English history, but that Shakespeare was considered as a candidate shows his potential power as a linguistic colonizer. This power is arguably demonstrated through the popular open-air productions that took place in botanic gardens across Australia through the twentieth century to the present: “Shakespeare” adding a stamp of civilized authenticity to the genteel European-style gardens he was presented in.³¹ Within this context, the Players positioned the students as modern Mirandas, asking them to civilize their strange settings and harmonize

³⁰ *The Tempest* provides the title for the first collection of essays considering Shakespeare in Australia - *O Brave New World*, whose introductory essay notes the uncomfortable resonances between the play and Australia’s colonial past, Golder and Madelaine 1-16.

³¹ See Rose Gaby, 124-136; Gaby discusses the enormous popularity of open-air Shakespeare in Australia and also accounts for a gradual move from productions in English gardens to venues that emphasize striking native spaces (for example, Ballarat’s Ozact in the Grampian National Parks). Nonetheless, companies continue to perform summer Shakespeare in Sydney’s and Melbourne’s Botanical Gardens, spaces that, while containing many native species, also echo the productions of Australia as English Arden that Gaby and Flaherty discuss.

discordant sounds through the twangling tapestry of Trevor's lavish narration and Shakespeare's rich language.

The interior spaces that students were called upon to imagine were equally freighted with imperial values. Alongside the gleaming court of Westminster Abbey and the "heraldic magnificence" of England's history plays, students were asked to conjure the magnificent dignity of the court in *The Merchant of Venice*:

Imagine a lofty, sombre room, somewhat dimly lit, and hung about with banners, coats of arms and portraits of bygone [sic] Venetian nobles. There is a dais with a throne for the Duke of Venice; seats for the spectators, clerks and attorneys. The Magnificos are installed in state near the Duke's throne, and there is a sense of formality, of legal dignity, about the whole court.
(*The Merchant of Venice* 20)

What is notable about the many interior spaces that students were asked to conjure is the abundance of things: as in Dunsinane, power is conveyed by a proliferation of objects, through banners, thrones and portraits. Tellingly, although the chaos of The Boar's Head offered the potential to imagine a different kind of space, students were led to "a cosy private parlour, much used by Sir John Falstaff and sometimes by the Prince" (*The Story of Prince Hal* 10); the democratic cosmos of the tavern is narrowed to a parlour fit for a prince. My point is not that such settings or emphases are extraordinary for the period but rather that by principally using language as a way to describe things (rather than, say, plot, ideas or character) Trevor redefined the linguistic terrain that he shared with Shakespeare: in a world where language was used to describe rich objects, the richness of language hinged upon its ability to convey *things*. Thus, the inclusion of the descriptive passages in *Macbeth* was justified as Shakespeare's words became pretty decoration. Returning to the Chorus is helpful: while the Chorus does call upon the audience to deck kings and manufacture "silken dalliance" (2.0. 2), the silk is left in the wardrobe as England heads to war and the pictures that the Chorus conjures, for all their pomp

and jingoism, draw on a wide spectrum of the population, from the abandoned old ladies to the clamoring armourers. Hunt's initial evocation of the chorus narrows his speeches to the visual narration they offer, explicitly pitting this linguistic imagination against a paucity of Australian design and finances:

You will remember what Shakespeare himself says in the Prologue to the play,
HENRY V:

*"Think, when we talk of horses, that you see them Printing their proud hoof I'
th'receiving earth:-For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings."*

So try to do just that. Try to imagine the Court of King Henry of England, with its noblemen and bishops in their rich costumes, its banners and its trumpeters. Listen carefully and you will hear the thunder of the cannon and the armies of soldiers fighting their battles at Harfleur and Agincourt, and you will see, too, the cold frosty night on the Battlements of Elsinore, where Hamlet meets the Ghost.

Of course we would like to bring you all these things, actors, scenery, costumes and lights, but to see all this you must wait until Australia has developed sufficiently to make it possible for theatres to be built in every large town in the country (Young Elizabethan Players 1958 Program, original emphasis).

In fact, the AETT imagined students as critical to the sufficient development of Australian theatre, hoping to recruit them as both audiences and theatre-makers. With their roles as co-conspirators in imagining the worlds for Shakespeare's plays an important first step in this process, it is perhaps not too much of a stretch to see a link between the use of Shakespeare's language here (rich words to describe rich things) and the students' potential as future consumers (of Australian theatre and other things). Though the Players did not explicitly evoke the figure of the teenager in this interpellation of students into consumer culture, it was the youthfulness of their actors that facilitated this imaginative conspiracy between actors and audience.

This relationship between teenagers, things, and Shakespeare's language is greatly amplified in the Bell Shakespeare Company's work. A pair of anecdotes offers a useful contrast

between the Players and the Actors. Describing his difficulty with delivering the heroics of Henry V's Crispin Day speech, inaugural Player Bruce Barry remembers one occasion where "the entire auditorium, boys and girls, about a thousand kids, rose and echoed Harry's cheer. It turns out that St. George was the local rugby league team" (Barry Tape 1). The students received pleasure from the sudden and surprising intersection of Shakespeare with their worlds and reacted enthusiastically. However, this intersection was accidental rather than intentional and the Players endured rather than exploited the school surroundings they found themselves in. In contrast, when Francesca Savige, one of the 2010 Actors, was repeatedly asked by audiences about her considerable resemblance to Alice from the *Twilight* movies, the actors decided to work it into performances, inserting a brief moment where Savige donned a baseball cap and pretending to pitch. Not only did this moment receive a huge cheer at the performance I attended, but when the first question in the Question and Answer session was related not to *Macbeth* or *Othello* (the two Shakespeare plays which were excerpted throughout *Trust and Betrayal*) but to *Twilight*: one student excitedly wondered if Savige had deliberately styled her hair to resemble Alice (*Trust and Betrayal*). Unlike Bruce Barry's incidental reference to St. George, connections to the lives and obsessions of the audience are cultivated by the Actors. If the Players could crudely be seen as encouraging their audiences to suppose that their blackboards and school surroundings could be authentic Shakespearean bears, the Actors are more concerned with helping students own Shakespeare, convincing them that hip young cubs such as Hamlet and Juliet are very much at home against a backdrop of schoolyards, i-pods and blackboards. Performing in the perimillennial period, the Actors also produce a teenage subject less indebted to England than to America and to a culture of romantic consumption. Producing Shakespearean characters and teenagers as romantic consumers clearly limits the definition of

teenagers in terms of sexuality, gender, race, and class: with Romeo and Juliet as the stars of this narrative, recast as a white suburban straight couple who survive beyond their tragic deaths to consume forever.

The popular *Twilight* references from *Trust and Betrayal* illustrate the Actors' mobilization of American teenage culture to connect to a contemporary Australian audience. *Twilight*, as I will discuss in Chapter Four, can also be seen as the epitome of Shakespearean romantic consumption, with its central characters refashioning Romeo and Juliet as suburban vampires who can consume forever. Though the Actors disavow the received pronunciation favored by the Players (or at least desired by the Arts Council), there are as many references to American culture as there are to Australian. In fact, the emphasis on *Twilight* illustrates a shift from the productions of the 1990s, some of which asked teenagers to relate Shakespeare to popular Australian soap operas. In the performances I witnessed, it was the references to American popular culture - to Lady Gaga, *Twilight* and *Desperate Housewives* - which drew the most enthusiastic responses from audiences.³² As well as amusing teenagers, these references also place Shakespeare's words within a language of consumer culture. Describing 1.5 from *Macbeth* as "hot or what?...Like a scene outta Desperate Housewives" re-imagines *Macbeth* as a tragic suburban romance, congruent with the Actors' presentation of the central couple as romantic rather than political figures (*Macbeth Intensive* 14). This brand of romantic consumerism is presented as the definition of love, with Actor 4 in the *Romeo and Juliet Intensive* describing the teenagers' trajectories in suburban terms: "You start your own family, buy a house, get a car, have babies..." (12). Though Romeo and Juliet are denied this suburban

³² *Hamlet Intensive*, *Romeo and Juliet Intensive*, *Trust and Betrayal*, St. Catherine's College, Sydney, 24 Aug 2010; *Macbeth Intensive*, *Love's Magic*, Eltham College, Melbourne, 12 Oct 2010.

fantasy, this dream is eventually realised by the Actors in this performance, who survive beyond *Romeo and Juliet* to fall in love. Ned Manning, who wrote the interpolated narration for the Actors' scripts, tellingly concretizes love's abstract force as "like a street directory...of the heart" (*Love's Magic* 7). Unlike the magic pansy from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* - one of the speeches delivered in *Love's Magic* - love springs not from far-flung skies, but is rather a disposable directory. Manning also presents Juliet as a Desperate Housewife in training, setting the scene for 2.1 as in "some beach side suburb" with Juliet as "this surfie chick and out of a hotted up 'dotf dorf' kind of motor hops this cool dude called Romeo" (*Love's Magic* 7). The somewhat familiar image of a rebellious Romeo on a motorbike is placed within safe suburban beach culture rather than a dangerous urban world; to be a teenager in these worlds is to be headed towards romantic consumerism that Actor 4 outlines, a future of straight partners, suburban lawns and cool cars.

This vision of Verona's lovers determines the language that they speak. Depicting Verona as "one of Shakespeare's images of bourgeois society," Graham Holderness argues that the purity of Romeo's and Juliet's poetry becomes compromised by its proximity to the bourgeois economy:

paradoxically, the poetry which seeks to transform bourgeois society becomes a characteristically reified product of that society's culture: idealized and romanticized out of all dialectical relationship with society, it takes on the seductive glamour of aestheticism, the sinister and self-destructive beauty of decadent romance. The 'death mark't passage' of the lovers' *liebestod* is the culmination of a process of abstraction and refinement which gradually transforms 'passion into 'poetry', 'love' into 'literature'; and becomes not a subversion of bourgeois society but a paradoxical ratification of its power. The close of the play sees the lovers finally transformed into reified aesthetic objects - the statues which Montague and Capulet will raise to the memory of their son and daughter (*The Shakespeare Myth* xii-xiii).

Before Romeo and Juliet are enshrined in gold, their language already has been. A similar process is at work in the Actors' productions, where Shakespeare's words are depicted as a language of love, a precious commodity useful to draw on when wooing is required. Again, Shakespeare's language is principally valued for his verse, which is presented as the privileged language of romantics.

ACTOR 3: Oh yeah, [Romeo]'s passionate. And unlucky.
 ACTOR 2: And so beautiful. The way he expresses himself.
 ACTOR 1: In verse?
 ACTOR 3: Romeo uses verse because he's a romantic.
 "Courage man, the hurt cannot be much"
 ACTOR 1: Mercutio uses prose when he's dying because he wants to bring
 Romeo back to earth.
 "Ask for me tomorrow and you shall find me a grave man".
 (*Romeo and Juliet Intensive 25*)

Romeo owns romantic verse while Mercutio is associated with prose, deflecting any potential for a queer reading of their relationship. This potential is further closed down by the casting of a female Mercutio and the use of the female Actors 2 and 3 to consistently swoon over the romantic power of Shakespeare's language delivered by the male Actor 4. The language of love is not only exclusively straight, it is also tied to consumerism. When Actors 2 and 3 swoon further in *Love's Magic*, they present love as both universal desire and commodity:

ACTOR 2: Even so, everyone wants to be in love. Don't they?
 ACTOR 3: Of course.
 ACTOR 4: Why?
 ACTOR 1: 'Cause my buddy, it's such an awesome feeling.
 ACTOR 2: Love can be such a positive force.
 ACTOR 3: Yeah...
 ACTOR 2: I'd like a buck for every play written about love.
 ACTOR 1: Or film.
 ACTOR 4: Or poem.
 ACTOR 2: Or song.
 When characters are in love they use the language of love. It's like they need something more than ordinary language to express their feelings. They need images, word pictures, to capture the depth of the emotion they are caught up in.
 ACTOR 3: Like Romeo and Juliet on their wedding night?
 (*Love's Magic 21*)

The Actors *are* getting a buck for at least one play about love, with *Love's Magic* capitalizing on the potent mix of love and Shakespeare. Equally, the purity of Shakespeare's words as the heightened language of love is somewhat compromised by the preceding conversation, which explicitly ties the proliferation of love stories with an abundance of bucks, a connection heightened by Actor 4's initial promise that their play will "check out a couple of this Shakespeare dude's hottest plays and see what they have to say about this lovin' business" (2). In this "lovin' business," Shakespeare's verse is coded as the hottest property, the original language of love. While it would be untrue to suggest that lovers, Shakespearean or otherwise, never speak in verse, it is equally limiting to categorize Shakespearean verse as a language of romantic consumerism.

The very vernacular that the actors use to connect to a teenage world in the narrative segments is rejected when the actors sigh over verse, contending that Romeo and Juliet are "not going to shake hands and say, 'see ya buddy, been awesome', are they?" (*Love's Magic* 23) and celebrating Shakespearean speak as 'the opposite of texting' (*Trust and Betrayal* 8). This reverence for the old-world elegance of Shakespeare's language is not that far from Trevor's preservation of the "best of the verse." Indeed, there is something about the format of these truncated versions for teenagers that depends upon a separation from Shakespeare's language and contemporary idiom: at the performances I witnessed, the actors delivered the contemporary narration enthusiastically, in broad Australian accents, but were more restrained in their delivery of the excerpts from Shakespeare. While they didn't attempt to hide their Australian accents in the Shakespearean excerpts, their voices did shift in register, becoming clearer and using a more "proper" (and English sounding) accent than the exaggerated Australian teenspeak they used for the contemporary segments. This shift was especially noticeable in the tragedies, with the

contemporary narration, defined by high energy and humor, jarring considerably with the slow and serious verse. In the *Hamlet Intensive*, “To be or not be” was delivered almost as a poetry recitation, with the other actors vacating the stage to leave the brooding Hamlet alone. In all the productions, Shakespeare is given the last word, with a short speech delivered clearly by one character while the others listen in rapt stillness. At the end of *Trust and Betrayal*, the actors note that Macbeth’s “most famous speech comes after his wife’s death” (29) before Actor 4 dives into a heartfelt rendition of “She should have died hereafter” to close the play, the servant sent packing so that it becomes a showcase soliloquy. However, divorced from the rest of *Macbeth*, it is difficult for these words to have the same valence as they would in a full production, especially when the Macbeths’ relationship has been presented as a version of *Desperate Housewives*. Wrenched from context and character, the speech becomes an excuse to admire a “famous” passage; in the midst of sound and superficiality, the words themselves signify not much at all.

Examining what kind of language these edits privilege helps crystallize both this discussion of language and to consider how teenagers are constructed as romantic consumers rather than political agents. Clearly, to end *Trust and Betrayal* with “She should have died hereafter” edits *Macbeth* as a romantic story, with the political consequences of its final scenes left out.³³ I want to turn to how both the Actors and the Players approached the political context of their plays, focusing on how the narrow vision of Shakespeare’s language (pretty verse to describe pretty things or personal crises) constructs a teenage subject that has the capacity to describe but not to act.

³³ *The Macbeth Intensive* does include Malcolm’s final speech.

A Mad, Sad World: From Stars of England to Apathetic Onlookers.

The first recorded performance of Shakespeare in Australia was a production of *Henry IV* on April 8 in 1800.³⁴ That the playbill describes the piece as “the favorite play” points to a history of performances prior to the nineteenth century and suggests a “little touch of Harry” (*Henry V* 4.1, 47) in the national DNA, with the prince’s roguish and heroic characteristics alternately called upon to comment upon Australia’s convict past and imperial ties.³⁵ Shakespeare’s play was also used to shape young minds, with an early twentieth-century textbook, *Simple Studies in History for Young Australians*, using Shakespeare’s words as objective history to describe the siege at Harfleur: “We see them closing the wall up with English dead, and we hear the cry: ‘God for Harry! England! and Saint George!’” (Gillies 69) Hal’s story also offers a compelling *bildungsroman*, from “wild, high-spirited youth” to “the hero of the siege of Harfleur” (Gillies 68). Situated within this wider history, the version of *The Story of Prince Hal* that the Players presented is especially revealing. Trevor conflated the two parts of *Henry IV* to offer a telescoped narrative that emphasized Hal’s evolution from lay-about to responsible heir, removing the Hotspur and rebellion scenes to focus on his relationship with Falstaff and his father. This focus on Hal’s maturation was also foregrounded by his presentation by a young actor in jeans. However, despite the denim he wore, the “prince” in Trevor’s title was never forgotten. A shift in the play’s edit reveals the extent to which Hal’s princely qualities were emphasized at the expense of any connection with Falstaff’s rambunctious energies. Initially, the Players staged the

³⁴ The only evidence of this production is a playbill, making it unclear if the production took place or which part was performed, though the cast list suggests that only Part 1 was presented (Golder and Madelaine 257; frontpiece).

³⁵ A spectacular production of *Henry V* drew huge crowds in 1876 and was repeatedly revived; Prime Minister Billy Hughes told a story about a production of *Henry V* while visiting troops in World War One; John Bell has been involved in influential performances of the *Henriad*, as a performer in 1964 and director in 1998-1999 (See Golder and Madelaine frontpiece, 15-16; Gay, “International Glamour” 180-199; Kiernander 236-255).

rejection scene in *Henry IV Part II*, though with a stern warning by the narrator that Hal had no choice but to reject Falstaff: “Hardest of all for King Henry, there still remains the decision he must make about Falstaff and the lads from the Boar’s Head...nor will he be able to appear other than harsh with them, particularly as Falstaff chooses the worst possible moment to seek recognition” (*The Story of Prince Hal*, unpaginated addendum). Hal’s refusal to recognize Falstaff is presented as Falstaff’s fault, his crime augmented by his choice of “the worst possible moment” to present himself. This version - which ended with a deflated Falstaff on stage with Shallow - was revised, so that this scene was cut entirely and related through stark narration: “Hal banishes his low companions, even including ‘valiant Jack Falstaff’ who is obviously no fit companion for a King” (*The Story of Prince Hal* 28). “Obviously” no companion for a King, the rebellious energies of Falstaff are contained by the narrator, who presents Trevor’s subjective judgments on character as facts that should be clear to the audience. The telescoping of *Henry V* is similarly illuminating: Trevor cut the last lines of the chorus’s epilogue, which undermine the Henry V’s triumph by recalling the bitter defeats of his son, and ended the production on a note that celebrated Hal’s apotheosis to “this star of England” (*The Story of Prince Hal* 35). Certainly, there are practical reasons for cutting the final lines of the chorus, not least that Shakespeare’s *Henry VI* plays were not often shown on twentieth-century Australian stages. However, the unbalanced edit of *The Story of Prince Hal* removed everything from *Henry V* except for Henry’s romantic triumph in Act 5. By restricting Shakespeare’s language to a language of love or description (with the excision of the chorus’ final lines turning him from a potential critic to a descriptive cheerleader), the potential of Shakespeare’s language to offer political critique, as Williams does, for example, was abnegated.

The potentially anarchic energies of the crowd in *Julius Caesar* were managed in a similar way to Falstaff's. Students were actually recruited as part of the crowd, in a rare moment of audience interaction, but their interpolations were carefully stage-managed by the narrator and cast members were interspersed throughout the auditorium to ensure appropriate responses. The narrator coached the audience to respond to Anthony's speech, prompting and quickly curtailing freedom of expression:

Right. Good. And now you don't want to hear Anthony - what would you shout?... (ad lib) Good. But remember, you must let the cast interpose the lines set down for them, and you must follow the emotions their comments suggest. (*Julius Caesar* 22)

The differences between the script for the initial experiment in 1959 and a subsequent performance in the 1960s are revealing: the latter version increased the narrator's babysitting of the students' ad lib, proffering individual lines and chants for the students to utter. The audiences were given a mouth only to have a muzzle imposed; they were invited to use their imaginations to fill in the gaps in the plays, but the canvas the Players used was paint-by-numbers, with ideology already shaded in.

Temporal limitations also often called for a simplification of plot and character. In the edit of *Macbeth*, the excision of much of the middle portion of the play diminished the play's political charge, emphasizing the personal deterioration of the central couple at the expense of the play's wider interest in the effects of tyranny on society. Moreover, the narration narrowed the story further, directing students' interpretations of character: "Where Macbeth is uncertain, vacillating and something of the poet, the dreamer, Lady Macbeth is all iron determining [sic] and ruthless ambition. Here she is reading yet again" (8). Lady Macbeth's entrance reading her husband's letter was authoritatively inscribed within a wider back-story: she was reading a letter "yet again". This "yet again" was a curious move, suggesting a cosy familiarity with the

character while also distancing the narrator from her, the “yet” imposing a negative judgment on her use of time. The familiarity that this observation implied allowed the narrator’s negative assessment of Lady Macbeth - as “all iron determinating [sic] and ruthless ambition” to pass as empirical fact rather than authorial interpolation. This Lady Macbeth was a partner in greatness right to the end of the play, with the doctor narrating that “Macbeth and Lady Macbeth make all preparations at Dunsinane for a siege” (34): even after her sleep-walking scene, Lady Macbeth was imagined as ruthless and uncompromising! It is not that Trevor’s perspective was especially surprising for the 1960s or indeed textually controversial, but rather that the narration naturalized historically specific and sexist readings. While Trevor sought to “allow a play to speak directly for itself” the narration determined the tone the characters’ words were heard in (“Press Release for New South Wales”). Furthermore, Trevor’s reluctance to cross-cast meant that in several plays with a small number of female parts (*Julius Caesar*, *Henry V*) most of the narration was taken on by a female voice, creating a version of history where men acted while women watched. While this version of *Julius Caesar* was arguably better than Shakespeare’s - men act while women weep or swallow fire - the modern language of the narration presented women as *transhistorical* observers rather than actors and points at the ways in which Shakespeare could subtly shape teenage conceptions of gender. Furthermore, the liminal spaces that these performances took place in, school auditoriums, gymnasiums and tennis courts, situated students within the school setting but outside of the classroom, allowing for the possibility of freedom or transgression. The young players, neither teenagers nor teachers, carried the possibility of alternate, even rebellious, identities.

However, any transgressive potential of theatre was also swiftly contained: when a teacher complained of male actors who were “obviously effeminate in speech and mannerism”

and thus “totally unacceptable at a boys’ school” (Tyler), Trevor’s carefully drafted response apologized that the probably homosexual tendencies of some players had been visible on stage, “that such traits should have been observable in unsuitable characterisations is most regrettable” (“Letter to Graham Little”). Trevor’s vision of gender was as restrictive as his take on sexuality, with the female actors (who wore skirts rather than jeans) seen as decorative objects for adolescent boys: “it is most important (particularly in boys schools!) that the girls look (when necessary) as attractive as possible” (Young Elizabethan Players Notes). I bring these points up not to lambast Trevor or the Players for their perspectives (fairly conventional for the period) but to suggest the ways in which their school Shakespeare productions conformed rather than challenged teenage perceptions on gender and sexuality; if the Players performed a supplementary role in socializing teenagers and constructing teenage identity, the potentially liberating or rebellious energies that they and the spaces they performed in suggested were often suppressed rather than embraced.

A look at the Actors’ treatment of *Macbeth* illustrates the ways in which the simplistic portrayal of the central couple is remarkably similar to the Players’ version. Discussing Lady Macbeth, the actors present contemporary equivalents:

ACTOR 1 Doesn’t leave much to the imagination does she?
 ACTOR 2 It’s fantastic.
 ACTOR 3 Oh yeah and such fun to play.
 ACTOR 4 It’s scary.
 ACTOR 1 What kind of a woman would...
 ACTOR 3 Why is it that men find strong women so threatening?
 ACTOR 2 They better get used to it. There’s plenty of them around.
 ACTOR 3 Hilary Clinton.
 ACTOR 2 Julia Gillard.
 ACTOR 3 Angela Merkel.
 ACTOR 2 Penny Wong.
 ACTOR 2 Ellen Johnson.
They look at her.
 ACTOR 2 President of Liberia. First woman president in Africa.
 ACTOR 4 Paris Hilton?
 ACTOR 2 She’s an act not a person.
 (*Trust and Betrayal* 13)

Here, the female actors 2 and 3 give their male counterparts a crash course in feminist politics, suggesting that Actor 1's discomfort with Lady Macbeth stems from anxiety about powerful women. Throughout the *Macbeth Intensive* and *Trust in Betrayal*, the male actors tend to find Lady Macbeth "scary" rather than "fantastic," describing her as "a piece of work" (*Trust* 7), "she's no shrinking violet that's for sure" (*Macbeth* 9) and "she's pretty out there isn't she?" (*Macbeth* 12) Conversely, the female actors are presented as her cheerleaders: heralding Lady Macbeth as "a woman on a mission" (*Macbeth* 12) and exclaiming "Go girl!" after one of her scenes. (*Trust* 13) While the plays are often smart in their negotiation of these politics and are at the very least interested in exploring different perspectives on the characters, the Lady Macbeth that the female characters conjure is not one that far removed from the iron lady of the Players. Struggling to define Lady Macbeth's positive attributes, the female actors cling to a vision of her as a strong woman:

ACTOR 2 [Macbeth] needs a good woman to spur him on.
 ACTOR 1 A good woman?
 ACTOR 3 A woman with...you know...with...
 ACTOR 2 Strength!
 ACTOR 3 That's it! Yes, strength! (*Macbeth Intensive* 7)

However, Lady Macbeth's strength partially hinges upon her sexuality in this production and, alongside Hilary Clinton and Ellen Johnson, the other analogue offered to Lady Macbeth is Eve seducing Adam, leading to the comparison of her to a sexed-up Desperate Housewife (10; 14). Though 1.7 is performed twice to explore a range of performance choices, the versions of Lady Macbeth offered (shrill or sexy) remain reasonably narrow. A telling moment shifts a discussion of the complexity of *both* characters to a discussion which focuses solely on Macbeth's multi-dimensionality:

ACTOR 3 Lady M knows him pretty well eh?
 ACTOR 2 These are complex characters. They are human. They have doubts.
 They question their actions.
 ACTOR 1 You mean they have a conscience?
 ACTOR 3 Exactly.
 ACTOR 4 So for Macca there's a problem. Competing motivations.
 (*Macbeth Intensive* 10)

The lengthy discussion of Macbeth's motivation which follows omits any reference to Actor 1's point that *they* have a conscience. Crucially, the editing of the play also telescopes Lady Macbeth's story into that of a strong woman who suddenly breaks, excising the earlier moments where the play suggests a troubled conscience. Many of the moments in the play which offer fault-lines in Lady Macbeth's supposed iron determination (her soliloquy in 3.2; her dismissal in 3.1; her faint in 2.3) are not performed, leading actor 2 to puzzle after 5.1 that "She hardly resembles the Lady Macbeth we meet early in the play" (*Macbeth* 23). Despite their laudable interest in gender politics and the potential of performance, the Actors' version of *Macbeth* is essentially one where a "man of principle" (*Trust* 8) is compromised by a strong, sexy woman.

The *Macbeth Intensive* is the Actors' piece that deals most extensively with politics, constructing a vision of teenagers that casts them as observers rather than potential actors. Manning continually connects *Macbeth* to historical and contemporary conflicts, with the opening scene juxtaposing lines from Macbeth with lists of battles, from Marathon to Waterloo. While the male actors are cast as enthusiastic players, crashing into each other with the mention of each battle and later jostling to play Macbeth, the female Actor 2 is cast as a beleaguered observer, asking a string of questions that signal her anti-war perspective: "War, war, war...I want to know why we do this to each other?...Why are we obsessed with violence" (2-3). This line of questioning eventually leads her to an examination of Shakespeare's role in the construction of a culture of violence: "Like, do writers like Shakespeare encourage our

infatuation with war?" (3). The ensuing dialogue neutralizes this question, using Shakespeare's own words to defend him as a neutral chronicler of human nature:

ACTOR 1: He wrote heaps of other plays...comedies, love stories...
 ACTOR 2: Exactly! How violent's *Romeo and Juliet*?
 ACTOR 3: He wrote about the world as he saw it.
 ACTOR 2: As he says himself in *Hamlet*, when he talks about why we do plays,
 "the purpose of playing whose end, both at the front
 and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror
 up to nature."
 ACTOR 1: That's all he's doing isn't he? Holding up a mirror so
 that we can see ourselves.
 ACTOR 2: It's not a pretty sight.
 (*Macbeth Intensive 3*)

Manning uses a more dialogic form of narration than Trevor, allowing for a multiplicity of perspectives, but challenging questions are resolved quickly. Conflating Shakespeare with Hamlet pits Actor 2's interrogation of Shakespeare against his treasured words, a conflict she can only lose. Her initial resistance - that *Romeo and Juliet* is also a violent play - is quashed by the might of Shakespeare's language, leading her to conclude that the violence of human nature is sad ("not a pretty sight") but ultimately unchangeable. Shifting from an interrogation of the ways in which culture might produce violence to a resigned acceptance of a universal tendency towards violence, Actor 2 offers contemporary teenagers a subject position that questions violence but casts them as passive witnesses to atrocity, suggesting the capacity to comment but not to change. Hamlet's relationship to theatre is also redefined by association, *The Murder of Gonzago* a reflection of the state of the world rather than an attempt to use theatre for political expression.

The construction of a teenage subject position that is politically helpless becomes especially pronounced when *Macbeth* is connected to contemporary politics:

ACTOR 1: Macbeth's ambition leads directly to Civil War.
 ACTOR 4: Hitler's ambition led to a World War.
 ACTOR 2: Same old story isn't it?
 ACTOR 3: Collateral damage as far as the eye can see.

ACTOR 2: Out of control.
 ACTOR 4: Nothing comes without a price.
 ACTOR 1: Look at what Saddam Hussein has left behind.
 ACTOR 3: Fear and destruction while he ruled and Chaos after he's deposed.
 ACTOR 2: No-one's safe once the rules of common decency are betrayed.
 ACTOR 4: Look what happens to Banquo.
 (*Macbeth Intensive* 15)

Actor 2's contributions here are consistent with her capitulation that war is a regretful characteristic of human nature, the "same old story" that's worth lamenting but not challenging. However, the connections to Iraq connect this subject position to contemporary apathy and ignorance: Saddam Hussein is positioned in a line of terrible tyrants, from Macbeth to Hitler, and is responsible not just for fear and destruction while he was leader but for chaos after his deposition, with Actor 1's comment: "Look at what [he] has left behind" firmly placing the blame on Hussein's shoulders. This narrative of conflict in Iraq denies any other players - Iraqi, American, English and Australian - of both agency and responsibility; in this analogy, it is clear that *Hussein* has broken the laws of common decency, not the Australian government. This is not to defend Saddam Hussein so much as to point to the limiting parallels that this vision of *Macbeth* offers. Indeed, this vision is also limiting to *Macbeth*, erasing Banquo's ambiguities (his soliloquy in 3.1 is neither performed nor discussed) and presenting him here as an unfortunate victim rather than the soldier who clearly suspects Macbeth but finds it beneficial to hold his tongue; Banquo is a personal victim rather than a political player. Actor 2 is presented as a similarly powerless victim by the end of the play, lamenting: "You'd think we'd learn... War, war, and more bloody war!" (26). While her frustration has perhaps increased, her ability to ask questions has diminished and, like the female narrators in the Players' *Julius Caesar*, she is relegated to the sidelines, watching as Malcolm closes the play with the Shakespearean security of rhyming couplets.

Manning's edit of *Hamlet* for the *Hamlet Intensive* also imagines teenagers' political roles as resigned commentators rather than active participants. Hamlet is cast as an emo teenager, burying his head in a hoodie and listening to "Mad World" from the *Donnie Darko* soundtrack, recalling the quintessential intellectual teenage rebel of the noughties.³⁶ Although the narration presents Hamlet as "not all emo all the time" and "up for it when it's on," the story is told out of chronological order, beginning with an "up for it" Hamlet who sorts things out in 5.2 but then increasingly depicting an apathetic teenage Hamlet.³⁷ This Hamlet is both repeatedly presented a subject for the teenage audience to relate to - "He's us"; "a character that reflects the zeitgeist" - and as occupying a subject position that is overwhelmed by the political world. The narration after "To be or not to be" casts Hamlet's sea of troubles as contemporary ones, with "global warming, the financial crisis and the war on terror" offered as currently compelling reasons to feel suicidal. Manning's *sujet* presents a Hamlet who deals with these political and romantic crises by sulking further, retreating into his hoodie to listen to the soundtrack from Donnie Darko. His final speech is "what a piece of work is man" which is related to the fatalistic "Mad World": "The dreams in which I'm dying are the best I've ever had" (Jules). This is not to suggest that Manning should have presented a Hamlet taking arms against global warming and the financial crisis, but that the version of Hamlet that the Actors portray, one directly related to teenagers and contemporary political problems, is a limiting presentation of the character that further limits teenagers' abilities to imagine themselves as agents of positive social change;

³⁶ "Emo" is a post-millennial term for "emotionally troubled," usually associated with a teen-age subculture and mournful music. See *Ours as We Play It* for a discussion of emo Hamlets on perimillennial stages (46-47).

³⁷ All quotations from *The Hamlet Intensive* are recorded from the performance of 24 Aug 2010.

onlookers in a mad, sad world, teenagers-as-Hamlet can turn up the volume of the words and music that epitomize their angst, but nobody else is listening.

The solution offered to this political disenfranchisement in the *Romeo and Juliet Intensive* is romantic consumerism. The production initially recalls the *Macbeth Intensive*, with some actors defending Shakespeare as reflecting the world “as he saw it...fighting and wars and stuff” and another pointing out that the world “*still is* fighting and wars and stuff!” (4, original emphasis) Love, however, offers an escape from this cycle of violence. The *Romeo and Juliet Intensive* is structured around an unexplained fight between the female Actor 2 and the male Actor 3, with their relationship thawing as they play the central characters. Eventually, the tragedy of Romeo and Juliet catapults Actors 2 and 3 towards reconciliation:

ACTOR 2 Romeo and Juliet’s deaths change the world.
 ACTOR 4 Their deaths bring peace.
 ACTOR 1 And bring the families together.
 ACTOR 2 Yo bro!
 ACTOR 3 ’s cool.
 ACTOR 2 He’s ok. Once you get used to him!
 ACTOR 3 So’s she.
 ACTOR 4 Why do we need a big disaster to bring us together?
 ACTOR 1 No gain without pain?
 ACTOR 4 It’s like we need to suffer before we wake up to ourselves eh?
 (*Romeo and Juliet Intensive* 33)

In an edit of *Romeo and Juliet* that effectively erases parental presence, this shifting of the reconciliation from the older to the younger generation is especially significant. While the older figures do appear in the *Romeo and Juliet Intensive*, their presence is minimal and superficial and when they do feature it is usually to berate or betray: Capulet disowns his daughter while the Nurse’s main role is to betray Juliet. Here, the “moral” of Shakespeare’s play (that families are reconciled through the tragic deaths of their offspring) is swiftly dispensed with to focus on the real reconciliation: that of Actors 2 and 3. The glooming teenage peace afforded these characters continues through the final moments, where both speak the Prince’s concluding lines; the tragedy

of *Romeo and Juliet* is partially mitigated by the tentative romance between the actors who played them, encouraging the audience to resurrect hope from tragedy's jaws and presenting a "happy ending" to *Romeo and Juliet*. This happy ending stages the romantic consumerism that this *Romeo and Juliet* embody, with Actors 2 and 3 consuming the Prince's speech and redefining its contents to convey romantic promise rather than communal healing. Where this romance will end up has already been suggested by the earlier definition of love that leads to romantic consumerism: "You start your own family, buy a house, get a car, have babies..." (12); Actors 2 and 3 move towards the ellipsis denied to the suburban *Romeo and Juliet* that they played, embodying a happy ending that pivots on romantic consumerism.

This happy ending is rather galling considering some contemporary connections that the production makes earlier. Romeo's masculinity is couched in contemporary terms, with contemporary slang for an effeminate man used unproblematically to translate the Nurse's invective:

ACTOR 4: The nurse gets stuck into him for being such a wus.
 'Stand up, stand up! Stand you and be a man!'
 ACTOR 3: Romeo straightens up and heads off to see Juliet.
 ACTOR 2: To see her?
 ACTOR 3: Yeah.
 ACTOR 2: He climbs into her room doesn't he?
 ACTOR 3: Yeah...
 (*Romeo and Juliet Intensive 26*)

Romeo's straightening here is both literal and ontological, leading directly to his copulation with Juliet, the dangers of being a "wus" elided; the happy ending also re-enforces a conservative vision of masculinity and suburban romantic consumerism. I do not mean to idealize gay romance as somehow free from an association with consumer culture or necessarily more political (or, indeed, to suggest that Romeo being a "wus" makes him gay): rather, I want to highlight that the production of teenagers as romantic consumers limits romance to that of straight romance and narrows that romance further to one that is ineluctably heading towards the

suburban fantasy that *Seventeen* imagined for Teena. The subtle redirection of love towards suburban consumption is rather at odds with the ecological sustainability introduced rather awkwardly in the play's discussion of Friar Lawrence. Friar Lawrence is imagined as an Aboriginal Elder (though played by a white actor) whose primary virtues lie in his appreciation of ecological balance: "ACTOR 4: Friar Lawrence respects the land doesn't he? / ACTOR 1: You have to respect the land. Not only does he respect the land but he understands it" (18). A "Big Picture Man" (18), this Friar Lawrence's values twin ecological responsibility with the communal peace that he strives to manipulate, relevant goals for an Australia debating the merits of carbon taxing in 2010. Within the context of a planet burdened by overpopulation and a country struggling to return to (and appropriate) an Aboriginal ecological harmony, a happy ending that hinges upon a white couple heading off to have more babies and drive cars seems rather myopic.

While I am not trying to suggest that the minimal references to climate change are present in the minds of audiences by the end of this production, the landscape that these productions present is one where teenagers' primary function is to consume, with Shakespeare's words one of the choicest delicacies they are offered. Two images - from the Actors and the Players productions - offer nice illustrations of the ways in which Shakespeare was embedded within a teenage culture which hinged upon consumerism. The first is of the sets for the Actors' productions, rectangular screens that they placed at the back of the playing space to define the area. The principal text on these bright orange screens was of the names of the plays performed and the Bell Shakespeare Actors at Work brand. However, the companies sponsoring the productions also had their names emblazoned on these screens, Shakespeare's words and the corporation that brought them to teenagers side by side in harmony. This incorporates the

Actors' productions within the wider corporate-sponsored Shakespeare that the BSC has produced: as well as offering masterclasses for business professionals to show the ways in which Shakespeare offers good leadership or money making strategies, most programs for mainstage Bell Shakespeare productions foreground an ad by the sponsor which involves some witty rephrasing of Shakespeare: a picture of a despairing Leontes in front of a blank television was accompanied by "Loss was an emotion with which Leontes was all too familiar. Which is why he would have appreciated the new Philips VCR with remote locator" (*The Winter's Tale Program* 1997). An ad in the program for 1999's *Henry V* used the image of Joel Edgerton, the actor playing Henry, to sell wine for Yalumba. It was not just Edgerton who was conscripted, but Shakespeare, with the sepia-tinted photo of Edgerton looking at a superimposed crown over a full glass of wine accompanied by a quotation from *Henry V*: "And liquor likewise will I give to thee, And friendship shall combine, and brotherhood" (*Henry V* program). This is rather an odd quotation to use for *Henry V*, given that it is spoken by the carousers who Henry has renounced. This connotation is especially strange for a production that toured extensively to school audiences and completed Hal's evolution from "teenage brat to national hero" (*Henry IV Program*); Hal's maturity is here conveyed by his taste in fine wine, conflating the right kind of consumption with kingliness. The world that The Actors present is thus a universe walled in by corporate culture with Shakespeare's words branded alongside the sponsors.

A second defining image is the jeans that the Players wore. Despite the publicity garnered from their choice of clothing, Trevor was at pains to disassociate the jeans from any contemporary resonance, claiming that "the jeans are not meant to be noticed...they are a cloak of invisibility, providing a workmanlike, basic costume that has neither the slender, balletic line of tights or the bodgie-like appearance of flannels" ("Shakespeare's Plays at Tumut"). The

contemporary associations of the bodgie fashion were rejected in favor of an image of jeans as a cloak of invisibility. These Emperor's New Jeans were complemented with white shirts and an array of cloaks, capes and crowns rather than leather jackets. Despite the purported minimalism, many of the costume changes were quite elaborate with coloured cloaks and capes masking the jeans and rendering an overall effect of "Shakespeare in Swathes of Fabric," a rather less attractive title. The jeans themselves were replaced by slacks in 1961 when the Players secured sponsorship from J. Anthony Squires, who outfitted the male actors in trousers in exchange for a program advertisement, capitalizing upon the teenage market that *Seventeen* had first mapped out. In a letter to this sponsor, Trevor observed that "the casts continue to comment on the interest shown by senior boys particularly at the private schools" ("Letter to S. Sinclair"). Jeans, the iconic image of teenage rebellion, were traded in for trousers cut for privileged grammar school boys.

*"Inexplicable dumb shows and noise": Teenage Responses to Touring Shakespeare.*³⁸

Are teenagers thus doomed to see exquisitely attired but depoliticized versions of themselves reflected in Shakespearean mirrors? Returning to student responses is useful. Among the responses on the Actors at Work website are several students who are enthused not just about Bell Shakespeare but about the comedy derived from Shakespeare's collision with contemporary capitalism: "I loved the part when Teresa was talking about an app that was \$1.99 that was funny" (Samantha); "I loved it when Teresa was advertising the app" (Nhi); "I loved it when Felix was dressed as a girl, Teresa was advertising the app and etc" (Karen). The performances themselves are seen as not far from applications for some of these students: study guides that

³⁸ *Hamlet*, 2.2, 10-11.

help to make Shakespeare “accessible to us teenagers in the 21st century” (Jazzy4ever-94). However, there are also audience members who don’t comment on Bell Shakespeare’s website. A look at the stage manager reports for the school tours of Bell Shakespeare’s mainstage productions reveals an array of less enthusiastic teenagers: “a very bored boys audience, lots of rustling, nose picking, twitching and generally not listening” (Ryan 12 May 1998); “the kids got very rowdy during a couple of the more bawdy scenes...laughed at the death scenes, and other ‘sensitive’ points” (M. Clarke 6 Apr. 1993); “Rancid school boys were stimulating masturbation & the noises that go along with it while Ms. Gordon & Ms. Woods were on stage” (Ryan 4 Jun. 1997); “some little shit-head threw something on stage during the English sc. & received long hard stares from Mr. King and Mr. McDonell” (Ryan 5 Jun. 1997). These twitchers, nose-pickers and inappropriate guffawers are following in a tradition of unruly school audiences: the Players experienced many restive audiences and a reporter for *The Sun Herald* catalogued some of the crimes of a Sydney school audience during a performance of *Hamlet*: “Some of them yawned, scratched their backs, turned to chat with friends, sniggered at the duel scene. Others drooled when Ophelia appeared, laughed when the queen was poisoned, guffawed in the wrong places - but applauded wildly at some of the right places” (“Jeans Views Differ”). I’d like to consider what these “wrong” responses might tell us about teenagers’ responses to school Shakespeare, ways in which they might constitute a form of talking back to Shakespeare and his association with teenage consumerism. I should be clear that I am not trying to suggest that stimulating masturbation or picking a nose shows a disavowal of the subject position of consumer citizen - indeed, the Sydney version of the “rancid schoolboys” that Ryan mentions showed their disdain for a performance of *Macbeth* by skipping off to McDonalds, hardly a show of resistance to consumerism (Ryan 12 May 1998). Equally, I should stress that I am not forwarding a *right*

answer here, but rather suggesting that teenagers' actions might signal a sophisticated response rather than interpretative inadequacy.

Reflecting on his experience working on a contemporary production for teenagers, Richard Fotheringham theorizes how teenagers' laughter at "inappropriate" moments might constitute such a response. Using Klaus Jensen's concept of "interpretative repertoires" to explore how student audiences respond, Fotheringham perceives that "live audiences are not just interpreters; they are also characterized by their own roles as performers, with both interpretative commonalities and a repertoire of possible individual and collective behaviors" ("Audiences as Performers" 68).³⁹ Arguing that while teenage audiences are frequently derided for their lack of interpretive competency, Fotheringham contends that in fact they want to enjoy the play as much as possible, claiming that laughter is a way to extend this pleasure and that "audiences are always willing to extend their repertoire of possible reactions for their greater pleasure and meaning-making" (68). While part of this repertoire is institutionally determined, live performances also seem to possess some of the transgressive charge of school outings, allowing students to release oppositional responses. Fotheringham sought to channel oppositional responses by using laughter and youth culture references to win over teenage audiences, revealing that the language of their new production was "enriched with intertextual references to rock bands, cult film stars, and the language of youth culture generally," references which "appealed to them as a specific and semi-exclusive interpretative community and, by so doing, ensured that the rest of the narrative was considered worth attending to" (75). The "language" of youth culture that Fotheringham employed was specifically directed at a "semi-exclusive" interpretative community, flipping the question of competency so that teenagers were rewarded for their youth

³⁹ Jensen is adapting Susan Bennett's "interpretative communities" from *Theatre Audiences*.

culture savvy rather than at an interpretative loss, a strategy which clearly parallels the youth culture references in Manning's scripts for the Actors. Fotheringham's piece might be seen in terms of Barbara Wall's double address: parts of it were only accessible to a semi-exclusive teenage audience adept at speaking in youth culture.

We might also consider teenage laughter as a sort of double reply, communicating to other members of a teenage audience - and sometimes the young actors on stage - but not to adult teachers or Shakespeare. One of the initial Players read the students' laughter in *Hamlet* as signs of the Players lack of theatrical competency rather than a deficiency of student interpretation, noting that "kids are the closest thing you can get to the Elizabethan audience today and as far as we are concerned the audience is always right...The duel scene was hammy and the Queen's death can be better arranged. It is up to us to hold a young audience, and through trial and error we will learn to do it" ("Jeans Views Differ"). However, the Players' trial and error seemed to continually lead them towards error when they tried to elicit tragic responses; though tragedies constituted a critical part of the school curriculum, the Players seemed more suited to tapping out an Elizabethan jig, the comedic steps of release, rather than tracing a tragic strut and fret across the stage. Part of the problem was the youthfulness of the actors, which some teachers found inadequate to portray tragic depth: "we felt that Shylock was far too young. He was not made up sufficiently well to give the illusion of age and stone cold in the afternoon, without the glamour of a proper stage and lighting effects, was scarcely credible" (Baily 1). The broadness of the Players' style also meant it difficult for student audiences to transition between comedies and tragedies with Trevor noting that "it is essential that schools understand that in no circumstances should combined performances begin with the comedy. If *any* students are attending both plays, the tragedy must proceed [sic] the comedy," outlining the

“great problems” that the actor playing Macbeth faced when students were unable to forget his farcical portrayal of Gratiano (“Notes of a Meeting” 1, original emphasis). All of these responses imagine student laughter at tragedy as a plague to be avoided. Reports from the Actors at Work reveal similar responses. Artist in Education Matt Edgerton, who co-ordinates and sometimes directs the Actors at Work program as part of his job, acknowledged that tragedies could be harder than the comedies to sustain student attention and that students were apt to laugh at tragic deaths (Edgerton). Though Edgerton argued that “by end of the play we’ve earned audience’s attention and they’re prepared to sit through the very tragic end,” Manning admitted that the *Romeo and Juliet Intensive* went through several edits to minimize this problem, slicing at Romeo’s lengthy speech which many students found hard to take seriously (Personal Interview).

Another strategy is to elicit laughter rather than resist it, a strategy which suggests that sometimes younger actors hear students’ responses differently than their older bosses. The emo *Hamlet* offers a useful example: in the performance I witnessed, the actors courted laughter at times, suggesting Hamlet as a parody of an emo teenager. For example, Hamlet’s “Mother, Mother, Mother!” (3.4. 6) was played for laughs, with Aaron Tsindos delivering the line as an impatient teenager having a tantrum. Equally, when Sean Hawkins entered as Hamlet in a hoodie to the tune of “Mad World,” his silent nod at the teenage audience somehow suggested both profound melancholy and a self-aware distance from this emo stance, prompting laughter that seemed to be with, rather than at, Hawkins. The promptbooks from the BSC school performances reveal some similar moments. Performances of *Romeo and Juliet* in 1993 sped up when student audiences seemed restless, suggesting a synergy between actors and audience: “A very fast show. There were a lot of kids and they were quite restless” (Worthy 23 Apr 1993); “A nice quick, sharp performance... The kids were a bit restless during the show” (Worthy 20 Apr

1993). Reports from *Henry IV* and *Henry V* show actors enhancing students' pleasure rather than cutting short their pain: "A little over the top in places - people enjoying the young, enthusiastic, responsive house" (Ryan 19 Oct 1999); "Wart & the football team corpse very badly during the recruitment scene, which permeated until the end of the scene" (Ryan 16 June 1998). Responsive young houses led actors to perform differently, pushing them over the top and towards laughter themselves. While spontaneous onstage laughter might lead to the death of the actor, corpsing might also lead to a rebirth of intimacy between young actors and audiences; while such reports cast stage managers and writers as modern Hamlets, fretting that the broad Heroding of actors pitches plays towards inappropriate parody or comedy, they might also suggest ways in which actors hear a different message from young audiences and respond accordingly to enhance the pleasure of all. This emphasis on pleasure also led to broad characterizations from some young Players (to the despair of some Arts Council members) but also seemed partially accountable for their continued success. Though not old enough to credibly portray Shylock or Lady Macbeth, the Players were close enough in age to their audiences that they could connect meaningfully with them. Exuberance often compensated for other reservations and one teacher delighted that "the actors were so obviously enjoying their work that they could not help but transfer their enthusiasm" (Staniford 1). Bruce Barry described the infectious transfer of energy:

We were all round about 20 years of age...very young, very enthusiastic and I cannot begin to tell you what a thrill it was to just go out in front of a bunch of Australian kids who had absolutely no interest in Shakespeare whatsoever and for the first ten minutes to know that they couldn't have cared less whether you lived or died or forgot your lines or stumbled over the furniture and then...around about the ten or fifteen minute mark you could feel them coming and it was just wonderful (Barry Tape 1).

The Players' ability to enjoy the performances rather than educate their audiences seems pivotal to their success and doubtlessly tempered some of the didactic tone of the narrative segments.

Manning's scripts also have an aspect of parody written into them: the actors are not portraying themselves, but Actors 1 through 4, who have distinctive characters (the jock, the ditzy girl etc.) that are, in one sense, parodies, or at least exaggerations of contemporary teenagers. At a remove from the characters Romeo, Juliet and the sparring Actors 2 and 3 are the real actors, Sean and Alex, who are onstage as themselves for the final talk back. Thus, the happy ending of Actors 2 and 3 who fall in love is somewhat punctured by the remove of the performers from this narrative. This distance helps curb the didacticism of Manning's script, with the ability of the actors to poke fun at themselves in performance helping defuse derision. The continual undercutting of the narration also helped steer the plays from didacticism whenever they tipped dangerously close: when the other actors explained how Macduff's caesarian section fulfilled the witches' prophecy, Actor 4 was the voice of dissent, exclaiming 'What is this? A biology lesson?' (*Macbeth Intensive* 22) Similarly, the high-fiving alliteration-admiring actors were exaggerated and unrealistic versions of actual teenagers (some of whom might be inclined to roll their eyes before lifting their palms for a high five) and their infectious enthusiasm helped endear them to students.

Students responding to the Actors at Work website often talk directly to the individual actors, showcasing a version of this double reply to Shakespeare. Tran's response to *Midsummer Madness* provides a useful example: "i feel sorry for Bottom as he was 'more sinned aganist than sinning' as he was turned into a donkey. PS: Felix, MAN-UP!" (Tran) The first sentence, with its quotation from Shakespeare, seems accessible or even addressed to an adult teacher, using a Shakespeare quotation to reflect on another character's predicament and demonstrating an interpretative competency. The postscript is written in a different register, one solely intended for Felix, one of the Actors who visited their school, and communicates an in-joke from the

interpolated modern narration rather than from Shakespeare. The amount of direct addresses to individual actors on this comments board is striking, testifying to the rapport between the young actors and their audience. Certainly, this rapport does not necessarily constitute a resistance to the subject position of disempowered political agent or budding consumer citizen. If anything, the adulation of the actors as celebrities might be seen to reify them, to turn them into golden statues who convey their wisdom across the internet. Yet this intimacy also allows a space, however small, where teenage responses are not dismissed as inexplicable noise or dumb shows but are heard and reciprocated, with the young actors responding to posts and sometimes modifying their performances towards parody.

At one performance I witnessed, one student did seem to make a more pointed statement of resistance: letting out a groan and lying down across several chairs immediately after the *Desperate Housewives* reference in *The Macbeth Intensive*. This dumb show seemed to convey resistance to not just Bell Shakespeare, but also to a brand of romantic consumerism that incorporates Shakespeare as part of its vocabulary. Certainly, one supine teenager does not a revolution make and not only was this student's "protest" swiftly interrupted (with teachers rushing over and getting him to sit properly in his seat) but to read it as a protest is perhaps to re-embed it within an empire of meaning that it seeks to resist. Despite this caution, I believe it is useful to attend to such dumb shows as alternative strategies of meaning rather than displays of dumbness and to consider the ways in which parody offers teenagers a space outside of the subject positions of disempowered political observer or consumer citizen. The next chapter turns to the classroom as a crucible for teenage encounters with Shakespeare, attending to the ways in which Shakespeare serves as a site for students to produce, resist and parody teenage values.

Chapter Two.

Excellent Dumb Discourse: Shakespeare in Perimillennial Classrooms.

Hector Hush, boys. Hush. Sometimes...sometimes you defeat me.

Dakin Oh no, sir. If we wanted to defeat you we could be like Cordelia and say nothing.

(A. Bennett 64)

In Alan Bennett's *The History Boys* (2005), Dakin recognizes the rebellious power of silence, especially when it is a collective silence in the classroom. While Cordelia doesn't quite say nothing so much as *say* "nothing," her language of refusal and unwillingness to participate in a commodified empire of meaning (the exchange of pretty words for pretty fields and rivers) make her a suggestive figure for student rebels. Of course, Dakin is no Cordelia and his evocation of rebellion through a Shakespeare quotation affirms the value of his teacher's pedagogy: he has garnered enough cultural capital to exchange *bons mots* with his teachers. What is ultimately valued in *The History Boys* is participation in an emotional empire of meaning; Hector's motto of deferred learning demands that students soak up Shakespeare and other great authors with the hope that this will make them wiser: "Pass the parcel. That's sometimes all you can do. Take it, feel it and pass it on. Not for me, not for you, but for someone, somewhere, one day" (A. Bennett 109). These two quotations from *The History Boys* hint at several of this issues which animate this chapter: the subversive power of student silence, the importance of emotional learning and the shared experience of education.

This chapter complements the work of Chapter One, moving from theatre-in-education performances by professional actors to drama-in-education techniques suggested by textbooks and enacted by students in perimillennial classrooms and on YouTube. This chapter is split into three sections: in the first, I establish how drama-in-education techniques can also interpellate teenager as romantic consumers and consumer citizens, analyzing the activities of the Cambridge

School Shakespeare editions; in the second, I argue that student performances on YouTube can parody teenagers' subject positions as romantic consumers but also perpetuate other stereotypes and prejudices about teenage identity; in the third, I briefly consider the Shakespeare Reloaded project in Sydney and argue for performance-based pedagogies that combine critical thinking and engagement with Shakespeare's language with the excellent dumb discourse that student parodies create. I expand upon my concept of *double reply* to explore student parodies, analyzing the ways in which student projects posted on YouTube often communicate to a double audience, meeting the requirements of a class assignment as well as addressing an exclusively teenage audience and parodying teenage culture. I want to suggest an importance in being dumb, that we might read YouTube videos as trivial parodies for serious people, with teenagers communicating through an excellent dumb discourse. I also argue that the performance-based pedagogies discussed in this chapter enable Shared Shakespeare, a perimillennial iteration of Social Shakespeare, based on the ethos of the ensemble. Jean E. Howard advocates teaching "the social Shakespeare," a reading of Shakespeare's plays that recognizes them as a "result of endless collaborations" between a multiplicity of agents drawing on shared cultural and linguistic resources ("Shakespeare and Authenticity: Teaching the Real Thing" 96). Rex Gibson shares this interest in Social Shakespeare, believing that the "co-operative, shared activity" of performance-based pedagogies recalls "Shakespeare's own working conditions as he and his colleagues at the Globe rehearsed together to produce a performance" (*Teaching Shakespeare* 12). Here, I use Social Shakespeare as Gibson does, to describe the collaborative work that performance-based pedagogies perform but offer Shared Shakespeare as a way of emphasizing both the role of digital media in perimillennial pedagogy (where Shakespeare is often a clip to be shared online) and the shared critical inquiry of the ensemble pedagogy that the RSC advocate for. At its best,

Shared Shakespeare can create a collaborative community of critical thinkers, engaging dumb discourse with critical thinking to imagine teenagers as politically engaged *actors*.

Following Christy Desmet, I use Linda Hutcheon's work on parody to consider student projects on YouTube as a sophisticated form. Hutcheon offers a defense of parody, aiming to free the form from its Romantic and capitalist opprobrium: "the Romantic rejection of parodic forms as parasitic reflected a growing capitalist ethic that made literature into a commodity to be owned by an individual" (*A Theory of Parody* 4). Classifying parody as "repetition with critical distance, which marks difference rather than similarity," Hutcheon observes that this critical distance often pushes parodies towards conservatism, despite the fact that it has been hailed as "the paradigm of aesthetic revolution and historical change" (6; 68). Citing Brecht as an example, Hutcheon ultimately argues for the possibilities of modern parodies that are closer to carnival than conservatism and have satiric ends, satire being "both moral and social in its focus and ameliorative in its intention" in her formulation (16). I want to expand upon Hutcheon's work to think about the ways in which parody with satiric ends can offer a critique of the capitalist culture that denigrates parody. For Hutcheon, Shakespeare in 1984 was somewhat at a remove from consumer culture, with Wendy Cope's parody of Sonnet 55, which promises that "not only marble, but the plastic toys/From cornflake packets will outlive this rhyme", relying on a *disconnect* between consumer culture and Shakespeare (qtd. in *A Theory of Parody* 79). While Shakespeare's words do not yet pop out of cornflake boxes (though this may be an oversight on my part) they are frequently commandeered as part of teenage consumer culture, as the Orange Juliets and soul-mated skirts from *Seventeen* testify.

Attending to the ways in which students communicate *around* Shakespeare's language, I follow Desmet's interest in performance, which she aims to recuperate "as an alternative

metaphor for the artistic, ethical and political act of appropriating Shakespeare” (“Paying Attention in Shakespeare Parody” 228). Many of the parodies of Shakespeare that Hutcheon cites rely on Shakespeare’s language for effect, a memorable example being Hutcheon’s reading of a moment in *Star Wars* when Chewbacca holds the detached robot head of CP-30, his grunts sharing “the rhythmic syntax” of Hamlet’s lament for Yorick (27). This emphasis on language participates in a trend that Douglas Lanier notices, where Shakespeare’s language as “symbolic flashpoint” becomes the means by which appropriations of Shakespeare are judged (*Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* 59). Desmet considers the ways that performances on YouTube push beyond fidelity to Shakespeare’s language as a measure of their distance from Shakespeare, attending to the non-verbal discourses that students engage with.⁴⁰ Her interest in responses to Shakespeare that have a critical distance is one that I share, thus I am also interested in parody rather than pastiche.⁴¹ To attend to student projects as parody rather than pastiche, as Desmet does, is to take them seriously and to dismiss the “anarchic pleasure” that these videos take in resisting close academic readings.⁴² By situating school projects on YouTube within the pedagogical context that they emerge from and the participatory culture on YouTube that they engage with, I hope to demonstrate the ways in which some examples of the genre can be read as a parody with satiric ends and as the sort of anarchically pleasurable text that Barthes imagines. Indeed, I argue that it is in embracing a sort of teenage *jouissance*, through the inclusion of

⁴⁰ This work builds off of Hutcheon’s later work, *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006), which explores performances as adaptations.

⁴¹ Defining pastiche as the distinctive feature of postmodernism, Fredric Jameson described it as “blank parody,” a parody “without the satirical impulse, without laughter, without that still latent feeling that there exists something *normal* compared with what is being imitated is rather comic” (qtd. in *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* 87, original emphasis).

⁴² Desmet cites Lanier, who argues that “refusing the academic imperative to ‘read closely’ is often the point, a source of anarchic pleasure” for pop citations of Shakespeare (*Shakespeare and Modern Culture* 52).

bloopers that revel in teenage laughter rather than adult-mediated meaning, that some of these videos release pleasurable parodies that offer insightful critiques of Shakespeare's incorporation within teenage culture. The bloopers that students include as part of parodies offer an especially good instance of double reply and talking back to Shakespeare: in a "five minute" version of *Romeo and Juliet*, these additional out-takes can often add several minutes to the video, rivaling condensed Shakespeare for length. I argue that these bloopers are addressed to a teenage audience and serve a different function to the rest of the video, often refusing to *mean* in the same way that a school assignment requests.

Returning to Baudrillard's term, "the empire of meaning," is helpful in considering this excellent dumb discourse. Considering the relationship between children, animals and silence, Baudrillard evokes the rebellious language of nothingness that Cordelia offers:

Children speak, to the adult universe they are no longer those simultaneously strange and insignificant beings - children signify, they have become significant - not through some sort of 'liberation' of their speech, but because adult reason has given itself the most subtle means to avert the threat of their silence...What is essential is that nothing escape the empire of meaning, the sharing of meaning. Certainly, behind all that, nothing speaks to us, neither the mad, nor the dead, nor children, nor savages, and fundamentally we know nothing of them...They, the animals do not speak. In a universe of increasing speech, of the constraint to confess and to speak, only they remain mute, and for this reason they seem to retreat far from us, behind the horizon of truth...In a world bent on doing nothing but making one speak, in a world assembled under the hegemony of signs and discourse, their silence weighs more and more heavily on our organization of meaning (136-137).

It must be acknowledged that Baudrillard is not talking about teenagers, but principally animals and children, as well as other marginalized subjects, including "savages." That said, I contend that "the empire of meaning" is a helpful way to consider the manner in which Shakespeare's language becomes a readymade vocabulary for students to mean through, with authority figures often determining the direction of this meaning. In perimillennial School Shakespeare, this direction is often personal rather than political, with the "sharing of meaning"

that Baudrillard discusses similar to Hector's idea of pass the parcel: Shakespeare's words offer deferred meanings, words that *will* convey emotional truths, dependent upon a signified that will appear later in life. By evoking the silence of animals and communicating around Shakespeare's language, students are able to resist an empire of meaning which, in the perimillennial period, is chained to corporate culture. My use of empire of meaning in relation to Shakespeare highlights Baudrillard's point that adult discourse produces meaning for silent subjects to "avert the threat of their silence." I do not mean to suggest that saying nothing is the only response that students can or should have to Shakespeare: as I will discuss, I believe that Shared Shakespeare can lead to a sharing of meaning that *includes* students in its production and that encourages students to engage with language. Thus, I use empire of meaning here not to suggest all construction of meaning, but rather adult-mediated meaning produced for teenagers.

I want to begin by considering what sort of meaning was ascribed to the study of Shakespeare in the first context I discuss: the perimillennial England where Shakespeare had been introduced as the only compulsory author in the English curriculum.

The beat of the understanding heart: The Cambridge School Shakespeare Series.

The Cox Report foregrounded Shakespeare's ability to speak to every age as the primary reasons for studying him:

Many teachers believe that Shakespeare's work conveys universal values, and that his language expresses rich and subtle meanings beyond that of any other English writer. Other teachers point out that evaluations of Shakespeare have varied from one historical period to the next, and they argue that pupils should be encouraged to think critically about his status in the canon. But almost everyone agrees that his work should be represented in a National Curriculum. Shakespeare's plays are so rich that in every age they can produce fresh meanings, and even those who deny his universality agree on his cultural importance (qtd. in Leach 29).

Clearly, this report sides with the “many” teachers who endorse Shakespeare’s universality rather than those “other” teachers that question his status within the curriculum, blithely silencing the vigorous debate in the 1980s about Shakespeare’s place in the English Curriculum by assuring that while Shakespeare’s universality might be denied, his cultural importance is universally agreed upon. Elsewhere, Cox associates Shakespeare’s language with this cultural importance, positing that his linguistic influence, as well as his abilities, goes “beyond that of any other English writer” (qtd. in Leach 22-23). Portrayed by the report as containing “rich and subtle meanings,” Shakespeare’s language is a specialized code, one that explains the present and sheds light upon the past. The richness and subtlety of this language acknowledges that it is not immediately accessible to students and part of the rationale for the promotion of performance-based pedagogies is that they help students to unlock this code and uncover the universal values inside. Rex Gibson was also on the committee with Cox and lobbied passionately for the inclusion of Shakespeare, and the performance-based pedagogies he had been developing, in the National Curriculum.⁴³ Gibson lists four main reasons for studying Shakespeare: abiding and familiar concerns, student development, language, and otherness (*Teaching Shakespeare 2*). This list resonates with the reasons Cox supplied to Susan Leach for studying Shakespeare: wisdom, cultural heritage, language and insight into human character (Leach 22-23); Shakespeare offers historical specificity (otherness; cultural heritage) as well as contemporary relevance (familiar concerns; student development; insight into human character; wisdom). The divergent objectives of these lists clarify the way in which Shakespeare’s language is presented a pivotal bridge between past and present: Gibson advises teachers to “remember that, whatever else, Shakespeare is about language” (*Secondary School Shakespeare 2*) and

⁴³ These pedagogies were developed through the Shakespeare in Schools Project, which operated through the Cambridge Institute from 1986.

encourages students to own Shakespeare's language and thus respond with a "real sense of personal engagement" (*Teaching Shakespeare* xii).

The *personal* engagement that students are encouraged to respond to Shakespeare with matches Gibson's belief that "Shakespeare develops the understanding heart" (*Teaching Shakespeare* 5). Gibson's *understanding* heart might be seen as an image that reconciles an imagined binary between heart and head, between the challenges of Shakespeare's linguistic complexity and the promise of his universal relevance that The Cox Report outlined. Developing the understanding heart is one of Gibson's fundamental rationales for performance-based pedagogies, which Gibson argues can "dissolve the traditional oppositions of analysis and imagination, intellect and emotion" and can lead to "informed personal responses which are both critical and appreciative" (*Teaching Shakespeare* xiii). The heart's role in providing intellectual and emotional responses is literalized by exercises which encourage students to listen to their hearts to hear the beat of iambic pentameter (*Teaching Shakespeare* 67); part of the comprehension that Gibson's understanding heart performs is linguistic as well as emotional. This understanding heart is a rather less appealing image within the context of Thatcherite Britain, where Shakespeare was imagined as "a Tory, without any doubt" by Nigel Lawson (qtd. in Irish 8). The veins of Gibson's understanding heart certainly ran Tory blue, circulating a romantic image of Shakespeare as a repository of universal values at a time when cultural materialist critics argued for a pedagogy that examined rather than perpetuated Shakespeare's role in the production of culture.

The conservative aims of the Cox Report were twinned with a radical pedagogy, which encouraged teachers to liberate desk-bound students and embrace "exciting, enjoyable approaches that are social, imaginative and physical" (qtd. in Irish 10). These adjectives suggest

some of the reasons proffered for performance-based pedagogies, which recall some of the objectives of the theatre-in-education groups discussed in Chapter One: a call to students' imaginations, enjoyment, and embodied learning. J.L. Styan argues that "the direct method" of performance-based pedagogy creates a "live experience in a dead classroom," animating and focusing critical conversations ("Direct Method Shakespeare" 199). Styan stresses the importance of critical engagement through performance-based pedagogy, believing that performing scenes in class produces students who are "pleasantly alert and critical" ("Shakespeare off the Page" 64). This *pleasant* alertness prefigures Gibson's understanding heart and his rationale for performance-based pedagogies stresses their ability to both enable the imaginative, exciting and enjoyable encounters with Shakespeare that the Cox Report discusses and to enable critical thought, with active methods giving "focus and substance to the discussion, writing and design work that students undertake" (*Teaching Shakespeare* xii). A summary of these objectives - student enjoyment, critical thinking, collaborative learning - might suggest a radical pedagogy at odds with a Conservative Government's investment in Shakespeare's cultural heritage and indeed the performance-based pedagogies suggested by Susan Leach are designed to facilitate critical questioning, using Shakespeare to interrogate power relations. However, the freedom that performance-based pedagogies enable, coupled with the goal of making Shakespeare relevant to teenage experience, can mean that the filtering of Shakespeare's language through teenage bodies produces teenage values, with collaborative critical thinking at odds with ownership of Shakespeare within a Thatcherite context.

The understanding heart developed by the CSS editions had a distinctly *teenage* throb and continued the evolution that Robert Shaughnessy tracked in 20th century editions of the New Cambridge Shakespeare. Shaughnessy notes that in John Dover Wilson and G.I. Duthie's 1955

edition, Juliet's "Was ever book containing such vile matter/So fairly bound?" (3.2.83-4) is accompanied by a gloss that connects Juliet's dilemma with contemporary teenagers: "when a girl in our own age is troubled by the thought that the boy she adores, though delightful to all appearance, may be at root wicked she does not usually express her heart-sick feelings like this...She speaks more directly, more spontaneously" (qtd. in Shaughnessy 177). Shaughnessy points to the strain in this connection, noting that the editors' attempts to bridge the worlds of teen romance and Petrarchan idiom lead them to the linguistic collapse of ellipses, ending up with "a rather lame non sequitur, as if its author were suddenly stumped, either by the implications of opening up such a dialogue between high and low culture and everyday life, or by the prospect of what such directness and spontaneity might actually entail" (177). The gradual teening of Juliet that Shaughnessy tracks in the Cambridge editions between 1921 to 1955 is complete by 1992, with students continually called upon to imagine contemporary idioms or correlations to events from the play, whether writing Rosaline's diary, casting themselves as television reporters at the Capulet's party or thinking about "how Romeo's and Tybalt's friends are like teenage groups today" (*Romeo and Juliet 1st Edition* 46). This evolution continues through the revisions of the Cambridge Schools Shakespeare *Romeo and Juliet*: while the text inside remains the same (and derives from the New Cambridge editions), the bindings become fairer with increasingly contemporary couples on the cover.⁴⁴ It is to the hearts of teenagers (and perhaps some other parts) that these attractive young couples appeal, and students' hearts are further petitioned inside as they are asked to relate problems of the play to their own lives

⁴⁴ The 1992 edition features a sketch of Timothy Dalton and Estelle Kohler from the RSC's 1973 production, the 1999 edition uses an original photograph by Mark Mason with two young models as the central couple in contemporary formalwear and the 2005 edition features a photograph of the interracial couple from the RSC's 1998 production (Ray Fearon and Zoe Waites): while all three editions use young couples, the final interracial couple, as well as the updated material inside, locate much of the novelty of this edition in its contemporary relevance.

(writing diaries or agony aunt letters) and to respond romantically to 2.2, learning a few of their favorite lines “by heart” (62).

In the competitive market of School Shakespeare textbooks, the CSS editions distinguish themselves as hybrid works: the play text appears on the right hand page while the left hand page features classroom and homework exercises, interpretive questions, and short glosses and plot summaries.⁴⁵ Treating Shakespeare’s plays as *scripts*, partial and provisional texts which require “imaginative, dramatic enactment for completion,” Gibson pointedly sets the CSS editions against School Shakespeare textbooks with extensive footnotes (*Teaching Shakespeare* 7).⁴⁶ The form of the CSS editions works to conceal the editor’s hand and foster independent analysis: a discussion of the play appears after the text in lieu of an introduction and glosses are short and kept to a minimum. Likened to actors, students are addressed directly and encouraged to “make up your own mind about Romeo and Juliet rather than having someone else’s interpretation handed down to you” (*Romeo and Juliet 2nd Edition*). The CSS editions, for all their originality, share striking similarities to both the heavily annotated editions that Gibson criticizes and the No Fear Shakespeare and Shakespeare Made Easy series which offer a contemporary “translation” of Shakespeare on the left hand page and Shakespeare’s language on the right hand page;

⁴⁵ The proliferation of school editions in the Post World War II period indicates Shakespeare’s central role in the school curriculum and the teening of school editions that Shaughnessy discusses: The 2005 Oxford School Shakespeare Edition features Claire Danes and Leonardo di Caprio on its cover, in a still from *William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet*; the *No Fear Shakespeare* editions stress their ability to communicate to a contemporary audience, reassuring students that their translation will deliver “the kind of English people actually speak today” (*Romeo and Juliet* v). For an analysis of different school editions see Ann Thompson 74-87; Cookson 170-183 and Leach 47-59. The New Cambridge Edition continues to be published alongside the CSS series, indicating different degrees of commitment to Teenage Shakespeare.

⁴⁶ Gibson decries an edition of *Macbeth* with 4 lines of text and “fifty-two half lines of explanation and mention of twelve named ‘authorities.’” (8). These editions come from the 19th century version of School Shakespeare. Shakespeare featured in excerpts or editions which used his words as a vehicle to teach philology and featured extensive footnotes commenting upon grammar and linguistics, “an inordinate fecundity of explanation” which was “quite too much the order of the day” in Henry Hudson’s estimation (4).

Shakespeare's language is separated from explanations and exercises, occupying a privileged textual position. Although the CSS series casts Shakespeare's words as a provisional script, the absence of notes suggests a *stable* text that can be variously interpreted through performance and occludes the editorial work that transforms a variety of editions into one text. The format of the CSS editions privileges Shakespeare's language as essential: the multiple exercises accompanying each page of text are designed to be optional, rendering many disposable, with the exigencies of the curriculum making it impossible for any class to do all, or indeed many, of the activities.

Many of the suggested exercises ask students to respond to words by creating pictures, creating group tableaux, dumb shows and individual responses to lines: these exercises lead to both a hierarchy of print and performance (the dumb shows enact the words) and often position students as silent subjects who are denied a political voice. For example, students are encouraged to stage Horatio's narrative from 1.1: "One person narrates, the others enact each episode. The lines contain over twenty-five separate actions that can be shown. (For instance, 'Sharked up' is a vivid image of a shark feeding indiscriminately)" (*Hamlet* 8). It is difficult to imagine a situation where the enactment of a ravenous shark by one student while another makes his or her way through Horatio's speech is anything other than comic and this exercise both directs students' interpretations towards comedy and deflects their engagement with the political context of this speech. These activities present Shakespeare's words as principally descriptive, nouns waiting to be materialized; as with the Players' scenic descriptions, rich language is used as a springboard towards rich things, with students embodying the golden statues of Romeo and Juliet in tableau (*Romeo and Juliet 2nd Edition* 198).

Exercises from the *Hamlet* edition further the creation of Shakespearean characters and contemporary teenagers as romantic consumers, minimizing Hamlet's political role in favor of his qualities as a romantic hero, with his honeyed love letters the prized currency in this world. Students are asked to write in Hamlet's diary and to write two love letters to Ophelia (who is configured as a sort of diary here, a sponge to absorb Hamlet's worries). Students are prompted that Hamlet's diary "will describe his feelings about Claudius and Gertrude and his own moodiness" (28) and his love letter to Ophelia will reveal "some of the concerns, suspicions and melancholy that he has exhibited, but also includ[e] other aspects of their relationship" (64). Students' expansion of the world of *Hamlet* is principally romantic, compounded when they are asked to write another love letter to Ophelia and to dramatize the interaction that Ophelia reports in 2.1. The objective here is both analytical (students pore over the text to find evidence for their letter) and imaginative (students include "other aspects of their relationship). A problem here though is that the analysis is heavily directed, as students are told what to include, and the imaginative response curtailed to personal responses. Laurie Johnson argues that the problem with perimillennial pedagogies that focus on contemporary relevance (such as updating Hamlet's thoughts to a contemporary diary) is that they fail "to engage the students as *critical thinkers*. In effect, what relevance-making does is reinforce the idea that the text and its world are alien to the students' private stocks of knowledge right from the outset" (68 original emphasis). Asking students to resort to their private stocks of knowledge can sometimes close down rather than liberating interpretations. For example, an exercise in the CSS *Macbeth* asks students to consider Banquo's "gentle lady" (2.3, 79): "Can Lady Macbeth be gentle? Write down six or seven adjectives that you feel are more suitable" (*Macbeth* 52). The "more suitable" answer might be found elsewhere in the text, but students are also encouraged to draw on their own impressions

(they have been keeping a personal diary about Lady Macbeth) and validates responses that deny the possibility of Lady Macbeth as a complex character by suggesting that Banquo has made an error.

At the other end of the spectrum, Ophelia is imagined as primarily gentle. Though there is some interest in resisting the Millais tradition of Ophelia as a doomed drowned object of aestheticism, the strain of presenting Ophelia as contemporary teenager is apparent. Noting that “[t]here is debate about how to play Ophelia: as a meek, passive victim of Hamlet’s anger or as a stronger character,” Gibson asks students performing 3.1 to “try lines 144-55 in both ways” (108). While this demonstrates both restraint and an opportunity for students to discover their own interpretations, the paucity of direction here seems to indicate a scant commitment to a different Ophelia, with the vague “stronger” set in opposition to the clear picture of Victorian Ophelia as a “meek, passive victim.” This strain is also evident when students are encouraged to talk back to Polonius in 1.3: “As Ophelia, write eight to sixteen lines of advice to Laertes and to Polonius. Try to include images which are as striking as those used by her brother and father” (56). The “try to” here suggests that students might struggle to match Shakespeare’s language and suggests Gibson’s difficulty in presenting a stronger Ophelia. Moreover, while students are encouraged to identify with Hamlet, Ophelia is an object to be analyzed: a reproduction of John Everett Millais’s 1851-52 picture of a Pre-Raphaelite drowned Ophelia accompanies 4.7 and students are asked to “write doctor’s notes” on Ophelia in 4.5 (182). Again, the analytical and imaginative objectives of this writing exercise are undermined by in manner in which student imaginations are directed: despite the interest in Ophelia’s strength, it is the image of the Millais Ophelia that these exercises seem most destined to reproduce, helping to construct gendered teen

subjects with female subjects as objects of identification (to be analyzed through doctor's notes) and male subjects offering the primary point of identification.

Though the *CSS* edition of *Julius Caesar* is less invested in romantic consumption, it stages a similar re-direction of political engagement with Shakespeare's language, imagining students as creative consumers, with students continually asked to adopt professions such as management or design consultants. Whether designing coats of arms, pageants for Caesar or "Cicero tours and Cassio travel books," (30) students are asked to embrace Roman pomp through corporate culture, a process that reaches its apotheosis when students are prompted to create drawings of coins for Brutus or Cassius as "a design consultancy" (122); usurped from his place on the British twenty pound note, Shakespeare is still being used to add value to currency. While *Julius Caesar* offers multiple subject positions that offer the potential to challenge dominant culture, the exercises here redirect subversive positions into corporate channels: students are asked to represent a "public relations firm competing to produce the best corporate image for the Republican cause" (80). When some exercises do prompt students to consider a resistance less allied with consumer culture, the conditions in which resistance is imagined - "an intolerable political regime" in a dystopic future - present political dialogue as the most extreme of activities (44). While it's not surprising that a textbook quells rather than fans revolutionary energies, what is somewhat dispiriting about this edition is the depoliticized voices imagined for young people and marginalized characters. Students are asked to "write Lucius' dream as he slept through the meeting of the conspirators," (52) calling upon them to invent personal lives for young characters rather than imagine them as political subjects. A later exercise expands upon this, acknowledging that Lucius' perspective is as provisional as Portia's and asking students to "[i]mprovise a conversation Lucius holds with the other slaves next morning, describing that

night. The slaves may ask many questions and have plenty of ideas about what it all means. They may get it right - or they may not!" (58) Though this exercise encourages an admirable expansion of the world of *Julius Caesar*, and an attention to inadequate access to information afforded marginalized voices in this world, the jaunty conclusion that this speculation may well be completely wrong pitches these marginalized voices as idle gossips. Rather astonishingly, a poem is introduced from a slave's perspective in another exercise, not to discuss that position, but to provide a poetic form for students to imagine a Roman perspective: "write a poem in the same form as 'I am a slave,' but start and end each verse with 'I am a true Roman' (34); this exercise literally erases slaves from this history, asking students to ally themselves with a Roman (consumer) culture. Part of the strain evidenced here is that slaves are of course not all that visible in *Julius Caesar* and the sleeping Lucius is hardly an active political agent. Using Shakespeare's plays as a way to think about contemporary politics can often limit both this political dialogue and the presentation of young people as politically engaged citizens.

This helpless subject position is also applied to contemporary students, who are asked in *Julius Caesar* to imagine themselves as Elizabethan schoolboys and start their own exercise books filled with commonplace sayings from the play, beginning with "improvis[ing] a story around 'lowliness is young ambition's ladder'" (40). This recalls the use of Shakespeare in schools that Sinfield reports, where female students who spoke too loudly were made to copy out Lear's eulogy of Cordelia: "Her voice was ever soft/Gentle, and low, an excellent thing in woman" (5.3 267-268; Sinfield 161). This use of Shakespeare to discipline assertive students and to master any rebellious tendencies is also clear in Seward's commonplace book. Seward glosses lowliness as "being respectful and pleasant to everybody" and while students are allowed to disagree with the maxim in their commonplace book, the exercise nonetheless seems to position

them as placidly pleasant workers, slowly making their way up ambition's ladder until they can become management consultants or press agents.

It must be acknowledged that evaluating these activities only through their appearance in a textbook is an incomplete act and that while these exercises often direct student responses they do not necessarily produce these responses. I will return to the CSS series later in this chapter, to consider a more positive reading of the activities that they suggest, but first it is useful to consider student responses. One popular assignment of performance-based pedagogy is to ask students to create a condensed version of the play they are studying, the performances of which can now be recorded rather than acted. I will examine some of these performances on YouTube, arguing that YouTube's format allows teenagers to engage in double reply and to create excellent dumb discourse that resists their conscription as consumers of and through Shakespeare.

Enter, Confronted with a Dog: Teenage Shakespeare on YouTube.

The CSS editions aspire to hybridity (as a mixture of manual and playscript) and a participatory culture (encouraging students to engage with one another as well as Shakespeare), two defining features of YouTube that have particular implications for its use as a pedagogical platform.

Desmet argues that the hybridity of YouTube enables critical thinking: "part video, part website, it combines the immediacy of the first with the search capacity and critical distance of the second" ("Teaching Shakespeare with YouTube" 66). Anandam Kavoori breaks down YouTube further, arguing that it is a specific kind of web text with three linked components: "the primary video that dominates the spatial organization of the page, the ancillary videos that appear alongside, functioning like a visual sidebar, and the comments that scroll beneath" (5). The format of YouTube offers a different model of engagement with Digital Shakespeare than the

“passive, ‘iconic’ engagement” encouraged by DVD watching in W.B. Worthen’s argument (“Performing Shakespeare in Digital Culture” 243). All of the components that Kavoori describes encourage active participation, with viewers encouraged to leave comments or watch related videos (or advertisements); uploading a Shakespeare project on YouTube embeds it within the “participatory culture” of the digital age, encouraging literal file-sharing and the sharing of meaning. Writing just before YouTube emerged, Henry Jenkins defined participatory culture against consumer culture, arguing that a new mode of engagement “contrasts with older notions of passive media spectatorship” and will potentially enable “new ways of thinking about citizenship and collaboration” (3; 246). YouTube has become a pivotal part of the digital participatory culture that Jenkins defines, expanding enormously from its launch in 2005 and its original impetus: YouTube was founded as a place to easily share videos online after its three founders struggled to find online clips of Janet Jackson’s Superbowl exposure (Barkham). Alongside Janet Jackson’s breast (now readily accessible on YouTube) and a myriad of other videos is a canon of School Shakespeare videos, with high school students and college filmmakers “by far, the most prolific posters of Shakespearean videos on YouTube” in Desmet’s estimation in 2009 (“Teaching Shakespeare with YouTube” 68). As Ayanna Thompson outlines in her essay on YouTube iterations of *Othello* and *Titus*, “Unmooring the Moor: Researching and Teaching on YouTube,” student videos on YouTube present a host of opportunities and challenges and suggest that “the classroom-inspired performance video should be viewed as a genre in and of itself” (356).

School Shakespeare assignments posted on YouTube are not just a different genre but also occupy a different space from other school texts, situated in the worlds of the school and the digital culture, both participatory and consumer, that YouTube represents. Enmeshed uneasily

within both participatory and consumer culture, YouTube offers an excellent arena to examine the encounters between Shakespeare, teenagers and consumer culture. As part of participatory culture, YouTube enables user-generated content and the appropriation and remixing of corporate media. Since its acquisition by Google in October 2006, however, YouTube has been increasingly part of a consumer culture where adverts produce meanings for consumer citizens: the presence of advertisements has increased significantly, ensuring YouTube's profitability (C. Miller). Thus, while student videos might parody consumer culture, these same videos jostle alongside advertisements and often contain authorized links to purchase the songs that videos use. The corporatization of YouTube has become increasingly pronounced in the three years I have been examining School Shakespeare videos, sometimes changing the kind of Shared Shakespeare produced: the sidebar which suggests linked videos, and helps to create a community of videomakers engaging with Shakespeare, now contains advertisements that are not linked to the video being watched. This confirms Thompson's view of YouTube as an unstable medium, where videos might not even be for an age, with several of the videos I looked at in 2010 now no longer accessible. Despite these challenges, Thompson's essay speaks to the value of exploring the YouTube archive, illuminating the subversive opportunities to talk back to Shakespeare and racial stereotypes that YouTube facilitates as well as the perpetuation of racial stereotypes and disturbing racist, sexist and homophobic comments that YouTube also enables. Following Thompson and Desmet, I consider a representative sampling of videos here, restricting my range to videos of *Romeo and Juliet* that originate from a school assignment and offer a condensed version of the plot: this constriction allows for an analysis of how teenagers from the US, Australia and England deal with one of the most popular School Shakespeare texts in a similar format and the manner in which they resist a reading of *Romeo and Juliet* as

romantic consumers. Although I appreciate Thompson's concerns about protecting teenagers' identities, I have listed the names of videos here for ease of accessibility.

One characteristic feature of the special genre of classroom inspired performance video that Thompson outlines is that these videos consciously invoke double reply to communicate to different audiences. As a response to a school assignment, these videos fulfill certain requirements: they distill *Romeo and Juliet*'s plot within the prescribed time limits (usually five minutes) and feature students performing multiple roles, sometimes within a school setting. While the presence of these videos on YouTube can also be accounted to meeting these requirements - enabling easy access for teachers and other students - the continued presence of these videos beyond the assignment that prompted them suggests an interest in another audience. Tsipos's "Romeo and Juliet in 5 mins," an early example of the genre from Australia, explicitly addresses a teenage audience unfamiliar with this project: "Should be handy for all those people studying R&J without reading the book :)" (Tsipos). Double reply is used here to address other teenagers who haven't read the prescribed School Shakespeare text, using informal language ("Should be handy") and emoticons to distinguish this comment from the school project it is attached to.

Double reply is also used throughout this video, with references to teenage culture and lingo consciously addressing other teenagers, both the original viewers (fellow students) and the wider community reached out to through the above comment. In fact, this video's frame structure is predicated on double reply: an opening scene shows the two students who will play Romeo and Juliet talking to a third student, who hasn't prepared for Shakespeare day. As they attempt to explain *Romeo and Juliet*'s plot, this "realistic" school setting is abandoned for a filmic version of the story: the male students are still at school in uniforms, but the codes of order are subverted

(wigs are introduced, collars popped up to portray different characters) and extra-diegetic music is introduced. This frame returns at the end to punctuate the rather serious handling of the lovers' deaths: five minutes of Shakespeare has sent the third student to sleep. This frame legitimates the use of double reply throughout, creating a surrogate teenage audience that justifies the casual language used to describe the plot. Double reply is used here not just to create a distance from School Shakespeare, but also from teenage culture. This Romeo is described as "pretty much...a bit of an emo" and the version of 1.2 presents his emotional nature in clearly parodic terms: the actor playing Romeo sighs on a ledge and mimes slashing his wrists with a sword. What is being parodied here is not just Romeo's emotional nature in 1.2, but also teenage culture, with "emo" functioning like the above emoticon, communicating in a register closer to teenagers than Shakespeare. This moment can also be read as parodying the kinship between teenagers and Shakespeare that some of Gibson's exercises assume: instead of tragic identification with Romeo, these students use critical distance to configure such identification as comedic. Romeo is principally treated as an object of parody in these videos, whose temporal constraints and logistical make it difficult to stage tragic identification. However, the terms in which Romeo is parodied explicitly connect the perceived ridiculousness of his love to teenage culture: in MsFunnyVid's "MsFunnyvids's "The Magical Tale of Romeo and Juliet (spoof)," a US example from 2009, Romeo enters in 1.2 weeping and clutching a teddy bear that Rosaline has rejected; Romeo's Petrarchan love is translated into a ridiculous romantic consumerism, with double reply employing teenage lingo to parody teenage values.

Another characteristic feature of these videos - the addition of bloopers or outtakes at the end of the video - illustrates the different registers they communicate in different audiences and suggests the embrace of a teenage *jouissance* that refuses to participate in an empire of

meaning. The addition of these bloopers destabilizes the order of the school assignment, creating “five minute” versions of *Romeo and Juliet* which in fact run for seven or eight minutes. The inclusion of these bloopers suggests the double audience that they imagine, with MsFunnyVids’s description of the video distancing it from its inception as a school project: “This was originally made for a highschool assignment but it was made to be a comedy” (MsFunnyVids). The “but” in this sentence imagines an opposition between school and comedy, between education and entertainment, and the inclusion of bloopers at the end of the video signals comedy’s rebellious victory over tragedy. In one sense, these bloopers stage a happy ending for *Romeo and Juliet*: the actors are resurrected, laughing, displaced from the chronological *sujet* of the School Shakespeare assignment. Yet the bloopers refuse to mean in this way, instead celebrating, and memorializing mistakes and misreading, reveling in the anarchic disruption of meaning, closing-up to teenage bodies, *jouissance* pleasurably displacing Shakespeare. In fact, these bloopers allow a space to embrace misreadings of Shakespeare’s language, or the contemporary idiom it has been translated into: in Pudgezilla’s “Romeo and Juliet Parody,” a US video from 2007, the bloopers end with the actors’ repeated inability to deliver lines. This breakdown of meaning is celebrated rather than condemned, an occasion for laughter. Laughter is not necessarily directed at but rather with the students: the inclusion of bloopers suggests a pride in these mistakes, testified to by the positive praise for some of the bloopers on MsFunnyvids’s video. Indeed, some of the comments on this page refer *exclusively* to the bloopers, skipping over the Shakespearean story that incubated them. While these comments may well be from some of the teenagers involved, the presence of these school assignments on YouTube, and their explicit acknowledgement of a wider teenage audience that they don’t know, suggests that the Social Shakespeare they stage goes beyond the ensemble of students involved in their creation.

YouTube's format enables Shared Shakespeare, with its sidebar directing viewers to similar versions of *Romeo and Juliet* and its comment function prompting viewers to participate and, in these cases, to celebrate the comedy of their spoof.

This *jouissance* can also lead to the parody with satiric ends that Hutcheon discusses, allowing teenagers to parody consumer culture. Outside of the timeframe of the School Shakespeare assignment, the outtakes give students freedom to explore other topics. While often these outtakes feature teenagers messing around, they also offer the potential for parody. For example, DeathKnightPooter's US "Romeo and Juliet English 1 Project" sets a modern version of 3.1 in the toy aisles of Wal-Mart, with the Montagues and Capulets imagined as the dueling corporate citizens of Target and Wal-Mart. This corporate consumer culture is parodied within the version of 3.1 but even more forcefully afterwards, when some of the bloopers show the teenagers examining the toys and getting kicked out of Wal-Mart. The inclusion of a Wal-Mart employee chiding them for rebellious film-making distances the teenagers from consumer culture, a position strengthened by the use of handwritten notes as title cards (one of which reveals their eviction from Wal-Mart). The product that the teenagers examine - a plastic toilet for a plastic doll, which teaches children to flush away plastic poo - is presented in close-up as an object for critical analysis, with one of the teenagers concluding "That's nasty" (DeathKnightPooter). While this examination of the plastic toilet has nothing to do with *Romeo and Juliet*, the liberating structure of bloopers allows teenagers to resist an incorporation within consumer culture that the logic of their Shakespearean adaptation might require: as surrogates for the Shakespearean characters, the youth of Wal-Mart and Target are tragically doomed and destined to die. The inclusion of bloopers carves a space for students to speak *around* Shakespeare's language and to resist *Romeo and Juliet's* tragic narrative. Certainly, the dismissal

of the plastic toilet is playful and part of the anarchic pleasure of the bloopers, probably not intended to *mean* in this way. Nonetheless, I would argue that its inclusion here, especially in the context of the resistance that the whole video stages towards Wal-Mart, enables a resistance of the construction of teenagers as consumer citizens and of a narrative of *Romeo and Juliet* that depicts them as romantic consumers, the powerless children of Wal-Mart and Target CEOs. This parodying of teenage consumer culture also appears in other videos: a weeping Romeo endlessly consumes pizza in Mantua (MsFunnyvids); Friar Lawrence prescribes Lunesta, a prescription medication to cure insomnia, to Juliet instead of poison, leading to the insertion of a YouTube parody of a Lunesta advert (Pudgezilla); Romeo survives to become “the richest man alive” as the inventor of tomato ketchup (Pudgezilla). Although these videos are enmeshed in YouTube’s ambiguous environment, which promotes advertisements and the songs used in videos, this context only heightens the critique of consumer culture; using double reply, these videos are able to talk back not just to Shakespeare but to teenage consumer culture, mobilizing an excellent dumb discourse that resists Shakespeare’s language to produce silly parodies with serious satiric edges.

We might ask at this point whether Shakespeare is as disposable as plastic poo in these videos? Are students really talking back to Shakespeare when they parody Lunesta? Many of the moments discussed hinge on a celebration of *jouissance* outside of the school system (with students running away from the school grounds in Tsipos’s video) and outside of both Shakespeare’s language (which is more often updated than retained) and plot (which the bloopers depart from). Another American video, “Romeo and Juliet Under Five Minutes,” strikingly book-ends its story with two appearances of a small dog: in the first, the dog is in a teenager’s hands as an off-screen voice delivers the Prologue from *Romeo and Juliet*; in the

second, the dog is seen through a glass door, yawning and sticking out his or her tongue as a teenage voice summarizes the plot of *Romeo and Juliet* in contemporary language (Harper). The other aspects of this video recall other five minute versions of *Romeo and Juliet*: death by light-saber, the biting of thumbs, a short and silly balcony scene. But then there is the dog, determinedly not playing along, the glass back door an appropriate physicalization of the barrier between Shakespeare and the dog's indifference.

Or perhaps the dog's imagined indifference. It is hard to say what the dog is doing in this video, both why a dog has been positioned here and what the dog *means* as he or she fills the frame in close-up at the end: yawning, looking up (hopefully?), sticking out his or her tongue, gazing to the side. In one sense, this dog's presence seems unremarkable on YouTube, the home of cute animals simply *being*.⁴⁷ Yet here is a collar of signification claspings itself around the dog, who is inexorably meaning something, book-ending and up-ending this video so significantly. What has this dog to say about the tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet*? Nothing is the simple answer, but this nothing might be conceived as a cousin of Cordelia's, a nothing reverberating with rebellion. For that the dog cannot talk back to Shakespeare, is indifferent to the cadence of the prologue or the catastrophe of the final plot summary, says something. For Shakespeareans, the dog might recall Crab, who in Bert States's view disrupts the play that he enters: "the theater has, so to speak, met its match: the dog is blissfully above, or beneath, the business of playing, and we find ourselves cheering its performance precisely because it isn't one" (qtd. in Beckwith 63). *Two Gentlemen of Verona* is not part of the canon of School or Teenage Shakespeare (though Crab puts in an appearance in the popular *Shakespeare in Love*) so it's hard to read it as a definite inter-text here. However, the cheering that States mentions recalls

⁴⁷ The first video uploaded to YouTube was of elephants in a zoo (Barkham); Kavoori discusses the popular phenomenon of pet videos on YouTube (58-67).

the “anarchic pleasure” that Lanier sees in Shakespearean parody; this dog is outside the business of meaning, his or her yawning comically juxtaposed with Shakespeare’s serious story. Such a reading aligns the dog with a teenage subject position, with teenagers placed behind a similar glass door, denied access to Shakespeare’s serious story and yawning with indifference.

This is not to banish Shakespeare from this conversation. Shakespeare is rarely completely banished from these videos, even in the bloopers. Or rather, Shakespeare is never *banishèd*. All of the performances of *Romeo and Juliet* discussed above are curiously faithful to this “proper” pronunciation, with Romeo always “banishèd,” even when he is surrounded by contemporary slang. Equally, despite the variant deaths for Romeo and Juliet (by gun, chainsaw or sword), Mercutio is almost always killed under Romeo’s arm, with this fidelity especially pronounced due to the centrality of 3.1 in YouTube performances of *Romeo and Juliet*. While these details might be seen as perfunctory nods to the obligations of a school assignment, they also suggest an interest in engaging with *Romeo and Juliet*. I want to return to the “intimacy” between works that Hutcheon sees in parodies, with *para* as “beside” suggesting a “strong suggestion of complicity and accord” to consider how these videos work as iterations of *Romeo and Juliet* (*A Theory of Parody* 53). Lesley Aers is critical of this type of assignment, arguing that the contemporary idioms that students adopt to condense Shakespeare’s language produces an unfavorable contrast (37). However, to judge these performances based on the engagement they demand with Shakespeare’s language misses the point: although the anarchic versions of 3.1 that these videos perform don’t include Shakespeare’s language, they are clearly recognizable as versions of this story. To fully recognize what sort of version of *Romeo and Juliet* these videos present, I want to focus on three general trends: the emphasis on an ensemble as opposed to

romantic consumers; the subversive potential for a queer reading of the play; and the problematic constructions of sexuality and gender staged.

As performances of *Romeo and Juliet*, these videos often de-emphasize the lyrical romance of Romeo and Juliet to focus on a non-verbal ensemble story, with the fights of 1.1 and 3.1 usually being staged at length. The editing of Tsipos's video illustrates this emphasis, with Act 2 taking 25 seconds while 3.1 lasts for one minute and eight seconds, a considerable amount of time in a five minute video. mrhahnrock's English video, "Romeo and Juliet in 5 minutes," is even more drastic in its edit, cutting Acts 2 and 4 to ten seconds each, and spending two minutes on the first act (principally the opening scene) and one minute and seventeen seconds on 3.1. The story of *Romeo and Juliet* is changed through this emphasis, with the wider communal consequences and context becoming foregrounded. Partially, this could be due to the logistics of these assignments: as a version of Social Shakespeare, there is a perhaps a tendency to favor scenes which involve more than two participants. The emphasis of 1.1 and 3.1 also speaks to the appeal of these scenes in all-male schools as performances of masculinity, perhaps further testified by the prominence of *Romeo and Juliet* videos that only perform 3.1, such as DeathKnightPooter's video. Such a preference privileges a rebellious rather than romantic reading of *Romeo and Juliet* and accordingly constructs teenage subjects as rebels. The anarchic energy of 3.1 makes Shakespeare a space for *jouissance*, allowing for transgressive play within a school setting. Students subvert school codes by re-arranging their uniforms during the fight scenes (Tsipos), by engaging in violence in school corridors (mrhahnrocks) or by leaving the school setting entirely; several of these videos use 3.1 as an excuse for a burst of energy, with a bouncing handheld camera following Romeo or Tybalt (mrhahnrocks; Tsipos; DeathKnightPooter; MsFunnyvids). This transgressive departure from the school-grounds can

also be *transgressive*, with this scene departing from cloistered school interiors to liberating open spaces; Romeo's banishment to Mantua in mrhahnrock's video is visually liberating, with the camera leaving the dark school corridors to enter a sunlight filled schoolyard. In these rebellious versions of *Romeo and Juliet*, which often parody the lovers' relationship, banishment to Mantua appears a release rather than a punishment, an opportunity to run away from Shakespeare's tragic script. Although the version of *Romeo and Juliet* that emphasizes the lyrical language of the lovers is perhaps the dominant one in School Shakespeare, these videos offer an alternative emphasis appropriate for Social Shakespeare that focuses on the ensemble. In MsFunnyvids's video, the whole group is prioritized in 1.5: when Romeo and Juliet fall in love it leads, not to an intimate sonnet, but to a group dance. Although the focus on the ensemble does not extend to an inclusion of the final scene, the addition of bloopers and frame structures to these videos means that they close not on the deaths of two lovers but on the celebration of the students' collaborative energies.

The interest in 3.1 does not preclude engagement with the lovers' plot and although *Romeo and Juliet* are often parodied, the performance of their story also allows for subversive stagings. If a focus on the ensemble of *Romeo and Juliet* undermines a reading of *Romeo and Juliet* as romantic consumers, performing *Romeo and Juliet* in single-sex schools both encourages students to engage with gender as a performative act and allows for an expanded definition of the teenage subject: performances of *Romeo and Juliet* in single-sex schools must at least flirt with queer identity. Allowing for the safe distance that parody provides, Desmet nonetheless argues for a "real homoerotic edge" in some of the all-male YouTube projects that she discusses ("Paying Attention in Shakespearean Parody" 235). Desmet reads YouTube parodies as versions of *prosopopoeia*, the adoption of a fictional voice in rhetoric, a favored

assignment for early modern schoolboys (“Paying Attention in YouTube” 233); by speaking for other genders, students can expand their own identities. If *Romeo and Juliet* was used by the Actors at Work to narrow the range of love to that of heterosexual romantic consumers, it can equally be a space to expand a definition of teenage sexuality. While I wouldn’t argue that either of the all-male videos I discuss here has the same homoerotic edge that Desmet identifies, the subdued treatment of the lovers’ deaths in Tsipos’s video and of Mercutio in mrhahnrock’s video carry a destabilizing charge and offer serious treatments of sexualized male intimacy. Although Tsipos’s treatment of Act 5 hints at parody, the manner in which Juliet dies evokes a heightened realism more than parodic death by pinecone: the student kneels, presses the sword into his chest and crumples forward, his face obscured by his wig. Moreover, the five seconds of silence that follow Romeo’s death, while perhaps just indicating a slow actor, secures these male lovers in sober silence, just as Mercutio’s death in mrhahnrock’s video allows for a touch of tragedy. The restrained treatment of Romeo’s and Juliet’s deaths echoes the restraint with which their relationship is depicted: a door closes as they kiss in 1.5, suggesting a reluctance to show intimacy between two male teenagers, but also a willingness to allow for homoeroticism.

Such readings are undermined by the overall tone of these videos, generally keen to straighten any homoerotic edges: in the UK version Romeo and Juliet skip off together, defusing any serious treatment of their relationship. In the Australian video, Romeo’s fear that his relationship with Juliet has emasculated him is disturbingly translated into contemporary terms, with the narration over 3.1 declaring that “Mercutio gets all pissed off because Romeo’s a pussy.” Though this is perhaps an accurate modernization of Mercutio’s viewpoint and misogynistic argot, the presentation of Paris as a “fag” is not filtered through any of the character’s subjectivity. Such casual homophobia is perhaps not surprising on YouTube and is

congruent with the disturbing comments that Ayanna Thompson uncovers by unseen viewers, who can “search, watch, and comment upon the videos here without having to suffer any real-life consequences for their blatant racism, sexism, and homophobia” (349). While none of these videos are popular enough to attract these comments, YouTube’s climate of casual prejudice certainly provides an accommodating home for Paris as a fag and Romeo as a pussy. In the liberating space of parody, such taboo terms as “fag” and “pussy” are allowed and these edits of *Romeo and Juliet* produce a story that prioritizes masculinity and naturalizes contemporary prejudices by situating them within a Shakespearean history.

This version of *Romeo and Juliet* courts not just homophobia but misogyny with *Juliet* being the person who is truly banished in these edits. All of the videos I discuss disproportionately limit Juliet’s role, often excising 1.3 to create a narrative focalized through Romeo, who picks up Juliet as a hot commodity. Even in MsFunnyvids’s version, which includes more of Juliet’s perspective, Act 4 is reclaimed as *Romeo*’s narrative, parodying his exile in Mantua as he sobs and eats pizza. If YouTube videos offer the potential to perform subversive identities and for “representatives of the silenced, the invisible, and the colonized to talk back” (Thompson 349), these videos also suggest Hutcheon’s reading of parody as a conservative genre, offering some possibilities for an expansion of Shakespeare’s world and teenage identity, but ultimately offering a narrow vision of both *Romeo and Juliet* and teenagers that celebrates masculine bravado at the expense of female and queer voices, bodies and identities.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Though I have not discussed race here, Thompson’s work on *Othello* and *Titus Andronicus* on YouTube demonstrates that performing race offers another possibility for subversive performance and containment. The proliferation of “ghetto” school projects of *Romeo and Juliet*, such as “Romeo Juliet (Ghetto.:Skool Version lol),” situate *Romeo and Juliet* within the conversation that Thompson starts.

The freedom that stepping away from Shakespeare's language gives students enables them both to perform excellent dumb discourse, parodying and rebelling against teenage consumer culture, but also to reiterate prejudices about sexuality, race and gender. This suggests the problem with stressing contemporary resonances: as with the supplementary writing exercises in the CSS editions, the imaginations that students draw on can often lead to prejudiced readings. To return to the objectives of studying Shakespeare through performance-based pedagogies, we might think of these exercises as fulfilling students' *imaginative* engagement with Shakespeare but perhaps not fully enabling the critical thought that Styan and Gibson see as centrally important to active methods. While these videos offer excellent opportunities to engage in Shared Shakespeare, the commentary on YouTube can tend towards pejorative insults rather than critical engagement, as Thompson discusses. The classroom work that these performances engaged with is not visible on YouTube, making it hard to determine what critical conversations, if any, they provoked. I want to conclude by entering a different classroom, exploring how the Shakespeare Reloaded project in Sydney suggests a pedagogy that combines critical thinking with excellent dumb discourse and allows for a sharing of meaning, and Shakespeare's language, between teachers and teenagers.

Reloading Shakespeare: Politicized Performance-Based Pedagogies.

Shakespeare Reloaded was a collaboration between the University of Sydney and Barker College, a private high school in Sydney, co-funded by Barker College and the Australian Research Council between 2008-2010.⁴⁹ Shauna Colnan from Barker College and Liam Semler from Sydney University articulate the project's aims as an attempt to "understand how

⁴⁹ The project continued for an additional two years and

Shakespeare and literature generally are taught in Australian schools and universities and to facilitate innovative approaches to these areas for the benefit of Australian students of English” (Colnan and Semler 3). Innovation communities were mostly facilitated by professional development (Barker College teachers took postgraduate courses, attended conferences and went on travel fellowships to the Oregon Shakespeare Festival) and by the Academic in Residence program (members of the English Department of the University of Sydney gave lectures and facilitated workshops with students). In 2010, I observed three of the Academic in Residence sessions and two classes that used some of the techniques the teachers had been developing through workshops and travel fellowships. I draw on this experience not to provide qualitative data or to provide an evaluation of Shakespeare Reloaded, but to further illuminate the potential and pitfalls of performance-based pedagogies. Returning to the some of the exercises from the CSS series, I suggest that a pedagogy that combines the excellent dumb discourse of YouTube parodies with shared evaluation and collaborative critical thinking allows for more expansive engagement with Shakespeare and creates a more politicized teenage subject.⁵⁰

The first class I observed was Lucy Solomon’s Year 11 class, where students performed three different interpretations of 4.3 and 5.1 of *Othello*: an Elizabethan version, a modern version and a Feminist version, all of which used edited versions of Shakespeare’s language that the students had rehearsed.⁵¹ To facilitate the performance, the students rearranged the classroom, which was arranged with rows of desks facing a whiteboard: desks were pushed back to the wall, blinds were drawn to convey night-time, the recycling bin was plundered to provide paper

⁵⁰ I do not present the Shakespeare Reloaded project as an ideal version of perimillennial Shakespearean pedagogy: many of its components are only possible because of its private school setting with the capital that Barker College provides, and the cultural capital its students already possess, crucial to the success of the project.

⁵¹ From class observations on 20 and 21 June 2010: all student names have been changed.

swords and iPods and iPhones (usually prohibited) were unleashed to produce sound effects. This transformation of classroom into performance space was mirrored by the inversion of school uniforms into costumes, quite literally in one case where the striped blazer of Barker College was turned inside out to make a stylish black-lined coat for one Othello. His Iago had no reason to be envious, sporting the costume triumph of the day: bright pajama bottoms festooned with cartoon figures. These pajamas were concealed under his school trousers until he made his dramatic re-entrance in 5.1, with his pajama bottoms and lantern he carried illustrating Iago's alleged innocence. This incongruous image of a student in pajamas and the equally comedic use of recycled paper swords illustrate some of the ways in which students refashioned their environment, subverting and disrupting traditional codes of order to create a space of play rather than work.

This playfulness trickled into the style of Shakespeare performed by the students, which tended towards a broad playing style or parody, with 5.1's cavalcade of deaths comic rather than tragic. Although the groups each had a different focus, all of the presentations shared a tendency towards verbal conservatism and non-verbal excess. Emily, one of the students in the Elizabethan group, said that they attempted to sound "more formal" and "put on a proper English type accent" but in fact all three groups sounded quite proper and smothered their Australian accents somewhat. The dialect of modern Shakespeare was not Australian English but American, with Desdemona's Willow Song turned into Taylor Swift's *Love Story* and Othello turned into an Americanized drug lord. Even this presentation, the most comic of the three, primarily used non-verbal techniques to elicit laughter: sound effects, pajamas, and exaggerated deaths.⁵² The pleasure derived from encountering Shakespeare in these performances came almost despite his

⁵² Taylor Swift's *Love Story* (2008) is itself inspired by *Romeo and Juliet* and is frequently used by teenagers on YouTube referencing *Romeo and Juliet*, something I will discuss further in the next chapter.

language rather than because of it. Nonetheless, in the discussion that followed the presentations, the students showed an eagerness to relate their performance choices to the text and the atmosphere created by the performances carried over into the discussion, both in the physical arrangement of the space (one student perched on a table instead of sitting at his desk) and in the animated tones in which students discussed Shakespeare. In this classroom, performance-based pedagogies facilitated further engagement with the plays and, not incidentally, proved enjoyable for students.

Enjoyment of Shakespeare is no mean goal, especially when a 2007 survey of British students commissioned by the RSC revealed a mere 18% of participants classifying Shakespeare as fun and only 20% thinking that Shakespeare's plays "help us to understand ourselves and others better" (Monk 62). Considering this class alongside some of the CSS exercises suggests a more positive reading of some of these activities in performance. Acting out Horatio's speech from 1.1, while perhaps encouraging silliness, also serves to subvert the stuffy image of un-fun Shakespeare that the RSC's survey describes and gives students the freedom to be silly. This silliness is often repurposed by the editors towards a more reflective stance, with students asked to study the tableaux they have created. Fun is also located within rather than alongside Shakespeare's language, with students encouraged to read the Nurse's speech from 2.4 collectively and to both "enjoy the language" and reflect upon the meanings of this enjoyable language: "Then talk together about what this scene adds to your understanding of the Nurse's character" (*Romeo and Juliet 2nd Edition* 78). The types of conversations enabled after scene works are sometimes different just because of the physical re-arrangement of space: in the class I witnessed, the informal, excited atmosphere created by the performance carried into the class

conversation immediately following it.⁵³ Detailing the results of a collaboration between the Royal Shakespeare Company and Warwick University, Nicholas Monk argues that by shifting physical furniture the intellectual environment is similarly re-arranged: a “transgressive” use of breaks down boundaries between teachers and students and enables a “transactional” mode of learning, “in the sense of an open and free exchange of ideas in which participants do not compete to bank knowledge as private capital but freely exchange and collectivize their learning” (4-5). At its best, this sort of space allows students and teachers to share in making-meaning, avoiding both student conscription within an empire of meaning and the re-iteration of student prejudices. In the year 11 class I observed, this process was mixed: students sustained a vigorous discussion about their performance of the gender politics of 4.3 and its relationship to their lives but did not discuss the racial politics of their performances, a notable silence when only one Othello was black and the modern staging relied on the tropes of black American gangsta culture. Certainly, this conversation was determined by the assignment (which included a feminist performance) and Solomon revealed that they had previously had multiple conversations about race in *Othello*. Nonetheless, this points to the complex stagings of teenage identity that occur through Shakespeare and the time restrictions - of students assembling a scene quickly, of teachers compressing discussions of scenes so that they can continue with other material - that perhaps inevitably lead to stereotypes.

The classroom conversation is not the only one that students have about scenes they perform and the collaborative creation and rehearsal of this assignment allows students to have fun together but also to think critically together. The idea of the ensemble is celebrated by the RSC’s “Stand up for Shakespeare” campaign, which draws on the ensemble model that the RSC

⁵³ In the class I witnessed the next day, which continued the evaluation of the performances, students were less animated, with some visibly less engaged.

used under Michael Boyd's tenure, seeking to create classroom ensembles which embody Charles Leadbeater's ideas about education: "Learning with, rather than learning from, should be the motto of the system going forward: learning through relationships not systems" (qtd. in Monk 79). Social Shakespeare within the classroom helps disrupt the Romantic notions of Shakespeare as authorial genius and of his central characters as touchstones for understanding humanity. This slightly more politicized model of an understanding heart is one suggested by Michael Boyd, who sees the ensemble model as a way of increasing empathy and "caring for others with a forensic curiosity that constantly seeks new ways of being together and creating together" (qtd. in Monk 81). Sharing and creating together allows for an alternative to a creative consumerism that hinges upon the production of corporate images for Shakespeare's words: the empathy nurtured here is not just emotional but also built on "forensic curiosity" and shared critical reflection.

This ensemble approach that stresses shared critical thinking can also historicize the limited subject positions of Shakespeare's young characters. An exercise from *Romeo and Juliet* positions an almost mute Juliet in the centre of the classroom while the rest of the class surround this student and hurl Capulet's insults from 3.5 (*Romeo and Juliet 2nd Edition* 132). While this exercise positions the central young character as almost dumb (Juliet is directed to speak the same lines to little avail), it also contextualizes this position and asks students to reflect upon this verbal abuse and the limited resources that Shakespeare's characters have to respond in this situation. This exercise presents Shakespeare's language as less a romantic commodity than a tool often denied to his young characters. Susan Leach describes a similar classroom activity, where students are given cards with Shakespeare's words from *King Lear* in 1.1, to trade as they read the scene. While Goneril swaps "dearer than space" for "shadowy forests," Cordelia's card

of “nothing” begets only its copy, with Leach reporting that students can discern “how untrustworthy words are” in this world (112-113). This exercise also encourages students to reflect upon words as commodities and reveals a pedagogy that contextualizes the relationship between language and political power; by exposing Lear’s “empire of meaning” through a game, Leach encourages students to consider their own access to language, with the reflective exercises she suggests, while also directing meaning, asking students to *share* in creating meanings rather than accepting conscripted ones. Cordelia’s “nothing” clearly has value using a different measurement and another of the exercises from the CSS series moves beyond a definition of speech-as-power, prompting students to consider the Fool’s performative activities in 1.4 while he has no lines (Bain 42). Penny Gay, who was part of the Shakespeare Reloaded project, endorses this cultural materialist oriented view of performance-based pedagogies, suggesting that students “be aware particularly to the power axis operating in their scene: who is the most powerful person, who is the least? Is it always discernible, and can it change in performance?” (“A Shakespeare Brief Immersion Method for Undergraduates” 157). This interest in power twins Social Shakespeare with critical thinking and nurtures the strengths of performance-based pedagogies: collaborative learning and enjoyment combined with critical thought.

This critical thought can also be applied to the relationship between Shakespeare and teenagers, allowing students to interrogate the culture production of Teenage Shakespeare. Liam Semler’s lecture on *Romeo and Juliet* as part of the Shakespeare Reloaded series, “Keeping it Real: *Romeo and Juliet* from Early Modernity to Postmodernity,” was designed to contextualize the play’s relationship with teenagers for its teenage audience.⁵⁴ This is the sort of pedagogy that

⁵⁴ Kate Flaherty’s lecture that I observed performed similar work with *Richard III* and her classroom exercise, where students collaboratively created mini-essays based on randomly assigned paper that determined a literary device, scene and topic, produced some provocative work, with students seeming to enjoy the disruption of a regular class and critically engage with the material (“Looking for Richard”; *Richard III* Lesson).

David Hornbrook suggests in “ ‘Go play, boy, go play’: Shakespeare and Educational Drama,” that is a pedagogy that recognizes Shakespeare’s role in the production of culture and historicizes and contextualizes Shakespeare’s plays and *The Shakespeare Myth* (156). Hornbrook sees a curriculum built on Shakespeare’s universality as one “dedicated to the perpetuation of powerlessness” (157); this perception that Shakespeare is not broad enough to encompass the identities of many contemporary young people is one shared by Ayanna Thompson and the teenagers she discusses, who talk back to Shakespeare through YouTube as a way of exposing the “woefully inadequate” presentation of cultural and racial tensions in *Othello* (354). Classroom encounters that foreground the difference between Shakespeare and teenagers, and that use performance-based pedagogies to create an ensemble of critical thinkers, allow for the presentation of teenagers as *actors* rather than consumers.

A summary of the principles briefly discussed here - silliness and enjoyment; an ensemble of actors and critical thinkers; an engagement with power dynamics - suggests a teenage subject that is not merely a consumer citizen or romantic consumer. Contextualizing the production of Shakespeare as Social Shakespeare rather than the Romantic capitalist who appears in *Shakespeare in Love* helps this process and also gives students resources other than consumer culture to fuel the imaginative work they are asked to perform. The “pass the parcel” here is not to future generations or to a future self, one that will finally draw on Shakespeare’s wisdom, but to the other bodies, minds and hearts in the room; the ethos of the ensemble departs from the Thatcherite logic of romantic consumption, from one Hamlet writing a letter to one Ophelia, to consider a multitude of perspectives. This pedagogy might seem at odds with some of the core texts of School Shakespeare; Hamlet’s individuality and *Romeo and Juliet*’s centrality are emphasized rather than the ensembles that constitute *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*.

I turn to these two plays now to consider their depiction in popular culture and the manner in which they construct teenage subjects as romantic consumers but also the way in which they function as shared symbols which can enable collaborative communities and rebellious readings.

Chapter Three.

“Youth to itself rebels”: Teenage encounters with *Hamlet*.⁵⁵

Two of the most popular texts of School Shakespeare, *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, are also critical sites for the production of teenage culture outside the classroom, with the young characters from each play alternately cast as rebels and romantic consumers. Shakespeare’s language is the key discourse for the negotiations of these categories, with the strategies I have described in a pedagogical context being redeployed to reaffirm and resist the subject positions of rebel or consumer. Attending to some of the myriad treatments of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* in perimillennial popular culture reveals a surprising narrative, with Hamlet’s rebellious tendencies being curbed to cast him as a romantic consumer and *Romeo and Juliet* refashioned as rebellious countercultural voices. In the next two chapters, I chart this story, examining young adult novels, performances of these plays on stage and screen, and teenage responses on YouTube to argue that while Shakespeare’s words are often chained to an empire of meaning associated with consumer culture, teenagers (and teenage characters) can use double reply and dumb discourse to assert a more resistant stance.

Turning to representations of teenagers in film and young adult novels illuminates the dialectical process between School Shakespeare and Teenage Shakespeare (and indeed, their relationship with “Shakespeare” more broadly) and allows us to consider how representations of Shakespearean characters, and fictional teenagers who encounter Shakespeare, enmesh teenagers within romantic consumerism as well as suggesting more rebellious alternatives. In the classes at

⁵⁵ *Hamlet*, 1.3 44.

Barker College and the performances of the Actors of Work that I observed, teenagers consistently brought up iterations of Shakespeare in popular culture: the Twilight series and Taylor Swift's "Love Story" were discussed in relation to the Actors at Work performances (*Trust and Betrayal*); "Love Story" and *O*, Tim Blake Nelson's teenage version of *Othello* provided inspiration for student performances (Solomon); students were introduced to *Macbeth* through Geoffrey Wright's recent film version (Potts). The representations of teenagers in Wright's film, which imagines the witches as sexy schoolgirls and Fleance as a budding gangster in emo clothes, clearly inform teenage ideas about Shakespeare and teenagers: the class of male students laughed and cheered at a still of the sexualized teenage witches, with little critical work done to contextualize the presentation of the witches as teenagers or to present them as something beyond attractive bodies to ogle. Examining *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, I am attentive to how these plays, and particularly their central characters, are used to restrict and expand teenage conceptions of gender and sexuality, considering gender in relation to representations of Ophelia and sexuality in relation to queer readings of *Romeo and Juliet*. I argue that the interpellation of teenagers as romantic consumers hinges upon a restriction of their abilities to imagine gender and sexuality, with Ophelia representing a disaster that can be saved through romantic consumerism and the straight romantic consumerism of *Romeo and Juliet* denying queer identities. In addition to considering teenagers' perpetuation of and resistance to this restriction of teenage identity through YouTube videos, I expand the concept of double reply and excellent dumb discourse to argue that fictional teenage characters, created by adults, can also talk back to Shakespeare and consumer culture.

This chapter principally focuses on uses of *Hamlet* in young adult literature. The emergence of the teenager as a cultural and consumer category led to the growth of young adult

literature, which expanded significantly in the perimillennial period, aided by the enormous success of the Harry Potter series (Cart 96). The perimillennial period also sees an emergence of a canon of Teenage Shakespeare texts, works which capitalize upon Shakespeare's canonical place in the school curriculum to address implied readers who are assumed to have both awareness of and potential resistance to Shakespeare. I look at three novels in this chapter from the perimillennial period which deal with Hamlet and cover three of the most popular plots in appropriations of Shakespeare in children's and young adult literature: historical fiction which re-imagines a Shakespearean plot or features young characters encountering the historical Shakespeare (*Dating Hamlet: Ophelia's Story*); contemporary retellings of a Shakespearean play (*Something Rotten*) and contemporary tales where teenagers study Shakespeare in school and find their own lives paralleling or intersecting with the play they are grappling with (*Heathrow Nights*). The first part of the chapter considers how *Hamlet* provides the language to recast the central character of *Heathrow Nights* as a consumer citizen, with Shakespeare's words imagined as a fantastic discourse used to access a universal truth (the importance of property and consumption) that is, of course, historically contingent. To this end, Hamlet's rebellious edges are softened and the political aspect of *Hamlet* is de-emphasized to produce a romantic comedy. The second part of the chapter focuses on Ophelia: contemporary texts often situate Ophelia as a gap within *Hamlet's* meaningful structure, a character that needs further filling in. Examining some of the array of Ophelias in the perimillennial period, I argue that while *Dating Hamlet* imagines Ophelia as a romantic consumer, other texts nurture rather than fill in Ophelia's smaller textual role, with Almereyda's film of *Hamlet*, *Something Rotten* and teenage responses on YouTube and in *Ophelia Speaks* using Ophelia to articulate a critique of consumer culture,

employing excellent dumb discourse as a particularly effective mode of communication for Ophelia.

A brief treatment of *Hamlet*'s interactions with youth culture is helpful in mapping out this argument. Glancing through twentieth and twenty-first century culture it is hard not to encounter *Hamlet*. There is Hamlet, scuttling across modernist poetry, Blooming in Dublin, ducking into absurdist theatre when Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are looking the other way, launching a veritable "Age of Shake-squarius" as pieces of men turn into rock songs in *Hair*. There is Ophelia, shedding layers of Victorian impropriety like heavy clothes: taking a lesbian lover, drowning in a wheelchair, now Lisa Simpson, now a Barbie in a blender... Hamlet has never been afraid to shift into as many shapes, and commit as many offences to subsequent eras, as he has had times to act in: revenge hero for the early modern stage, Romantic philosopher for Coleridge, Victorian aristocrat for Irving.

In the twentieth century, Hamlet the thirtysomething became infused with a teenage sensibility and Ophelia was refashioned as a teenager. The smack of himself that Holden Caulfield saw in Hamlet is reflected in the performances of several modern Hamlets, from the emo Hamlet of Bell Shakespeare's Actors at Work troupe discussed in Chapter One to the alienated teenagers presented on stage and screen, epitomized by Ben Whishaw's 2004 Hamlet at the Old Vic and Ethan Hawke's 2000 performance on film, with Hawke suggesting that Hamlet was "much more like Kurt Cobain or Holden Caulfield than Sir Laurence Olivier" (qtd. in Crowl 196). All of these "Hamlets in hoodies" could be easier mistaken for the protagonists of a young adult novel than as "goddamn general[s]," hinting at the huge cultural shift between the Olivier and Hawke films and suggesting that the connection that Holden anticipates in *The Catcher of the Rye* has been fully articulated by the beginning of the twenty-first century: whether or not the

prince is played by or as an actual adolescent, many modern Hamlets are more at home unscrewing Prozac than holding a broadsword and have a distinctive teenage sensibility (Salinger 117).⁵⁶

I would argue that this teenage sensibility of some contemporary Hamlets more closely associates Hamlet with the figure of the consumer or romantic hero than the rebel. Hamlet's central role as countercultural hero in "The Age of Shake-squarius" associated him with the *student* rebel rather than the teenager, with the defining image of this Hamlet being the long red scarf that David Warner's wore in Peter Hall's 1965 production, a scarf that tied him to undergraduate rather than secondary school culture. Hamlet's teenage sensibility is seen as a problem by some reviewers, a sign of regression rather than rebellion. Michael Dobson dismisses Ben Whishaw's Hamlet as "only a study in adolescent inadequacy, a *Hamlet* centered on a Prince who never rose to any of the occasions the play offered him but instead sulked and whinged his way gracelessly about the stage hoping that someone else, ideally his mother, would solve his problems for him" (293-294). For Dobson, the insufficiency of this portrayal was exposed in the "To be or not to be" speech, where Whishaw's delivery "characteristically reduced the speech's philosophical content to a mere whining personal complaint about what a miserable time Hamlet was having and how unfair it all was" (294). While Lyn Gardner is more positive about Joshua McGuire's "sullen prep-schoolboy" Hamlet at the Globe in 2011, she similarly associates a teenage sensibility with a diminished intellectual capacity: "Like the production itself, McGuire may not be the subtlest of Hamlets, but he's one who young audiences

⁵⁶ This sensibility is not determined by the age of the actor who plays Hamlet, so much a style of playing that is read as adolescent or teenage. That said, it is worth noting the age gap between Ben Whishaw, who by 23 had played Hamlet three times, twice in youth theatre and once at the Old Vic, and Thomas Betterton, who portrayed Hamlet in his seventies in the 18th century or the 56 year old Sarah Bernhardt who played a Hamlet with a cane in the early 20th century.

can embrace...He's not a great thinker, he lacks introspection, but he has a teenage impetuosity” (Gardner). While these reviews don’t necessarily suggest a teenage Hamlet associated with consumer culture, they do suggest that Hamlet’s teenage sensibility can be viewed as a barrier to intellectually satisfying delivery of Shakespeare’s words. Unlike Holden’s imagined Hamlet or David Warner’s smart student prince, these two teenage Hamlets were less intellectual or political rebels than teenagers consumed with personal problems and defined by privilege: sulking pill-poppers and sullen prep-schoolboys. Equally, the “teen spirit” that Leon Ford exuded for Bell Shakespeare in 2003 was one defined by his personal and romantic problems rather than countercultural aggression, the scent of Nirvana’s teen spirit masked by designer deodorant; Brendan Cowell’s Hamlet in 2008 was defined as an “emo” prince, the contemporary epithet designating his teenage sensibility as excessively emotionally fragile rather than rebellious.⁵⁷ Considering this trope of teenage Hamlets in young adult literature, I will explore how this imagined insufficiency is exploited, with Hamlet’s language repurposed to provide an adequate vocabulary for consumerism rather than philosophical discontent.

If Hamlet’s teenage sensibility is seen as a problem by some, as indulgent rather than heroic, Ophelia has been turned into the spokeswoman for a generation of troubled adolescent girls, following Mary Pipher’s 1994 bestseller *Reviving Ophelia*, which used Ophelia’s story as an emblematic cautionary tale. For Pipher, Ophelia is akin to a fairy-tale maiden, a “happy and free” girl who became unstuck by adolescence and died “because she could not grow” (20; 292). Pipher’s narrative continues Elaine Showalter’s account of Ophelia in “Representing Ophelia: Women, madness, and the responsibilities of feminist criticism,” which argued that

⁵⁷ Bell Shakespeare’s Magazine promoting their 2003 *Hamlet* featured a cover of Ford with the headline “Smells like Teen Spirit,” referencing Nirvana’s 1991 countercultural grunge hit (*Bell Magazine 10*). Kate Flaherty provides an overview of both Ford’s and Cowell’s performances in *Ours as we Play It*, 23-94.

representations of Ophelia tell the story of attitudes towards feminine madness and the development of hysteria, with representations of Ophelia dependent upon changes in discourse outside of the interpretation of *Hamlet*. Showalter sketches an account of Ophelia's representation partially in response to Lacan, who imagined Ophelia as a literal gap, an "O-Phallus" (qtd. in Showalter 77); as Ophelia says next to nothing compared to Hamlet's loquacity, she is a versatile symbol for appropriation. However, Ophelia's "I think nothing, my lord" (3.2, 106) could be related to Cordelia's "nothing," articulating a similar rebellion through nothingness, avoiding the sexual meaning that Hamlet ascribes and instead refusing to partake in Hamlet's, and Shakespeare's, meaningful empire. Showalter briefly discusses how Ophelia has been turned into a modern figure of rebellion precisely through her refusal to speak an ordered patriarchal language of meaning: "for many feminist theorists, the madwoman is a heroine, a powerful figure who rebels against the family and the social order; and the hysteric who refuses to speak the language of the patriarchal order, who speaks otherwise, is a sister" (91). An Ophelia speaking otherwise can be seen in Melissa Murray's 1979 agitprop play *Ophelia*, which cast Ophelia as a lesbian who sets up a guerilla commune. Showalter chooses not to end on this highly politicized Ophelia, however, arguing compellingly that it is important for feminist critics to consider the range of Ophelias, the "cubist Ophelia of multiple perspectives" (92).

I would argue that Pipher's version of Ophelia *changes* Showalter's account of Ophelia's representation as much as it continues it: by imagining Ophelia as principally a signifier of a teenage girl rather than a woman, Pipher shifts attention from Ophelia's madness to her incorporation within and oppression by mass media and consumer culture. As Lacan conceives of Ophelia as a lack, Pipher imagines her as a disaster site: "Something dramatic happens to girls in early adolescence. Just as planes and ships disappear mysteriously into the Bermuda Triangle,

so do the selves of girls go down in droves. They crash and burn in a social and developmental Bermuda Triangle” (19). Pipher imagines writers describing this “wreckage” of early adolescence, with Ophelia the model for a girl who goes down and thus needs to be rewritten, to be revived in a different fashion (19). I’d like to consider Ophelia in the context of what I call Disaster Shakespeare, following Naomi Klein’s account of disaster capitalism in *The Shock Doctrine*. Klein argues that the shock of a disaster is often used as an opportunity for capitalist reconstruction that is literal (the building of condos) and ideological (the privatization of public infrastructure). Using Sri Lanka and New Orleans as a couple of her examples, Klein demonstrates the ways in which disasters, the 2004 tsunami and 2005 hurricane, allow governments to think of spaces as *blank*, paving the way for the displacement of communities and erasure of public infrastructure to make way for luxury condos, charter schools and capitalist ideology (385-422). While Shakespeare can have a role to play in disaster capitalism, I’d like to consider Disaster Shakespeare more broadly. If Pipher considered Ophelia as a disaster site, she also created Ophelia as an opportunity: a figure that had to be rebuilt. Pipher herself has little interest in reviving Ophelia specifically, summarizing her tale in a paragraph and only referring to her twice in the rest of the book. Equally, consumer culture is part of the problem that Pipher addresses, specifically the commodification of young women. However, her presentation of Ophelia, or rather her *erasure* of Ophelia, creates Ophelia as a teenage everywoman, a gap to be filled in by perimillennial culture, a corpse to be revived. In “Adolescence, Thy Name is Ophelia!: The Ophelia-ization of the Contemporary Teenage Girl,” Jennifer Hulbert demonstrates Ophelia’s inability to speak to many of the social problems that Pipher discusses, arguing that “Pipher’s Ophelia is not Shakespeare’s, and it is inaccurate, dangerous, and severely limiting to define contemporary teenage girls as Ophelias” (218). While we might question that

there is any Shakespeare's Ophelia that is a *true* version rather than a series of different Ophelias presented in and on alternate quartos, stages and other locations, Hulbert's point is well taken: Pipher narrows a multiplicity of Ophelias to a version of the character where she is a helpless romantic heroine undone by society's expectations and her awkward age, both creating Ophelia as a disaster site but also suggesting a model for reconstruction: romance.

Following Showalter, I attend to a variety of Ophelia's revivals in the perimillennial period, arguing that representations of Ophelia speak to the relationship between teenage girls and consumer culture, with Ophelia cast as a rebel or romantic consumer. Shakespeare's language is central in this process, signaled by the title of a collection of teenage essays assembled by a teenager, Sara Shandler, in response to Pipher's book: *Ophelia Speaks*. Shandler associates speech with power, reviving Ophelia along Showalter's Cubist model, so that Ophelia would speak through "the collective voice and actions of Ophelias everywhere" (xiii).⁵⁸ While these contemporary Ophelias consciously reject or parody Shakespeare's language, Lisa Fiedler's young adult novel, *Dating Hamlet*, saves Ophelia through a version of Disaster Shakespeare with her appropriation of Hamlet's, and Shakespeare's language, central to this process of reconstruction. Other Ophelias, Julia Stiles in Almereyda's film or the Ophelia figure in *Something Rotten*, follow the model of *Ophelia Speaks* and communicate rebellion through excellent dumb discourse or by parodying Shakespeare's language. While these tensions reflect both Hamlet's contested character and the negotiations with Shakespeare seen in contemporary classrooms, Ophelia's role as rebel and romantic consumer is somewhat different: as Showalter

⁵⁸ Hulbert documents the array of other texts which responded to Pipher's and Shandler's work including *Ophelia's Mom*, edited by Shandler's mother; *Are We Reviving Ophelia?* a drama-in-education play at a Massachusetts High School and *Project Ophelia*, a non-profit designed to mentor teenage girls.

points out, representations of Ophelia respond not just to shifting ideas about Shakespeare's play but also to anxieties about the female body and representation.

Attending to the representation of teenage Ophelias also complements the work in *The Afterlife of Ophelia*, a collection of essays which considers Ophelia's representations. Coppelia Kahn's afterword argues that there is "more agency, subtlety, ambiguity, and variety in Ophelia's earlier manifestations - beginning, of course, with the several texts of *Hamlet* - than in those of, roughly, the last century. With John Everett Millais's painting of 1851-52, the grim scenario of a doomed young woman that is focused on the moment of her demise seems to take hold" (Kahn 232). Millais's painting is a touchstone for Kahn and the volume as a whole, the story of model Elizabeth Siddal - who almost got hypothermia while posing in the bathtub, whose own poetry has been eclipsed by her image as static Pre-Raphaelite ideal - serving to accentuate the painting's symbolic charge. However, 1851 also saw the publication of Mary Cowden Clarke's *The Girlhood of Shakespeare's Heroines*, and its elaborate imagining of Ophelia's back-story for a young audience. While Cowden Clarke's Ophelia is ultimately as doomed as Millais's, the spirited and sexualized girl she imagined points towards an alternative narrative of Ophelias, one not so focused on their grisly demise. By connecting *this* line of Ophelias to Pipher's narrative of endangered adolescent girls, I argue that it is by escaping from Shakespeare's language, present through a kind of reverse *ekphrasis* in the Millais tradition, that representations of Ophelia can distance her from both consumer culture and scopophilia.

The work of two scholars of children's literature - *The Narrator's Voice: The Dilemma of Children's Fiction* by Barbara Wall and *Language and Ideology in Children's Literature* by John Stephens - helps to theorize the way in which Shakespeare's language is used to negotiate perimillennial iterations of Hamlet and Ophelia in young adult literature. I have already outlined

how we might think of double reply as a response to Barbara Wall's double address, with teenagers talking back to Shakespeare in different registers, one addressed to adult authority, the other to their contemporaries. In Wall's analysis, the emergence of young adult literature in the twentieth century heralds a shift away from double address (which characterizes earlier children's literature) to single address, often through a first-person child or teenage narrator, with Wall concluding that in the 1990s "attempts to create, by the use of first-person child narrators, 'authentic' child voices in fiction for children at present dominate the market" (249). Stephens is critical of the first-person narrators of young adult literature, arguing that they "create extremely solipsistic subject positions for character-narrators which are then replicated by readers" (252). I would argue that the appearance of Shakespeare's language, often coded as typographically special, whether italicized, in quotation marks or indented, can disrupt both solipsistic narration and the use of single address. While Shakespeare's words are imagined as comprehensible to the implied reader, ultimately if not initially, they also seem to communicate in a sort of double address, speaking differently to an adult audience. The presence of Shakespeare's language in young adult literature often serves to disrupt the narrative, ideologically as well as typographically, introducing an unmistakably adult voice and perspective that the fictional teenage narrators sometimes use double reply against to deflect this mediating perspective.

I argue that the special status of Shakespeare's language also encodes it as a fantastic discourse within children's and young adult literature. This fantastic discourse is quite literal in appropriations of *Macbeth* and *Midsummer Night's Dream* where Shakespeare's words are often spells, enabling the appearance of magic.⁵⁹ I want to think of Shakespeare's language as fantastic

⁵⁹ Many of the works that Erica Hateley attends to in her survey of appropriations of *Macbeth*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest* see some variation on this theme of Shakespeare's language as magic discourse: examples include *The King of Shadows* (2001) by Susan Cooper; *Macbeth and Son* (2006) by Jackie French; and *Undine* (2004) by Penni Russon.

discourse in a broader sense, following John Stephens's distinction between the linguistic modes of realism and fantasy. Arguing that fantasy is principally a metaphoric mode and realism a metonymic mode, Stephens suggests that fantasy imagines a "naked power of language," (266) constructing a world where "there is a 'real presence' in verbal signs...these signs are thus grounded in transcendent meanings" (263). Within fantastic discourse, names are especially important, revealing an "originary creative subjectivity" and "an absolute presence of meaning" (267). This naked power of language can clearly be witnessed in contemporary children's fantasy, where "The Deplorable Word" is a weapon of mass destruction for C.S. Lewis' witch and "Voldemort" is both a riddle and a curse in J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series.⁶⁰ Conversely, Stephens argues that names in realist fiction often foreground the slipperiness rather than the solidity of language, with knowledge of a true name bestowing "no power, because there is no originary, innate and creative power" (269). In the novels I discuss here, Shakespeare's language is typically presented as a fantastic intrusion into a realistic world; amid an uncertain world, Shakespeare's words can reliably be connected to transcendent meanings and *name* the world correctly.⁶¹ The fantastic status of Shakespeare's language is foregrounded by its mediation through teenage characters (sometimes themselves actually figments of Shakespeare's language, such as re-imaginings of Hamlet and Ophelia) who use Shakespeare's language to produce meaning in an unstable world.

⁶⁰ *The Magician's Nephew*, C.S. Lewis, 1955; *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*, J.K. Rowling, 1998.

⁶¹ This speaks to early uses of children's literature to teach linguistic skills and help to classify the material world: for example, Comenius's *Orbis Pictus*, a popular text first published in 1659, used words to describe accompanying pictures, providing the appropriate nouns for things in a manner similar to alphabet books (Comenius).

Sipping(in The) Shakespeare: Hamlet in Heathrow.

Russell, the teenage narrator of *Heathrow Nights*, Jan Marks's 2000 novel, is particularly intent on using Shakespeare as an anchor amid adolescent uncertainty. *Heathrow Nights* stages the intimate relationship between teenagers and Hamlet that Holden Caulfield imagines. However, while Russell begins by imagining Hamlet as a Holden-esque rebel, both Shakespeare and Hamlet are re-imagined by the close of the novel and used to educate Russell about his subject position within capitalist England: a budding consumer citizen rather than a counter-cultural voice. This lesson happens not in the classroom, which Russell has been banished from, but the liminal space of Heathrow Airport, the destination where Russell runs away to when he is banned from a school trip because of inappropriate behavior at a performance of *Hamlet*. Thus, Marks's novel is an especially useful text to begin with: it imagines a rebellious close reading of *Hamlet* that takes place outside of the school system but ultimately denies this reading to redirect teenage readers towards a more mature vision of the play.

To read *Heathrow Nights* as merely about the production of consumer citizens is clearly to do it a disservice: *Heathrow Nights* is a well-written and thoughtful meditation on *Hamlet*. However, it is the subtlety of the connections between Shakespeare and consumer culture that it sustains that makes it worth commenting on. Explicitly pitted against School Shakespeare as a rebellious tale, *Heathrow Nights* capitalizes upon implied readers that have, or will have, contact with Shakespeare while using its position outside of School Shakespeare to imagine Shakespeare's language as invisibly guiding their implied readers towards a stable place within capitalist society, denying the possibility of Hamlet as a rebel or political agent to produce a vision of him as a romantic consumer. This is not to authorize a rebellious reading of *Hamlet* but

rather to expose the problematic way in which Shakespeare's language is encoded as a fantastic discourse that can reveal the universal truths of capitalism.

Russell's initial description of Hamlet hints at the novel's ultimate dismissal of Hamlet's rebellious qualities. While sympathetic towards Hamlet's plight, the contemporary language that Russell uses both assumes a teenage sensibility for Hamlet and, much like Dobson's review, sees that as something of a problem:

Young guy at uni gets a message; Father's dead. Hot-foots it home but, transport not being too fast in those days, it takes him a while to get back. By the time he arrives the old man is six feet under and Mum, the grieving widow, has married Father's brother, Hamlet's uncle Claudius. Everyone is out of mourning just a bit too previous, and partying like there's no tomorrow. Hamlet does just what anyone would do, goes into a massive sulk, stomps around dressed in black, very pointedly, face like something that got left in the fridge far too long, making snide remarks every time Claudius comes within earshot (4).

Though Russell acknowledges that Hamlet existed in a different era, an "in those days" with inferior transport, he clearly presents him as a contemporary teenager: stomping, sulking and dressing in black. The simile that Marks uses to describe Hamlet's expression - "face like something that got left in the fridge far too long" - is especially revealing, pitting Hamlet at odds with consumer culture; unlike the disposable goods that pass through that early icon of twentieth-century consumption, the refrigerator, Hamlet's feelings are more enduring, more complicated, smellier. Rotting imagery appears early in *Hamlet* too: an "unprofitable" place, the world is "an unweeded garden/That grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature/Possess it merely" (2.2. 133; 135-137). While it is the older generation polluting Eden in Hamlet's formulation, here, it is Hamlet who is out of joint with the world's machinery. As the plot progresses, Russell's maturation hinges on his ability to shed these teenage habits that are here associated with Hamlet - stomping, sulking, waste - and become an ideal consumer citizen; if Hamlet is a teenager who can't grow up, Russell, and the implied reader, must mature to ensure a comedic rather than a tragic end.

Initially, Russell's identification with Hamlet hinges upon a reading that casts Hamlet as an intellectual and a philosopher, somehow above the business of material things. This viewpoint is quickly undercut by his pragmatic mother who responds to his sarcastic desire to "live on air like the chameleon" with the prosaic "Chameleons eat flies" (7). Russell's defense of the sentiment - "It's in *Hamlet*. Air and promises" - suggests the legitimacy that *Hamlet* holds for him, transforming what his mother dismisses as nonsense into an acceptable statement. Moreover, the airy words of Hamlet provide philosophical sustenance for Russell, much of whose interior monologue in this novel is preoccupied with a close reading of *Hamlet* and of its parallels to his own life. This intimate experience is contrasted with the material *Hamlet* that his school attends, a production that Russell and his friends disrupt by treating as a pantomime, calling out a warning in 3.3: "He's behind you" (5). This unauthorized engagement with proper Shakespeare leads to the suspension of the three students but also allows Russell the time to pursue his individual reading of *Hamlet* outside of the school environment; by talking back to Shakespeare in performance, Russell enables his intimate connection with Hamlet the rebel. Equally, the experience of reading *Heathrow Nights* - where a teenage narrator offers a selective reading of *Hamlet* - allows the implied reader to forge a more personal connection with Shakespeare's play and central character.

Russell's reading of *Hamlet* re-encodes Shakespeare's language as a secret sign between narrator and implied reader. In a revealing simile, Russell imagines Hamlet's quips as answers in a crossword puzzle: "Quite a lot of *Hamlet* sounds like crossword clues, when you think about it: 3 down. Very like a whale, 5 letters. Cloud - or camel. Not a hawk. 7 letters. Handsaw. What builds stronger than a mason, a shipwright or a carpenter? 11 letters. Gravedigger" (38). The pleasure for the implied reader here is in matching the famous quotations from *Hamlet* to the

crossword answers, with the knowledgeable implied reader given an intellectual competence equivalent to Hamlet, who Russell imagines as a swift solver of crossword puzzles. Hamlet's words provide further answers in *Heathrow Nights*, serving as a fantastic discourse that provides the language for Russell's emotions and the magic answer to every question imaginable. When Russell's father dies and his mother remarries within the year, a quotation from *Hamlet* pops into Russell's head as he dines with his mother and stepfather. The emergence of Shakespeare within Russell's subconscious seems literally fantastic here, with this internal disruption mirrored by the textual disruption for the implied reader:

I saw her wedding ring with the candlelight on it, and that's when the line about funeral baked meats occurred to me. The remains of our main course were still on the plates - the waiter was just advancing to clear them away as it happened - and some words crossed my mind: *funeral baked meats* and *marriage tables*... I didn't know where the line came from then, but I looked it up in the dictionary of quotations at school; *Hamlet Act I Scene 2*.

I'd never read *Hamlet*, never seen it, but I got it out of the library and I looked up the line. In context it was even worse.

Horatio: My lord, I came to see your father's funeral.
Hamlet: I prithee do not mock me, fellow student.
I think it was to see my mother's wedding.
Horatio: Indeed, my lord, it followed hard upon.
Hamlet: Thrift, thrift, Horatio. The funeral baked meats
Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables.

Then I sat down and read the play. Father's funeral, mother's wedding. Suddenly it all fell into place. That was the moment, there in the school library, when Christopher Hague became Claudius (96-97).

Shakespeare's words are clearly a quotation here: italicized and indented, the implied reader encounters them as Russell does, imagining them in a book; Russell's reading of *Hamlet* disrupts his narrative, with Shakespeare's voice, preserved in italics, rupturing the single address crafted by Marks. By this stage in the middle of the novel, Christopher Hague has already become Claudius for the implied reader; indeed, has always been Claudius. Russell introduces his stepfather through his Shakespearean nickname: "In private he was Claudius, but that was a

private joke between me and me” (2). The intimacy of the young adult novel allows the implied reader to share in this private language, what is between “me and me” is ultimately what is between narrator and narratee, and thus “Claudius” is charged with double meaning for the implied reader. Russell takes ownership of Shakespeare’s language and plot but not in the way that Gibson imagines: unlike *Romeo and Juliet*, which he reads in school and hates, Russell encounters Hamlet outside of school, with Shakespeare’s words appearing in magic italics *before* he reads the play. Although the school library facilitates this reading, Russell’s primary encounter with *Hamlet* is in his obsessive rereading of the plot, a process that Marks depicts as principally internal. In liminal spaces outside of adult authority, garden allotments and airport lounges, Russell replays *Hamlet*’s plot and Hamlet’s words, re-encoding Shakespeare’s language as part of his own consciousness.

This transfer is coded through the shifting use of italics to denote Shakespeare’s words. Russell’s initial experience of Hamlet as a separate, indented and italicized text shifts as Marks uses free indirect discourse to classify Shakespeare’s words as Russell’s; as the boundaries between Russell’s life and Hamlet’s blur, Russell uses Hamlet’s language as a way of processing his own reality. Shakespeare’s language becomes a fantastic discourse, the right answer to the most fiendishly difficult of crossword puzzles. One particularly difficult conundrum, death, is processed by Russell through Hamlet:

I didn’t think, don’t think, that they are somewhere around, in spirit; they aren’t.
They are not. They *are* not.

To be means to live. *To be or not to be* means to live or not to live - Hamlet’s famous question when he walks in talking to himself. The edition I read, there are three pages of notes about what this speech means. It would be easier to understand if we knew what he’s been thinking before he starts talking. Has something happened to set him off? He says being dead is no worse than being asleep *but* what if you dream when you’re dead? Suppose death is one long nightmare? (70)

Although the italicized quotation from *Hamlet* is acknowledged by Russell as just that, a quotation attributable to Hamlet, its initial presentation embeds it within Russell's consciousness rather than identifying it as Shakespeare's language through quotation marks or indentation. More significantly, before Russell mentions Hamlet he is already talking like him. "They are not. They *are* not" echoes Hamlet's famous quotation both in content and in form and the italics, used for emphasis here, also suggest Russell's affinity with Hamlet: italics are used to signal his intellectual sophistication and capacity for philosophical thought. Again, this ability is explicitly pitted against School Shakespeare, which presents Russell with a bewildering three pages of footnotes, and instead encourages independent teenage thinking. This italicized perspective is not just ideological but a way for Russell to perceive his material surroundings: when his friend Adam abandons him at Heathrow airport, Russell comments: "as I watched him go all I could think was *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are dead*" (68). Unlike earlier quotations, which are clearly attributed to Shakespeare, this quotation merges the English Ambassador's lines with Russell's voice and imagines Shakespeare's word as the perfect language to express Russell's interior monologue.

From his use of "Claudius" to his mobilization of *Hamlet* to consider the afterlife, Russell's initial use of Shakespeare is both rebellious and anti-materialist. He discovers *Hamlet* through a shared disgust of the grossly material, a funeral defined by meat, and uses *Hamlet* to feed on airy philosophy. This is emphasized in the location for Russell's initial meanderings, allotment gardens, which Russell occupies not to cultivate but to rake over his thoughts on *Hamlet*: "What did I do? What I did mostly was try not to think about what I was doing, what I had done, what I was going to do. But I couldn't help thinking; just being on the move seems to get your brain into gear. What was Hamlet thinking, for instance, on that long trek back home to

Elsinore?” (17) The connection between Hamlet and Russell as perpetual *thinkers* established here runs throughout the novel and is foregrounded in Russell’s time in Heathrow Airport. In that paeon to capitalism, the airport lounge, Russell is thinking while everybody else is moving about and consuming. It is not just Russell’s thoughts which are rebellious but his subversive use of space. Not only has Russell run away from school and home but in a place where everybody is busy going somewhere, Russell is happy moving between nowhere to nowhere, shifting the seats he sleeps on to avoid notice from the security guards. He also partakes in mutual aid rather than consumerism, sharing with a homeless woman who serves as this novel’s Ophelia. The homeless woman’s gift, a book, emphasizes Russell’s intellectual journey and casts thought as a rebellious alternative to action.

The airport lounge is a space of delay rather than development and Russell’s return to his family and ordered society is inevitable: he must leave the liminal space of contemplation for the material world where chameleons feed on flies to survive. This rejection of Hamlet as rebel, prefigured in Russell’s treatment of teenage Hamlet as something of a problem, is also hinted at in Russell’s dismissal of *Romeo and Juliet*:

Romeo and Juliet are supposed to be easy to identify with because they are about the same age as us, but they are both such dipsticks. You feel they only fall in love because they haven’t got anything else to do. Most people in *Hamlet* have jobs, even if it’s only being a courtier which is kind of service industry, but no one in R&J, except the nurse and the friar, *does* anything, they just run in a gang and start fights. Nobody says, ‘sorry, guys, can’t stop to fight now, I’m late for work.’ (78)

Part of Russell’s dismissal of the play is its status as School Shakespeare. Unlike *Hamlet*, which he reads himself, he is forced to read *Romeo and Juliet*, which “we were meant to be reading on account of it is meaningful and relevant and hip” (78). “Relevant and hip” refers to the teenage culture that *Romeo and Juliet* became associated with from the 1950s, clearly evoked by Russell’s vision of the play as a world where people “just run in a gang and start fights.”

Contrary to the idle layabouts that populate Verona, everybody in Elsinore is “busy-busy-busy” in Russell’s estimate (78). This is a curious take on a play whose central hero is often held up as the paragon of inaction but it effectively sets out *Hamlet*’s role in Marks’s text, a liminal site to test identity before Russell can transform contemplation into busyness.

Although contemplation is arguably a form of busyness for Russell - he imagines both himself and Hamlet as thinking on the move - its end is associated with capitalist industry rather than philosophical satisfaction. Shakespeare is thus cast as a businessman rather than an intellect:

Shakespeare was writing for bums-on-seats, for punters who’d probably seen a public execution in the morning, watched a bear-baiting after lunch, and were taking in a play before they went to the brothel next door, not people who were going to sit there and pick over every line or write pages of notes about single words. Or people like me who were going to think and think about it afterwards and wonder what might have happened if things had turned out differently, imagining themselves part of it all (107).

The intensive identification with Hamlet that Holden Caulfield imagines is dangerous here, and Russell identifies “people like me” as part of an over-intellectualization of Shakespeare. He recognizes that he must move beyond his solipsistic identification to an appreciation of the wider world of Shakespeare’s theatre, the audience at the Globe for whom *Hamlet* was another thing to consume, a place to rest their rear between bear-baiting and brothels. While Marks’s rejection of Hamlet and Shakespeare as romantic geniuses is refreshing, it is rather dispiriting that the way in which Russell acknowledges this wider world is by abandoning thought for consumption. This is especially jarring considering the subject matter that Marks’s novel flirts with: teenage homelessness. The breakdown of Russell’s solipsistic connection with Hamlet leads not to a consideration of the wider political sphere of *Hamlet* or his immediate surroundings (which include a homeless Ophelia) but to an absorption of Russell into the heady world of Heathrow’s consumer culture.

Russell's move from contemplation to consumption is facilitated by the appearance of Claudius at the airport, there to rescue Russell from homelessness and his rebellious misreading of *Hamlet*. Sharing food and pints at a pub in Terminal 2, Russell and Claudius bond over their knowledge of *Hamlet* and Russell accepts Claudius's view that he behaved childishly at the play: "this is parent-speak, but he was right. That's just how we'd carried on, a bunch of nine-year-olds at a pantomime" (120). Understanding "parent-speak" means a recalibration of Hamlet as heroic teenager: Claudius's vision of a modern production of *Hamlet* is markedly different from Russell's:

If I did a production of *Hamlet* I wouldn't make him heroic. He'd be a weedy little runt with bi-focals. Now, if Hamlet were like Laertes, he wouldn't hang about thinking deeply and arguing with himself about death, he'd have Claudius's balls on a shovel by teatime. (122)

Hamlet as anguished teenage intellectual is replaced by a busy Hamlet who gets the job done efficiently, in tune with a capitalist schedule so he's finished "by teatime." The happy end that Claudius ushers Russell towards demands a re-evaluation of his worship of Hamlet and an acknowledgment that "I was talking to someone who knew the play even better than I did" (121). It also demands a romanticized reading of Ophelia, depicting the homeless lady as a plucky survivor, someone who is "not even dead" (123). Contrasting his plight with Hamlet's inevitably deflates Russell's circumstances but the happy end afforded the homeless woman rather belies the reality of homelessness in England, eliding rather than confronting the political issues that Russell has started to engage with. But this reading of *Hamlet* is one where the political is always subservient to the personal and the final quotation from *Hamlet* removes the magic italics to offer an authoritative happy ending:

He raised his glass.
I raised mine. 'the King drinks to Hamlet.'
'Act V Scene 2. We'll all be dead in a minute.'
'Nah. No Laertes. No Horatio. Tell you what, *anyone* would have been Claudius. It's not personal.'

‘Anyone who married Gertrude - Sarah?’
 ‘Anyone who married her that fast.’
 ‘At least it wasn’t two months.’

Here, Claudius stage-manages the transition from the narrative to replay of *Hamlet* to a contemporary story, substituting “Gertrude” for “Sarah” and emphasizing the differences in their situations rather than the similarities. This comedic revision of *Hamlet*’s tragic plot reclassifies consumption as healing rather than damaging; the bar in Terminal 2 re-imagines Shakespeare as corporate space through its name: “The Shakespeare.” Site of the liminal rite of passage and bonding ritual that is the English piss-up, “The Shakespeare” serves as a space for the authoritative reading of the play to be established, one that rejects Russell’s cultural production and redirects him as consumer rather than creator. The final moment in the novel demonstrates the transition that Russell has made. As he stumbles drunkenly upstairs with Claudius, they carry Russell’s bag “like a carry cot between them” (123). Russell and Claudius serve as a bizarre couple here, carrying his material possessions rather than a baby. This association with Russell as a parent rather than a stomping teenager or child, cements his ritualistic rite of passage. The rejection of one teenage version of Hamlet - a grungy, counterculture Kurt Cobain; the forgotten food at the back of the fridge - leads to the emergence of another, the ideal consumer-citizen of *Seventeen* who is happy to relinquish language and thought for a bag of things.

If this reading of *Hamlet* recalls some of the ways in which Shakespeare is tied to consumer culture in school performances, the treatment of Ophelia in perimillennial young adult literature recalls some of the strategies of resistance that teenagers used to talk back to Shakespeare, with Ophelia’s silenced and submissive subject position making her an excellent candidate to produce dumb discourse. I begin by considering Ophelia’s representation within the context of Disaster Shakespeare and Pipher’s doomed maiden.

Resuscitating a Noble Mind: Perimillennial Revivals of Ophelia.

One essay in *The Afterlife of Ophelia* - “Rebooting Ophelia: Social Media and the Rhetorics of Appropriation” by Sujata Iyengar and Christy Desmet - attends to Ophelia’s teenage sensibility. Iyengar and Desmet group some Facebook Ophelias as “Ladies,” noting that Ophelia is the means through which they can enact aristocratic fantasies, exclusively using screenshots of Kate Winslet’s or Helena Bonham Carter’s period Ophelias and associating Ophelia with “the ‘Disney Princess’ model of girlhood and the inherited model of monarchy with which Shakespeare’s play has an uneasy relation” (66). For Pipher, it was precisely Ophelia’s perceived similarity to a passive fairy tale princess that was the problem, inevitably leading to doom. This doom is circumnavigated by YouTube “Ladies” who present a narrative of Ophelia as romantic princess, but allow her a happy ending of sorts, suggesting that she is indeed the cause of Hamlet’s madness. Looking at PrimaViolinist’s popular videos from 2008 and 2009, “Hamlet’s Possession” and “Ophelia’s Immortal”, which edit footage from Branagh’s *Hamlet* with contemporary pop music, Iyengar and Desmet consider how they take advantage of video editing to remix *Hamlet*’s narrative:

When put together with the lovemaking scene and floated over a romantic soundtrack, however, these moments of pain are transformed; we see them as having to do not with Hamlet’s outrage at Ophelia’s betrayal or Ophelia’s anguish at her father’s murder, but as delineating a hermetically sealed tragedy between Hamlet and Ophelia. The effect is to intensify Ophelia’s fate as a doomed maiden and to rewrite Prince Hamlet’s own plot, so that the loss of Ophelia becomes the source of all of *his* emotional turmoil. No longer a revenge drama or a tale of fathers and sons - or even of fathers and daughters, as in the Facebook examples - *Hamlet* is transformed into a teenage love tragedy. (Iyengar and Desmet 69, original emphasis.)

In much the same way as Hawke’s *Hamlet* rewrites his story with a kiss with Ophelia as the redemptive reward at the end of brutal and carnal acts, all the play’s trauma is inscribed within a “teenage love tragedy.” While Primaviolinist doesn’t include a single shot of drowned Ophelia in

either video, they capitalize upon Branagh's interpolated love scenes, recycling Winslet's romantic embrace with Branagh again and again. Like Ethan Hawke's Hamlet, whose final image is of him kissing Ophelia, PrimaViolinist also imagines a happy ending for the doomed lovers: both her videos end with Hamlet and Ophelia kissing romantically. Several YouTube commentators make an explicit comparison to *Romeo and Juliet*, with V. Hammond asking "Who needs *Romeo and Juliet* when you have Hamlet and Ophelia?" PrimaViolinist's response to this comment reveals the ways in which this video ventriloquizes a resourceful teenage Ophelia, one barely hinted at in Winslet's performance: "there is definitely something more mature and believable about their relationship than *Romeo and Juliet*'s. I think part of it is that their lives don't revolve around each other and they don't spend every soliloquy exploring new euphamisms [sic] to express how much they love each other. Ophelia does talk about Hamlet a bit, but she does not speak "like a green girl" whatever Polonius says." Ophelia - and PrimaViolinist - are pitched against an older generation ("whatever Polonius says") and Ophelia's value lies in her ability to communicate outside of Shakespeare's language. Less vocal than Juliet, Ophelia is easier to be spoken on behalf of and the song she sings in this video is one where she is entirely defined by the man she rolls in bed with. Including these teenage iterations into Showalter's Cubist painting requires a shift in the picture, with the edges softened to present a Romanticized heroine, one who swims rather than floats, but whose freestyle leads her directly into the arms of a lover.

However, while Primaviolinist does present Ophelia in principally romantic terms in the video, as the comments reveal, this reading of Ophelia also imagines her as strong and independent, set in opposition to Polonius and patriarchy. Moreover, the comments reveal a community of "Ophelias" on Facebook. Using Ophelia as a shared site of interest, teenagers (and

others) exchange opinions and video responses, encouraged by YouTube's interface which prompts this sort of engagement. Iyengar and Desmet describe the way in which Primaviolinist's page became a space of both community-building and literary criticism, with commentators debating aspects of Ophelia's character and sharing basic plot information about *Hamlet*. Unlike the school parodies of Shakespeare, which, with some popular exceptions, seem principally to speak to a closed community of those involved with the production or assignment, the active comments field is an arena for Shared Shakespeare, with the version of Ophelia produced by the video somewhat changed by the variety of voices interpreting her below. In "Teaching Shakespeare with YouTube," Desmet argues that YouTube's infrastructure, a mix of video and website, encourages both close reading and the discovery of different but related videos: "the ease of repetition ("Replay" is only a click away) coupled with the length limitations imposed by YT focus viewers' attention sharply and thus promote close analysis...The urge to read closely seems positively contagious among YT aficionados" (66). This close-reading and commentary builds community, although the comments that Iyengar and Desmet discuss have been disabled in one of Primaviolinist's Ophelia videos, perhaps suggesting the difficulties that Ayanna Thompson identifies with YouTube communities. However, while the comments have been disabled for "Ophelia's Immortal," the conversation continues, with other imitation videos still uploaded, leading interested viewers down a YouTube vortex; if Ophelia is defined by Hamlet in Primaviolinist videos, she also becomes the means for community building and commentary.

This interest in a stronger Ophelia is also evidenced by reader reviews for *Dating Hamlet*. While many of the reviewers express distaste at some of Fielder's modifications to the plot, most of them are enthusiastic in her resuscitation of Ophelia as a stronger character and in her use of Shakespeare's language. Several commentators express their satisfaction that an Ophelia has

been drawn with “guts” rather than heavy garments, echoing the sentiments on *Dating Hamlet’s* jacket, which notes that Fiedler “felt female characters like Ophelia always got a raw deal, so she borrowed them from classic literature and gave them the guts to change their own destinies” (Fiedler). Fiedler has several allies on Goodreads and Amazon, a loose community who share their feelings about Ophelia’s character: “Finally the women get a voice!” (Ashley); “I always liked that girl; this feels more like the Ophelia I hoped was hiding inside” (Angie Barthel); “Lisa Fiedler has written an awesome book for teens and has given Ophelia, a character before thought of as weak, a spunky attitude that many girls can identify with” (swimlikeafish). Clearly, Fiedler’s Ophelia speaks to a frustration or longing that other readers feel with the character and teases out a hidden Ophelia that some “hoped was hiding” in the margins of the play. Though reviewers have mixed opinions about the success of Fiedler’s invented idiom, several valorize it as “proper language” (“Hamlet - but with less deaths and a happy ending!”) Conversely, the teenage romance plot allows for enjoyable Shakespeare for some readers, with mild guilt emanating from some of the reviewers that enjoyed a version of *Hamlet* that ended with a kiss rather than carnage: “I know its [sic] a corruption of Shakespeare’s original but i found it much happier than his” (Amber); “It may be predicable, but what’s wrong with a happy ending?” (“Hamlet - but with less deaths and a happy ending!”) The sharing of these comments online indicates a community of readers who relish the opportunity to talk back to Shakespeare through *Dating Hamlet*, clearly displaying a personal identification with Ophelia and a relief that this story liberates her from Shakespeare’s tragic script.

For Fiedler, the disaster that is Ophelia is saved by her appropriation of Shakespeare’s language and her ability to parody or dismiss it when necessary; by repossessing Hamlet’s words, Ophelia repurposes Shakespeare’s tragic script. Told from Ophelia’s perspective,

Fielder's narrative follows the general thrust of *Hamlet*'s plot but tells it from Ophelia's angle. This often involves inserting Ophelia or Anne, her servant and best friend, as eavesdroppers into a scene. The novel begins with the pair hidden on the battlements, listening to the events of 1.1. It is Ophelia, not Horatio, who first informs Hamlet of the ghost and when she subsequently overhears Horatio's account of the same scene, she is scornful of his account:

He makes no mention of his commanding tone, nor does he admit his inclination to strike the apparition with his sword. It is for this reason I regret that men record history; they include only the details which reflect well upon themselves.
(25)

This suspicion of male history runs through the novel, as does Ophelia's exasperation with male preoccupations, frequently expressed in a modern idiom: "Men! Can they not think on anything but conquest, of one sort or another?" (12) The alternative feminist history that Ophelia strives to tell is explicitly pitted against the martial tales of conquest and geopolitical struggle that *Hamlet* begins with. Listening to Horatio quiz the ghost, Ophelia is exasperated by his questions: "true to his gender, the fool accosts the noble spirit with - of all things - politics!" (10) With the political subtext of *Hamlet* dismissed as dull and masculine, Ophelia retells the plot as a romance; Shakespeare's language and Horatio's account are dismissed as trivial, occluding the true story that Ophelia exposes.

If its political charge is diminished, Shakespeare's language retains its value as the true language of love and philosophical introspection. Ophelia arrives at one of Hamlet's famous lines independently, announcing that "the play will be the very thing, wherein you shall expose and catch the conscience of the King!" (72) which Hamlet approves with a kiss. Ophelia's usurpation of Hamlet's lines (however imprecisely replicated) affirms their intellectual affinity and romantic compatibility. In Fielder's version, Ophelia helps Hamlet write his love letter from II.2, "improving" some of Hamlet's lines: "You may call me the most *beautified* Ophelia.

Implying that there may be falsehood in my beauty” and earning more kisses and a “clever girl” from Hamlet (53). Anne laments that Ophelia “speak[s] now like Hamlet,” in riddles too obscure for her comprehension (27). However, the line that prompts this - “Will I? Aye, a will have I. And a most solid one, you mark it. I will what I will” - demonstrates the strain of Fielder’s language and the limitations on Ophelia’s linguistic emancipation (27). Quite simply, Ophelia can’t speak as compellingly as Hamlet, something she acknowledges when she rhapsodizes his way with words: “He loves to tumble words over themselves, upending their meaning and playing on their sounds. When he speaks, I must listen with my understanding tipped at an angle that would make most others dizzy!” (2) Ophelia’s praise of Hamlet’s language exposes the deficiencies of her own; while Fielding reaches for the poetic here and elsewhere, this can only be diminished by contact with Hamlet’s actual words from Shakespeare’s play. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Ophelia’s encounter with Hamlet’s most famous soliloquy:

I look up from my missal, and the breath is all but gone from my body. He carries his beauty most dangerously this morn - tousled hair and hooded eyes. He approaches me as though he sees me not, and speaks aloud to none at all.

“to be, or not to be - that is the question...”

His passion draws me in. My eyes are wide, my lips parted and trembling. It is poetry, pure and dark, and deathish. I have never heard such words as these from Hamlet. (75)

While Ophelia is distracted by Hamlet’s appearance, Hamlet’s words are given special prominence; surrounded by white space, italicized and in quotation marks, Hamlet’s most famous words are reverentially preserved here. Their effect on Ophelia marks her not as his philosophical equal but as a girl besotted with a smart guy: Hamlet’s words impact Ophelia’s body, causing her lips to tremble and eyes to widen, but these are words she could not have arrived at independently, nor are they ones that are shared with her. Though Fielding does re-punctuate Hamlet to give him a more contemporary flavor (substituting a dash for a semicolon),

Ophelia's encapsulation of the soliloquy as "deathish" feels especially jarring in its proximity to the italicized Shakespeare. That several chapters end with Ophelia's own italicized and indented pronouncements compounds the contrast. The glib couplet that concludes the first chapter illustrates the ways in which Ophelia's language is unfavorably contrasted with Hamlet's:

Confusion boils in me. To tell. Or not to tell?
Hah! Confusion is short lived.

*For I, Ophelia, am not one to suffer the plague of indecision.
I will act! And tell my love of this night's most ghostly vision. (13)*

The direct contrast with Hamlet's soliloquy only exposes the shallowness of Ophelia's expression: in a world where Shakespeare's language has a transformative power, Ophelia is linguistically impoverished.

Part of Fiedler's point is that Shakespeare's language tells a tragic story; as in *Heathrow Nights*, the main character must move beyond an appreciation of Hamlet's language to mature. While Ophelia's rhyming couplets pale in comparison to Hamlet's soliloquies, they work as a parody of them: Ophelia is directly pitted as Hamlet's inverse, as a woman of action rather than a man of thought. Her speech recognizes the brevity of her thought process - "Hah! Confusion is short lived" - but also imagines her actions as critical to the happy ending of the play. It is by *doing* that Ophelia saves the day in this story, whether brewing the potion that bestows the illusion of death or punching Barnardo when he tries to sexually assault her. Furthermore, Fielder uses double reply to have her Ophelia talk back to Shakespeare through Shakespeare, giving Ophelia quotations that become a special code between her, Hamlet and the implied reader. The treatment of the nunnery scene is a good example of this double reply: Fiedler gives Ophelia and Hamlet some of their lines from Shakespeare, but alerts the reader that this is all a game and that Hamlet is pretending to hate Ophelia for the benefit of Claudius and Polonius.

Shakespeare's lines have a special meaning, with the implied reader allowed privileged access to this code. By casting Ophelia as a teenager who has to encounter Shakespeare's language, Fiedler allows Ophelia, a creation of Shakespeare's language, the opportunity to resist this language; Fiedler's Ophelia finds the words Shakespeare has written for her insufficient, using double reply to suggest an alternative reading.

Fiedler's repurposing of Shakespeare's tragic language to tell the plot of a teen romance initially changes the value of his italicized quotations from fantastic discourse to a language for Ophelia to interrogate through double reply or parody. A catalogue of the varied use of italics in the novel proves instructive. Italics are used for emphasis in direct discourse; emphasis in Ophelia's narration or an intensified expression of interiority at certain moments; selected quotations from Shakespeare; Ophelia's interior couplets that conclude three chapters; her ghostly mother's dialogue to her; the non-Shakespearean song that Ophelia sings to Laertes; and to provide the Latin name for a flower. The emphasis that italics provide in spoken dialogue often foregrounds Fiedler's feminist revision of the story: for example, Ophelia critiques a male version of history ('so the dull-witted, war-mongering *men* of this earth would have thee believe', 41-42) and bristles at *Hamlet's* familiar narrative of her death ('tis unjust and wrong I be remembered thus. I *drowned!*' 148) Equally, italics used to demonstrate an internal intensification of thought are often imagined as a way of communicating resistance to a patriarchal power structure or of expressing her empowered allegiance to Hamlet. Confronted with Claudius in IV.5, Ophelia imagines communicating a different message to him than her distribution of flowers ('*And what you are, I am thinking, is a heathen swine, who made the grave mistake of wronging me!*' 126); fumbling with Hamlet, Ophelia gives partial consent for further sexual exportation ('soft, not yet...*some more. Not all, but more*' 35) That Ophelia's

mother's ghost speaks only in italics suggests a reading of italics as an alternative mode of feminist discourse; that which has been suppressed in *Hamlet* is emphasized here, surfaces rather than sinks. Within this reading, an early appearance of Shakespeare's language in quotation suggests critical distance rather than reverence. Reflecting upon Laertes's advice in a conversation with Anne, Ophelia is skeptical of her brother's language:

“He bid me not be gullible to Hamlet's pleading.”
 “Does Hamlet plead?”
 “Well...I would not call it *pleading*, but he does propose, and coax, and both he does convincingly. Laertes warned that I might lose my heart, or - hear this one, Anne - my “*chaste treasure*.””
 “Hah!” Anne shakes her head. “Whilst he goes off to France to enjoy himself treasure-hunting among the women there!”
 I sigh. “true. But I care not how my brother tends his garden, if you get my meaning. That is his business. As Hamlet is mine.” (28)

Here, the italics mark Ophelia's suspicion of male discourse's ability to represent her experience. While the first italicized term, “*pleading*,” is the language of Fielder's Laertes rather than Shakespeare's, the second, “*chaste treasure*,” is a direct quotation from 1.3. Explicitly signaled as antique, almost alien discourse - “hear this one” - Shakespeare's language seems at odds with the modernized world of an independent Ophelia, with italics emphasizing its oddity rather than its value. However, Ophelia's description of Hamlet as her “business” hints at the different way in which Shakespeare quotations are used as the novel progresses: if her business is to possess Hamlet, Shakespeare's language provides the means for this takeover - by owning Shakespeare, Ophelia keeps Hamlet.

This ownership involves a shift in her use of Shakespeare's language, which ultimately is granted the status of fantastic discourse. One use of italics to convey a scientific Latin name for the flowers Ophelia discovers at her mother's grave suggests the deployment of Shakespeare's italicized language as this kind of fantastic discourse, one with magical powers for self-discovery. Ophelia is able to identify the “cluster of weeds” as “*Eupatorium purpureum*” but it is

her father (revealed to be the gravedigger, not Polonius) who is able to translate their significance to her: “ ‘From the Latin,’ he says, standing taller, ‘meaning ‘of a noble father’ ” (83). Here, italicized Latin suggests not just a mastery over the physical world but an ability to plumb deeper truths, to reveal the gravedigger as a “noble father” to Ophelia, redefining Shakespeare’s nobility as a moral rather than economic value. Instead of being set in opposition to Fielder’s alternative narrative as ossified and out-of-date, Shakespeare’s language becomes co-opted by this story, transformed into a sort of transcendental signifier which reveals truths inaccessible through other arrangements of the alphabet. The treatment of Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” suggests this, as does the italicized “*silence*” that follows his final scripted line. (170) Whereas Ophelia’s initial attempts to own Hamlet’s language were in his presence and often partial or diminished by contact with Hamlet (who frequently silences her speech with a kiss), once Hamlet leaves for England, Ophelia is given privileged access to Shakespeare’s language. Pining in bed for Hamlet, Ophelia seems to penetrate his subconscious: “I call out to Hamlet and dream with eyes wide open of shared kisses and *words, words, words...*” (111) Though the “words” that Ophelia longs for her are clearly Hamlet’s, her evocation of his language as part of her free indirect discourse, emphasized by italics but not in quotation marks, suggests a shift in her relationship with Shakespeare’s language.

Fielder’s treatment of Ophelia’s mad scene illustrates Ophelia’s intensified relationship with Shakespeare’s language. Italics are used here partially to convey words’ status as song rather than speech, but they also illustrate the way in which Fielder’s Ophelia repossesses Shakespeare’s language. Singing about Polonius, who this Ophelia certainly doesn’t care about, Ophelia finds herself thinking about Hamlet. As the passage progresses, the use of italics shifts, from denoting Shakespeare’s language to conveying Ophelia’s interiority:

Laertes clutches his breast, howling. (Perhaps he does not like that the attention is all mine.) I sing, more loudly:

*“And will he not come again?
And will he not come again? No, no, he is dead,
Go to thy deathbed.
He never will come again.”*

Waltzing gaily to the morbid words, I do not allow myself to think on them. To think that he is gone. No triumph can restore him!

“He is gone...”

Hamlet.

He is gone. *“...He is gone.”*

My cover cracks, a cleft in the charade that invites true grief to creep beneath it. The words remind me...*He never will come again.*

Bereavement breaks my strength, and I stumble. The Queen gasps; Laertes hastens to assist me, but I swipe at him, and he retreats.

I stand in the center of the hall. Alone.

There is no sound but for the ringing echo of my words, taunting me.

He. Is. Gone.

Gone.

Gone...

Oh, I am cold. And yet my palms perspire. I struggle to recall the closing lines of the song.
(133-134)

This repetition of “*Gone*” is especially striking here. The typography clearly recalls the treatment of “To be or not to be” here: surrounded by white space, italicized and indented, these words are given prominence. The isolation of these words is not to secure their status as protected Shakespearean speak, to italicize them in amber, but to convey Ophelia’s internal trauma. If Ophelia is a selective reader of Shakespeare (she omits the line from the song about a snowy beard as it suggests Polonius rather than Hamlet), her reading is nonetheless effective, repurposing Shakespeare’s language to access a personal truth, with the ellipsis after the second “gone” stretching the word towards infinity, indeed towards the “undiscovered country” that Hamlet approaches in his soliloquy (3.1 81). Perhaps this is another example where Ophelia’s language can only suffer by comparison and yet I would argue that here Ophelia’s possession of Shakespeare’s language is actually stronger than Hamlet’s.

Ophelia’s final encounter with italicized Shakespeare proves happier. As she waits with Anne and Horatio for Hamlet to revive, Ophelia repossesses Horatio’s famous line: “*Flights of*

angels, change thy course. Sing him here, to me!”(180) Initially, italics convey this quotation’s status as Shakespeare’s language (“flights of angels”) but, of course, Ophelia is rewriting the line, reclaiming the language, and Hamlet, as her own. What is especially notable is the break in italics in the second line, where “here” is presented in regular script, having the reverse effect of signaling it out for emphasis. The effect of this break splits the italics in this sentence, between the first half, which foreground the connection to the original Shakespeare, despite the addition of “him,” and the second half, which suggest emphasis rather than quotation. This is an especially significant moment to use italics for emphasis rather than quotation, signaling not just Ophelia’s possession of Hamlet and Shakespeare’s language but of the whole plot: by redirecting the mournful angels, Ophelia effectively reclassifies *Hamlet* as a teenage love story rather than a tragedy. This linguistic and generic shift is also at the expense of Hamlet, who is ultimately a figure of parody, rather ridiculous in his inability to make up his mind in the novel’s closing moments:

‘Verona,’ repeats Hamlet, and now a grin kicks up one corner of his mouth. ‘Ah, you know me, love. I cannot decide.’
 ‘Aye, my lord,’ I say. ‘But I can.’ I reach for his hand, and the journey begins.
 (183)

Fiedler closes her novel with Ophelia asserting her abilities and authority; although she ends up in Hamlet’s hands, she is the one leading them out of the wreckage of Elsinore and adolescence and towards a bright future.

We might ask, following one of the Amazon reviewers, what is wrong with a happy ending to *Hamlet*? Especially one as happy as Fiedler’s: not only does Hamlet survive, but Gertrude and Laertes too, leaving only the symbols of oppressive patriarchy, Claudius and Polonius, actually dead. Anne is allowed a romantic union of her own, pairing off with Horatio, while Fortinbras takes control of Elsinore, an occupation that Hamlet has no interest in. Fiedler’s

Fortinbras is a decent sort, recalling Kott's "cheerful fellow" with a "charming smile," but Fiedler's text endorses rather than suspects this Fortinbras (209). Indeed, his positive portrayal evokes Rozett's experience of teaching *Hamlet* in the 1980s, where her students endorsed Fortinbras as a typical business major while dismissing Hamlet as a typical English major (19). It is not surprising that Fiedler's Fortinbras falls for Ophelia, who, as a romantic consumer, shares his business major philosophy. Suffering proves rather profitable in this story; not only does a besotted Fortinbras give Ophelia a gold ring but Ophelia also acquires the pearl that Claudius used to taint the wine, a "most costly gem" that makes "the cost of our voyage...no concern" (183). Hamlet's desire to find exile in a romantic landscape - "some sweet-scented isle of flowers where we may spend our midsummer nights among fairies" - is dismissed as idealistic by Ophelia (182). Instead, Ophelia plans to go to Verona to sell her herbs to a certain friar, whose "letters lead me to believe our sleeping poison would interest him greatly" (182). Clearly, this evocation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet* is mostly intended as comic for a knowing implied reader, using two of the plays most familiar to younger readers. But the "interest" that Ophelia speaks of might also be thought of as economic: Verona provides a more suitable marketplace than a dreamy forest. This transformation, from the doomed drowned to canny capitalist, has been enabled by her possession of Shakespeare's language; owning Shakespeare allows Fiedler's Ophelia to carve a different narrative from the ancestors of Millais's static corpse, one where manipulation of Shakespeare's language creates ideal teenage consumers.

If the production of Fiedler's Ophelia as romantic consumer depends upon her re-encoding of Shakespeare's language (whose fantastic power is repurposed through double reply), the rebellious version of Ophelia relies upon other methods of communication. Glenda Jackson's

1965 Ophelia, the counterpart to David Warner's iconic prince, set the template for the rebellious teenage Ophelia in performance: staging a "silent revolt" against authority according to *The Sunday Times*' critic (qtd. in Dawson 145). As revelatory as Warner's Hamlet - Penelope Gilliatt remarked that Jackson should play Hamlet (Gilliatt) - Jackson defined Ophelia as a modern, messed-up teenager, in ways that previous twentieth century actresses, such as Muriel Hewitt and Rosalind Fuller, had hinted at but not fully articulated.⁶² Sullen towards her manipulative father and sexually aggressive in her mad scenes, Jackson's Ophelia moved between suggestive silent rebellion and explosions of anger, most particularly in her charged mad scenes but also in 3.1, where she screamed "the observed of all observers" as a damning indictment of the eavesdropping Polonius and Claudius. Jackson's sullen and silent rebellion is mirrored in Julia Stiles's performance in Michael Almereyda's film. Kendra Preston Leonard lambasts Almereyda for his winnowing of Ophelia's part to a mere 447 lines: "Although she is, ironically, perhaps the most cared-for Ophelia of all the cinematic *Hamlets*, she is also the least allowed to speak, be heard, and be seen...she has become all but dumb property in Almereyda's adaptation, a decorative object in the films rather than a meaningful participant" (115). However, Stiles's Ophelia mobilizes an excellent dumb discourse to communicate her rebellion, from the drawing she uses to communicate with Hamlet in 1.2 to her scream that fills the Guggenheim in 4.5. Stiles is aided by Almereyda, who expressively associates Ophelia with profound silence rather than tarnished words: in 2.2, Ophelia imagines diving into a blissfully silent swimming pool to escape the cacophony of her father's voice; in 3.1, an extra-diegetic cut to an airplane trailing through a clear sky punctuates Hamlet's harsh words to Ophelia, suggesting silence as a means of escape from the tyranny of words; as a photographer, Ophelia communicates through

⁶² Hewitt played Ophelia in Barry Jackson's 1925 production in London; Fuller played Ophelia alongside John Barrymore in New York in 1922.

images rather than language, distributing Polaroids in her mad scene. Ophelia's resistance to language is compounded by Almereyda's presentation of her death. After Ophelia's body is dredged from the shallow pool, a digital effect shows Hamlet's love letters floating in the water: what weighs this Ophelia down is not her heavy garments but the weight of Hamlet's, and Shakespeare's, words.

Other iterations of rebellious Ophelias in young adult literature communicate their rebellion outside of Shakespeare's language, with Lisa Klein's *Ophelia* (2006), following Cowden Clarke's model by focusing on Ophelia's early life and adding her own twist, allowing Ophelia to escape Elsinore and enter a nunnery, bolstered by supportive female figures. Olivia, the Ophelia figure in *Something Rotten* goes further than the rejection of Shakespeare's language that Klein's Ophelia stages, not even acknowledging Shakespeare. A witty retelling of Hamlet as a modern murder mystery, *Something Rotten* is narrated by wise-cracking Horatio Wilkes, who spends his summer vacation with his rich prep-school friend, Hamilton Prince in Denmark, Tennessee. Though the Princes have their share of personal problems which directly map onto *Hamlet*'s plot (not least Hamilton's father, who suggests he's been poisoned in a video from beyond the grave), the political fortune of the Elsinore Paper Company that the Princes run is equally important. Denmark's rotten stink can be traced back to the polluting plant and Ophelia is reconfigured as Olivia, a teenage environmental activist. This Ophelia is far from a Lady or a Disney Princess: working in a dingy café to provide pocket money, Olivia spends her free time protesting outside Elsinore Paper Company. She is also defined principally by her opposition to Elsinore's pollution rather than her attachment to Hamilton, even though they do end up together in the happy ending. This comedic end is facilitated by Olivia's flirtation with tragedy: Olivia drinks a jug of the polluted river water as a press stunt, silently ignoring Horatio's advice. This is

more than a modern Ophelia who goes into the river with stones in her pockets: removed from Shakespeare's language, and only loosely associated with *Hamlet's* plot, this Ophelia drowns as an act of political defiance. Although she is hospitalized, Olivia survives, with her stunt proving successful: Hamilton is roused from apathy and exposes the plant's pollution at a town hall meeting. Instead of selling the plant to the rapacious Fortinbras figure, Fort N. Branff, Hamilton vows to carve a more environmentally friendly paper plant, earning Olivia's approval. Although this happy ending is not without its wrinkles - Fort N. Branff heads off to take over a different company - it is one where Ophelia's romantic ending is not predicated upon either Shakespeare's language or consumer culture, but instead embedded within the successful resolution of the novel's political problem.

Part of the success of this happy ending hinges upon the novels' parodic relationship to *Hamlet* and Shakespeare's language. While Horatio's name ties him to the character, he has little time for Shakespeare's language, especially when Hamilton quotes Shakespeare to him:

‘Ah, but ‘there are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, that are dreamt of in your philosophy.’
I flicked water on him. ‘Thanks. Because I’ve never heard that one before.’
He grinned. ‘Anyway, you’re right. And in the meantime, the only escape is to sleep - or drink’ (102).

Shakespeare's language here is a cliché rather than the fantastic key to wisdom, something that Horatio has heard many times before. In this teenage world, consideration of sleep moves from dreaming (the subject that prompts the exchange) to drinking: unlike Hamlet, who critiques Denmark's boozy culture, Hamilton reaches for alcohol rather than philosophy when confronted with existential crises. The only other sustained quotation from Shakespeare similarly distances Shakespeare's language from teenage culture. Horatio's mother, an English professor, leaves an exasperated voicemail where her delivery of the “what a piece of work is man” speech abruptly shifts into criticism:

‘What a piece of work is man!’ My mom. The English lit. professor. ‘How noble in reason. How infinite in faculty. In form and moving, how express and admirable. In action, how like an angel. In apprehension, how like a god. And yet you can’t be bothered to call your mother when you get to Hamilton’s house? I will assume you are bleeding to death on the roadside in a twisted hunk of metal until you phone.’

Delete.
(90-91)

Shakespeare is channeled for sarcastic effect, the poetic world he depicts at odds with the prosaic one that Horatio inhabits; his language disposable with the touch of a button. It is especially significant that this speech in particular is deleted so casually. In many ways, “What a piece of work is man” is the defining text for the iteration of Hamlet as counter-cultural rebel: it is the speech that begins Almereyda’s *Hamlet*, the one serious speech in The Reduced Shakespeare Company’s parodic take on Shakespeare, the words that provided the material for an anthem in *Hair*.⁶³ For the primary text of rebellious Hamlets to be dismissed so cavalierly indicates Gratz’s treatment of Teenage Shakespeare: here, Shakespeare is better alluded to and not heard.

This attitude towards Shakespeare’s language mirrors Gratz’s treatment of *Hamlet*’s plot and characterization. Although his story follows *Hamlet*’s trajectory, most of the characters are spared a tragic end, with only the craven Rosencrantz and Guildenstern killed and the dastardly Claudius figure killed. This license extends to the romantic plot, with Olivia is allowed some critical distance from her relationship with Hamilton. When she coos over the “actual letters” he sent her “on really beautiful paper,” Horatio quips that it was probably Elsinore paper, contributing to the pollution that Olivia is protesting against (77). Olivia laughs and calls Hamilton a “bastard”; although this is a tragicomic laughter, which Horatio hears some tears in,

⁶³ Douglas Lanier describes the delivery of this speech in *The Complete Works of Wllm Shkspr (abridged)* as a serious contrast to the parodic take on “To be or not to be,” which leads its Hamlet, Austin Tichenor, to fall apart under the pressure: “After Austin dries up, Adam off-handedly recited the ‘What a piece of work is man’ speech, remaining in his California slacker persona but treating the passage ‘simply, quietly, and without a trace of interpretation’ (*Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* 104).

it nonetheless shows Olivia's facility for humor and her awareness of the parodic potential in her romance. This Ophelia is not drowned by the weight of love letters but able to both relinquish them and laugh about them.

The Barbie Ophelias on YouTube that Iyengar and Desmet discuss also use parody and excellent dumb discourse, using the silliness of parody as a way to liberate Ophelia from Hamlet's restrictive language. The madness of these Ophelias echoes some of the anarchic quality ascribed to madness in the early feminist criticism that Showalter discusses: in Frances W's "Barbie Hamlet part two," Ophelia becomes notably more disheveled when she turns mad, shaking out her perfect Barbie hair and exposing her plastic breasts. The "sweet ladies" (4.5, 70) that Ophelia addresses are present here: perfectly coiffed Barbies, dressed in carnation pink gowns. These perfect Barbies, who also "play" the Rosencrantz and Guildenstern figures are critical of disheveled Barbie Ophelia, voicing an "Ewwwww" and turning away as she bids them good night. While clearly comic, this moment also situates Ophelia within a wider context of female companionship and judgment that is minimally hinted at by Gertrude's presence in *Hamlet*. The dialogue that this moment engages one is that explicitly reaches beyond *Hamlet*, one that considers the representation of both Ophelia and contemporary teenage girls through the idealized images of consumer culture: this messed-up, "improper" Barbie subverts the codes of both Barbie and Shakespeare and serves as a response to the Facebook Ladies who imagine Ophelia as an aristocratic princess. Ophelia has a decidedly unromantic end in this version, diving into a blender as the theme from *Chariots of Fire* plays and a female voice intones Gertrude's poetic description of Ophelia's death. Again, while this moment is funny, it has the satiric edge that Hutcheon ascribes to some parody; by including the perfect Barbies' criticism of mad Ophelia, Frances W inscribes Ophelia's death within a wider discourse about the

representation of teenage girls, with this rebellious Ophelia (who jumps rather than sinks) exposing the insufficiency of Shakespeare's language to express her reality. The death of Ophelia in a blender clearly punctures Gertrude's speech, denying Shakespeare's language its status as a fantastic discourse that reveals universal meanings. Equally, by using Barbie as a *dumb* figure, in both senses of the word, these video-makers are able to contrast Ophelia's communication with Shakespeare's and to articulate Ophelia's language of nothingness. The Barbie Ophelia in Tiffany Reed's "Ophelia" (made "in about 5 minutes for a school project") is completely silent, bobbing about a meadow until a text message from Hamlet sends her into a spiral, with her body repeatedly falling in front of the camera and a jump cut showing her floating in a shallow stream. This narrative follows the romantic reading of Ophelia, ascribing Hamlet's rejection as the primary cause of her death, but the use of a dumb Barbie, who only speaks through a mournful song, Reed allows parody to also blur into social critique and there is something disturbing, as well as humorous, about the Barbie falling and falling. Indeed, the choice of song, which complements rather than ridicules Ophelia's situation, demands that this plastic Ophelia be taken somewhat seriously. As with Primaviolinist's videos, though less strongly, these Barbie Ophelias also create a loose community on YouTube, a network of videos linked through each other through association. If the Ophelia in *Hamlet* is a solitary figure, she is consistently used to create Shared Shakespeare, with a community of contemporary Ophelias sharing their rebellious revision of the character.

This communal spirit animates *Ophelia Speaks*, which Shandler positions as a way for teenagers to talk back to adult authority, voicing some resistance to Pipher's book:

[B]y the book's end, I was left unsettled. In fact, I felt Pipher was speaking for me, and I wanted to speak for myself. As I shared my thoughts with my friends, we all agreed - *Reviving Ophelia* had been a gift to us, but it had also sold us short. If Ophelia is to be revived then it must be done by the collective voice and actions of Ophelias everywhere (xiii).

This resistance to adult authority extends to Shakespeare. While Ophelia's story is referenced in Shandler's introduction, only one of the essays uses Ophelia as a direct analogue, Lucy-Jane Lang's "A First Person Narrative on First Love." The connection that Lang makes is parodic, exposing a gap between Shakespeare's language and the reality of teenage experience. In Lang's initial search for love, Shakespeare is the suggestive bawd, articulating a language of love that Lang longs to speak: "I heard its voice in opera and in Shakespeare. It was a sprightly nymph, a decadent myth that I sought" (218). As the parodic tone here implies, Lang is disappointed when her first love fails to fit the Shakespearean mould. Her "self-envisioned Hamlet" is at odds with the decadent language of love presented by opera and Shakespeare, with Lang's football player boyfriend imagined in all too prosaic terms: "His blood was too cold, and his eyes too empty, and my lips too tired of saying the same thing. Frankly, I was bored" (219). Lang invokes Ophelia as a romantic figure, the "starry-eyed Ophelia" who pined after a dream boyfriend, but she does so through parody, positioning herself as a wise Ophelia who, while still occasionally yearning for this love, also has a comedic critical distance from Ophelia's tragic perspective (220). This critical distance also extends to the comedic presentation of Ophelia as romantic consumer: the happy ending that Lang articulates is one where Ophelia breaks up with her boring boyfriend and gets published by writing about it. Equally, while none of the other essays in the collection refer to *Hamlet*, the freedom to communicate outside of Shakespeare's language allows for a more rounded articulation of Ophelia as everyteen. This is not to idealize *Ophelia Speaks* too much: all of the essays are mediated by Shandler's voice and perspective, filtering an array of perspectives about race, class and sexuality through a white, privileged teenager who would eventually work and write for *Seventeen*. Nonetheless, Shandler includes a wide variety of

Ophelias, with one using her position as Ophelia to attack teenage consumer culture and

Seventeen:

Here's some numbers from (irony of ironies) *Seventeen* magazine: Of the \$105 million earned by teenagers last year, \$103 million were spent last year. That's 98 percent! We're fucking wellsprings. We have some small amount of money, but it's easy as sin to get it out of us. We walk around with big red target signs!...What we need is to perfect the skill of cash warfare. Every political movement - from civil rights to gay rights to environmentalism - has learned this little secret. Don't buy shit. You know what shit is? Anything in print that's kind enough to tell you how to be perfect, and smart enough to show you a picture of just what perfect is. *Seventeen* is shit. *Jane* is shit. The girl power movement is shit. So let's you and me not be targeted (Carmichael 273-74).

Speaking outside of Shakespeare's language and plot allows Emily Carmichael to create an alternative to Disaster Shakespeare, to revive Ophelia as a political activist similar to Murray's agitprop heroine. This call for rebellion is not Shandler's perspective, nor may it be the perspective of the majority of Ophelias who speak in this volume, most of whom uncritically include consumer culture as the wallpaper of their lives. However, if Ophelia *must* be made to speak in a teenage tone, it is reassuring that she can be used as a mouthpiece for rebellion as well as romantic consumerism.

The social nature of these teenage revivals of Ophelia suggests the position that both Ophelia and Hamlet occupy in popular perimillennial youth culture: the canonization of *Hamlet* within compulsory School Shakespeare, coupled with the technologies and social media sharing that websites such as YouTube enable, make Hamlet and Ophelia especially useful *shared* symbols for teenagers to communicate through. That Shakespeare's language is often elided, parodied or excised to enable this communication need not be taken as a sign of the teenage dumbing-down of Shakespeare's Romantic genius but rather as one way of expressing resistance to teenage consumer culture and its restrictive portrayal of female bodies and voices.

Chapter Four.

Kissing Beyond the Book: Romance and Rebellion in *Romeo and Juliet*.

Touch me deep, pure and true
 Gift to me forever
 'Cause I'm kissing you, oh
 I am kissing you, oh
 (De'sree).

You can laugh
 A spineless laugh
 We hope your rules and wisdom choke you
 Now we are one in everlasting peace.

We hope that you choke, that you choke
 We hope that you choke, that you choke
 We hope that you choke, that you choke
 ("Exit Music for a Film").

Two of the anthems composed for *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* illustrate the different functions that *Romeo and Juliet* has played in sculpting youth identity. De'sree's lush song, "Kissing You," is woven into the "Slow Movement" leitmotif that consistently underscores the lovers' appearances and firmly situates Romeo and Juliet as romantic consumers: their pure and true love is a commodity, a *gift* forever.⁶⁴ Radiohead's "Exit Music for a Film" plays over the end credits and imagines Romeo and Juliet in very different terms: a pair of rebels united in hate, bitterly cursing an elder generation. In the Luhrmann film, romantic rather than rebellious music has the ultimate closing word, with Radiohead exiting to make way for a final reprise of "Kissing You." However, this is not the end of *Romeo+Juliet*, a film which survives not just through its authorized editions on DVD but also through numerous transmutations on YouTube. Both

⁶⁴ Though this lyric could be read to illustrate a system of donation, the striking use of "gift" as verb rather than a noun suggests that Romeo's and Juliet's is a love of things, a reading that situates them within the over-saturated commodified world that Luhrmann creates: Des'ree's rendition can be read as "gift" or "give," with both interpretations circulating on YouTube videos.

“Kissing You” and “Exit Music for a Film” provide the soundtrack for YouTube videos, which re-edit scenes of *Romeo + Juliet* to provide their own alternative endings to the film and the story, allowing teenagers to talk back to Shakespeare’s tragic end and articulate different versions of Romeo and Juliet as survivors, whether through eternal consumption or rebellion.

In this chapter I consider the double survival of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, arguing that both the play and its lovers have been used as a site to articulate different visions of the teenager and that while the view of the lovers as romantic consumers dominates their perception in popular culture, the perimillennial period is a time when both technological strategies and a political climate allow teenagers to present a queerer version of *Romeo and Juliet* as romantic rebels. *Romeo and Juliet*’s status as a canonical text of School Shakespeare is central in its redefinition for and by teenagers and I situate the uses of *Romeo and Juliet* in popular culture within the pedagogical discourses I discuss in chapters one and two; both the ownership of Shakespeare’s language that Rex Gibson suggests and the excellent dumb discourse that we can see in student parodies of Shakespeare are strategies used to articulate these divergent versions of *Romeo and Juliet*. The two works which are the primary focus of this chapter, the *Twilight Series* (2005-08) and *Romeo + Juliet* (1996), intersect with pedagogy directly: Bella, the heroine of the *Twilight Series*, encounters *Romeo and Juliet* through school; *Romeo + Juliet* instantly became a crucial pedagogical text, accounting for “a huge improvement in 14-year-olds” performance in Shakespeare tests” in the UK by 1998 (Irish 15). The extraordinary popularity and financial success of these works - *Romeo + Juliet* grossed nearly \$150 million worldwide in its cinematic release (Swanigan 1); the *Twilight series* has sold over 85 million copies worldwide (Click, Aubrey and Behm-Morawitz 3) - both fuelled and facilitated teenagers’ engagement with the works in other media, with teenagers “scribble[ing] in

the margins and creating their own texts” through websites, fan-fiction, social media and YouTube mash-ups, to borrow Barbara Hodgdon’s analysis of teenage interactions with the Luhrmann film (“*William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet: Everything’s Nice in America*” 92). My analysis expands upon Hodgdon’s, to think about how YouTube both facilitates the sort of scribbling that she imagines (allowing Shakespeare’s words to be paired with images from the Twilight movies) but also demands a different engagement, a dumb discourse that communicates *around* rather than through language. I broaden my discussion of discourse around Shakespeare’s language to include music, which is centrally important in both the Luhrmann film and YouTube mash-ups, providing a soundtrack for teenagers to talk back to Shakespeare and consumer culture.

I begin this chapter by considering how the Twilight Series repackages Romeo and Juliet as romantic consumers: suburban vampires who will consume forever. Appropriation of Shakespeare’s language is central to this process, with Meyer using her fictional teenagers to articulate a double reply to Shakespeare: when Bella encounters Shakespeare in school, she recasts his language as a romantic code, discernible only to her and teenage implied readers and unintelligible to authority figures. Teenage consumers of this series both further this process and use a sort of excellent dumb discourse when making YouTube mash-ups of the Twilight movies and *Romeo + Juliet* to provide happy endings for Romeo and Juliet as romantic consumers. Turning to *Romeo + Juliet*, I argue that the film allows a reading of the couple as romantic rebels rather than romantic consumers and point to ways in which viewers have expanded this reading on YouTube. I also offer a reading of Balthasar as a *dumb teen*, a marginalized young character who is a visually prominent but silent presence throughout the film, suggesting that Jesse Bradford’s Balthasar provides a queer perspective on this film that offers a future for teenagers

outside of romantic consumerism. Briefly tracing how this Balthasar fits in a wider treatment of the character in the twentieth century, from Anybodys in *West Side Story* (1957) to the narrator of the young adult novel *William Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet - Retold*, (2007) I argue that Balthasar often functions as an important empathetic node but also as a potential queer subject-position for spectators. I conclude by considering how *Private Romeo* continues this tradition, offering a rebellious reading of *Romeo and Juliet* that allows gay teenagers to reclaim Shakespeare's language through double reply and facilitates a more expansive version of teenage identity.

As this summary suggests, the representation of Romeo and Juliet as teenagers in popular culture recalls many of the issues discussed in relation to Hamlet and Ophelia, but also foregrounds the relationship between sexuality and the teenage norm more forcefully. As representations of Ophelia are dependent upon ideas about female sexuality and madness, then perimillennial representations of Romeo and Juliet might be seen as inextricably linked to representations of heteronormative sexuality: it is their depiction as the quintessential romantic consumers (the suburban couple from Bell Shakespeare who will get married and accumulate cars, houses and children) that makes Romeo and Juliet especially powerful queer figures. I begin by tracking the appearance of Romeo and Juliet in perimillennial popular culture and criticism, arguing that Romeo and Juliet have become a brand, "Romeo and Juliet," that is used to discipline ideas about teenage identity.

Romeo's and Juliet's status as symbols of romantic consumerism is partially due to their appearances in popular music: several scholars have offered short accounts of *Romeo and Juliet's* dialectical interactions with youth culture, paying particular attention to their role in

popular music.⁶⁵ The Reflections' 1964 hit "(Just Like) Romeo and Juliet," whose speaker expresses his love for his Juliet figure by promising to "buy her pretty presents/Just like the ones in a catalog," and the 2000 hip hop opera *Rome and Jewels* testify to the association of the central couple with consumer culture, especially strong in the latter, where Juliet becomes Jewels, a figment of Rome's imagination who does not appear onstage but signifies his tragic obsession with material possessions. Taylor Swift's 2007 hit "Love Story," frequently used to underscore YouTube videos of *Romeo + Juliet*, continues this trend, with the speaker a modern Juliet who pines for Romeo: "You be the prince and I'll be the princess...Romeo, save me, I've been feeling so alone" (Swift). When Romeo appears he confirms this Juliet's materialist fantasies, pulling out a ring and telling her: "I talked to your dad - go pick out a white dress/ It's a love story, baby, just say 'Yes.'" This association of Romeo and Juliet with music and consumer culture is compounded by the enormous success of the soundtrack from the Luhrmann film and the Nina Rota score of Zeffirelli's film.⁶⁶ So strong is the relationship between Romeo and Juliet and popular music that one of the essays in *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet* devotes a chapter to bringing rock songs into the classroom to teach the play.⁶⁷ This critical importance of music in defining *Romeo and Juliet* in twentieth and twenty-first century popular culture accentuates the importance of teenagers' use of music to respond to versions of *Romeo and Juliet* and express rebellious iterations of Romeo and Juliet.

⁶⁵ See Marjorie Garber's *Shakespeare and Modern Culture* (33-61); Stephen Buhler's "Reviving Juliet, Repackaging Romeo: Transformations of Character in Pop and Post-pop Music" and Robert Shaughnessy's "*Romeo and Juliet*: The Rock and Roll Years."

⁶⁶ The "Love Theme from *Romeo and Juliet*" reached number one on the American Billboard Chart in 1969 and was used by BBC radio in the 1980s to accompany everyday love stories (Shaughnessy 185-186); two successful soundtracks were released for *Romeo + Juliet*, as well as a special music DVD and several hit singles (Swanigan 2).

⁶⁷ See "'Who Wrote the Book of Love?': Teaching *Romeo and Juliet* with Early Rock Music" by Cynthia Marshall.

The multiple citations of Romeo and Juliet in popular music also reveals their prominence as figures of Shakespeare's language: Romeo and Juliet carry special force as Shakespearean names and also as "Romeo and Juliet," a brand dependent upon the appearance of both names. The CSS edition of *Romeo and Juliet* imagines the couple as the gatekeepers of semantic certainty, with an exercise sparked by Juliet's discussion of Romeo's name encouraging students to speculate about "what would happen if you went around calling things by different names (for example, try calling 'school' 'restaurant' and so on)" (*Romeo and Juliet* 2nd Edition 54). This improvisatory freedom seems designed to lead students to the conclusion that things are better off named as they are, an observation they are encouraged to extend to their own identities: "Choose a new name, perhaps from a different ethnic group, and talk together about what would happen if you insisted on being called that new name at home, at school, and elsewhere" (54). It is not just language that *Romeo and Juliet* polices here but identity, suggesting the narrow range of identities that "Romeo and Juliet" has come to signify. Derrida discusses the central importance of naming in *Romeo and Juliet* in "Aphorism Countertime," arguing that although Juliet asks Romeo to doff his name, the fact that she must address him *through* his name indicates that she understands the inescapable nature of language: "She knows it: detachable and dissociable, aphoristic though it be, his name is his essence" (178). Derrida explores the "double survival" of Romeo and Juliet, both through the ability of the characters to survive each other, if only momentarily, and their survival through language, through future iterations of *Romeo and Juliet*:

Another series, which cuts across all the others: the name, the law, the genealogy, the double survival, the contretemps, in short the aphorism of *Romeo and Juliet*. Not of Romeo and Juliet, but of *Romeo and Juliet*, Shakespeare's play of that title. It belongs to a series, to the still-living palimpsest, to the open theater of narratives which bears this name. It survives them, but they also survive thanks to it (182-183).

When Derrida talks about *Romeo and Juliet*, he is really talking about Romeo and Juliet still, the focus of his essay and the characters whom have been semantically yoked together. While it is possible for the “Anjelica” that Capulet calls for in 4.2 to be represented by his wife, the nurse or an otherwise anonymous maid in modern productions, the idea of a play called “Romeo and Ethel, the Pirate’s Daughter” is comically inconceivable in *Shakespeare in Love*. The force of Romeo’s and Juliet’s semantic pairing is testified by several of the examples that Garber discusses: “the Romeo and Juliet effect” a psychological term in the 1970s to describe the impact of parental interference and young love and “the Romeo and Juliet Law,” introduced in several American states in the perimillennial period to punish teenage lovers who had consensual sex when one of the pair was a minor (*Shakespeare and Modern Culture* 57-58). Although “Romeo” continues to get some mileage alone, it is the hash-tag for “Romeo and Juliet” that gets the most hits on Twitter.⁶⁸ An examination of popular uses of #RomeoandJuliet (a way for Twitter users to group their tweet with other tweets referring to the same phenomenon and make it more accessible to the general public) illustrates the manner in which “Romeo and Juliet” have become a shorthand for young heterosexual Western love. Several of the most popular tweets parody or challenge this status: “Forget about Romeo and Juliet, forget about Edward and Bella, the perfect love story I want to make is our own, You and I. ♥” (Damn It’s True); “True romance isn’t Romeo and Juliet who died together but grandpa and grandma who grew old together ♥” (Larra Solis); “I don’t want what Romeo and Juliet had, I want what Khadija and Mohamed had ♥” (MariamHazem). The latter tweet highlights the inability of #RomeoandJuliet to speak to a range of identities, compounded by some adjectives added to “Romeo and Juliet,” “gay”

⁶⁸ John O’Connor discusses the shifting use of “Romeo” in the twentieth century in “Shakespearean Afterlives: Ten Characters with a Life of their Own”.

(huffpostgay) and “Middle Eastern” (Ali Abunimah) suggesting the narrow precision of #RomeoandJuliet. Romeo’s and Juliet’s life on Twitter was capitalized upon by The Royal Shakespeare Company, whose 2010 production “Such Tweet Sorrow” unfolded across YouTube and Twitter. These references accentuate Derrida’s point about Romeo’s and Juliet’s inability to doff their names or escape from language and also suggest the inability of *Romeo and Juliet* to escape from Romeo and Juliet.

The prominence of Romeo and Juliet within *Romeo and Juliet* is emphasized by the endings of many contemporary productions and indeed Romeo’s linguistic inevitability also ties him to his tragic fate: he can have no other name, for his name must rhyme with “woe” to satisfy the tragic completion of the final rhyming couplet. If some of the tweets above suggest a resistance to the tragic inevitability of “Romeo and Juliet,” a similar tendency can also be traced in modern productions. In “Absent Bodies, Present Voices: Performance Work and the Close of Romeo and Juliet’s Golden Story,” Barbara Hodgdon looks at the endings of *Romeo and Juliet* in contemporary performance history and notices a trend towards extreme editing in the fifth act: once the lovers expire, many productions barrel through the reconciliation of the families, often omitting the Friar’s speech and the testimony of Balthasar and Paris’s page. Hodgdon contends that the lingering impressions of contemporary productions are of the two lovers, citing the gold statues of Michael Bogdanov’s 1986 production and Trevor Nunn’s 1976 production where Juliet awoke before Romeo died. Hodgdon argues that these “golden images” eclipse the ensuing events in the plays, seeming to “override these last emphases and to crystallize both the plays’ events and the spectator’s experience” (348); although dead, Romeo and Juliet survive through transmutation, enshrined in golden sculpture and memories. Effectively, these productions mitigate the cathartic close of Shakespeare’s play (where the tragic death of the lovers brings

communal healing and reconciliation between the families) for a different “happy ending,” one contingent upon the survival of the lovers in an eternal image (their death embrace) and language (their twinned names).

This alternative ending can be seen in the ways in which productions edit summaries of the play, both in the YouTube five-minute versions discussed in Chapter Two (all of which end with the lovers’ deaths and omit the familial reconciliation) and the summaries of the play in Royal Shakespeare Company programs. An analysis of these summaries from the 1958 to 2010 supports Hodgdon’s story and speaks to the way in which the doomed romance of the teenage tragedy eclipsed communal healing as the ultimate message of productions. The last sentence of the 1958 summary contrasts the fated nature of the helpless lovers with the resilience of their families: “Over the dead bodies of the ‘star-cross’d’ lovers the families vow to be reconciled” (*Romeo and Juliet 1958 Program*). Significantly, productions from the 1970s onward depart from this formula, either refusing this definitive ending, ending the description of the play with the death of the lovers or including the reconciliation of the families but in terms that foreground the lovers’ worth rather than their helplessness.⁶⁹ The 1976 program actually uses free indirect discourse to situate the reader within Juliet’s perspective, emphasizing the importance of the deaths that Hodgdon notes: “Juliet wakes; too late; Romeo is dead” (*Romeo and Juliet 1976 program*). Although I would hesitate to place too much importance upon program summaries, it

⁶⁹ For example, the 1986 program summary refuses to summarize the entire play at all, ending after 2.6 with “But their families’ feud rages around them unabated....” (*Romeo and Juliet 1986 Program*); the 2008 and 2010 program summaries end with the deaths of the loves, with the summary for the 2008 performances for schools reading: “However, their first meeting is in fact only a few hours away - and by the early hours of Thursday morning, both of them will be dead” (*Romeo and Juliet 2008 program*); The 2004 program acknowledges the reconciliation but emphasizes the grief of the families and the role the lovers have in uniting them: “United at last in grief, the two families agree to end their feud and raise statues to their dead children” (*Romeo and Juliet 2004 program*)

is nonetheless noticeable that the story they tell of *Romeo and Juliet* shifts, to emphasize the tragic, perhaps transcendental, deaths of the lovers rather than the reconciliation of the families.

To summarize these points about *Romeo and Juliet* in the perimillennial period - their strong association with consumer culture through music; the fixity of “*Romeo and Juliet*”; the increased importance of their death embrace as the dominant signifier of productions - is to foreground the radical, indeed rebellious, ending of *Private Romeo*. Set in a modern American military academy where the male cadets move from reading *Romeo and Juliet* in class to enacting the story themselves, the film ends with Matt Doyle, its Juliet, singing “You Made Me Love You” direct to camera, effectively queering the tragic end of *Romeo and Juliet* and this popular song, by putting it in a gay context and changing “the brand o’kisses” of the Patsy Kline version it is modeled on to the “the kinda kisses” of other versions (Cline). *Private Romeo* also rebels against a tradition of gay Shakespeare, including Joe Callarco’s *R&J* which inspired it, by allowing its lovers to survive. Lanier argues that within modern popular culture, Shakespeare’s language became the code for “eccentrics, lunatics, over-achievers, intellectuals, aliens, losers, homosexuals, and, most importantly, villains” (*Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* 66). A quick survey of some of the canon of modern gay drama reveals multiple uses of Shakespeare as a secret code between gay characters and as a tragic script to determine their doom. In Roger Gellert’s *Quaint Honor* (1958), rehearsing a scene from *Richard III* allows a predatory public schoolboy to woo his male Lady Anne: Shakespeare’s language becomes a special code through which the characters can communicate covert desires but it also serves as a tragic text that predicts the outcome of their affair. In Robert Anderson’s *Tea and Sympathy* (1953), Tom’s performance of Lady Macbeth leads to unfair accusations of his homosexuality while Tom in Tennessee Williams’s *The Glass Menagerie* (1945) is called Shakespeare by his fellow workers,

signaling both his status as a bookish outsider but also, perhaps, his sexual preferences. Amiri Baraka's *The Toilet* (1964), described as an "interracial West Side Story" (*Out on Stage* 290) uses *Romeo and Juliet*'s tragic model to ensure an unhappy end to the affection between white and black male teenagers. In Edward Albee's *The Goat* (2000), its gay teenager is associated with Shakespeare through a bizarre chain of nomenclature: Billy's name, which is like billygoat associates him with the central goat, whose name, Sylvia, is explicitly tied to *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Like the somewhat disturbing equations that characters in the play make between bestiality and homosexuality, Shakespeare is used to indirectly associate gay teenage sex with perversion, an association is compounded by *The History Boys*, where being gay means a continual struggle against pedophilia. As well as casting a gay teenager as the adoring Edgar to his teacher's Lear in a spontaneous class reading, Bennett includes Shakespeare with the dangerous queer practices of the Renaissance, dismissed by the Headmaster: "Fuck the Renaissance. And fuck literature and Plato and Michaelangelo and Oscar Wilde and all the other shrunken violets you people line up" (53). I bring up this catalogue of Shakespeare's underexplored role in modern gay theatre to highlight the ways in which Shakespeare serves as a normative and disciplinary force, limiting subversive gay uses of Shakespeare's language to stories which must end tragically. This is the script that Joe Callarco's *R&J* (1997) follows: the discovery of a copy of *Romeo and Juliet* is liberatory for four preparatory school students in 1950s America, with Shakespeare's language allowing them to express their secret love. However this code must end tragically, conforming to the script of *Romeo and Juliet* and confirming the stereotype of mainstream gay theatre, where gay characters must inevitably be miserable or punished (de Jongh 3). It is against this tradition that *Private Romeo* rebels and it is

within this context that I'd like to situate *Romeo and Juliet*, as a critical text for the interrogation of Shakespeare, teenagers and sexuality.

Romeo and Juliet is also used to police gender as well as sexuality. As many of the YouTube parodies drastically restricted Juliet's role in the diminished emphasis given to Acts Two and Four of the play, *Twilight* follows a similar pattern to *Dating Hamlet*, using access to Shakespeare's language as a code that redirects female character's intellectual ambitions towards romantic consumerism.

Thus with a kiss I live forever: Teenagers, Twilight and the Vampire Afterlife of Romeo and Juliet.

*These violent delights have violent ends
And in their triumph die, like fire and powder
Which, as they kiss, consume
(New Moon, unpaginated, original orientation.)*

The epigraph from Stephanie Meyer's *New Moon* is doubly duplicitous, slyly re-punctuating language from *Romeo and Juliet* into a more contemporary form and promising violent ends which the story fails to deliver. The first sleight of hand is perhaps rather minor: commas are inserted after "Which" and "kiss" and the text is centered on the page.⁷⁰ Such editing goes somewhat beyond the usual changes made to update punctuation in Shakespeare texts: slowing down the rhythm of the speech, simplifying the syntax for a teenage reader and most importantly, isolating the *romantic* union of fire and powder. Furthermore, this epigraph is a curious sort of trailer for what follows in the novel, which Meyer loosely sculpted around the

⁷⁰ The Norton facsimile of F1 reads: 'These violent delights haue violent endes,/And in their triumph:die like fire and powder;/Which as they kisse consume.'; Q2 reads 'These violent delights haue violent endes,/And in their triumph die like fier and powder:/Which as they kisse consume.' I have replaced "[j]" with "s."

structure of *Romeo and Juliet*. While promising sex and violence, the book delivers neither; fangs tease rather than penetrate and the “violent ends” that Friar Lawrence ominously predicts are transformed from their tragic realization in *Romeo and Juliet* into the happy comedic resolution of the Twilight series. From the start, *New Moon* treats *Romeo and Juliet*’s language and tragic status as negotiable, re-fashioning both to reject a vision of the lovers as rebels in favor of a version where they become the ultimate romantic consumers, with the absence of a period after “consumes” above a revealing, if probably accidental, hint at the endless consumption afforded to Romeo and Juliet who can never die.

New Moon’s treatment of this process is different from *Dating Hamlet*’s because of its treatment of Shakespearean pedagogy: functioning as both a modern retelling of *Romeo and Juliet* and a work where contemporary teenagers encounter the play in a school setting, *New Moon* repurposes Shakespeare’s language through double reply to create a special romantic code. This romantic code is also different from the Actors of Work’s presentation of Shakespeare’s language as the language of love, with fictional teenage characters using double reply to share specialized readings of Shakespeare’s language with a teenage implied reader. Chris Weitz’s film version, *The Twilight Saga: New Moon*, offers a good example of this process. In a class on *Romeo and Juliet*, Edward proves his superior knowledge of Shakespeare by reciting some of Romeo’s lines from 5.3, the camera slowly panning down the aisle towards him, as every head turns to hear him. After Edward’s perfect delivery, the teacher snaps “Eyes on the screen, people,” returning the class’ attention to “proper” Shakespeare, the legitimate BBC film version. Edward’s delivery of Romeo’s lines communicates in two registers: to the teacher and the classroom, it indicates his understanding of Shakespeare, but to Bella and the implied viewer, it communicates both Edward’s position as a Romeo figure and his superiority over the teacher -

as an eternal teenage vampire, Edward has had to sit through countless classes on *Romeo and Juliet*. It is the reading of Edward as modern Romeo that the film endorses, with the extra-diegetic music providing the sentiment that Robert Pattinson's delivery lacks and the camera's movement focalizing the spectator's gaze through the enraptured students. This adult-mediated appropriation of double reply responds rebelliously to Shakespeare in one sense, as Edward is clearly talking back to the authority figure of the teacher, but ultimately uses Shakespeare's language as a romantic code that legitimates the regressive gender politics of Meyer's series.

Situating *New Moon* amid other perimillennial appropriations of Shakespeare marketed for teenage girls tells a disturbing story, with Shakespeare's language the medium through which teenage girls exchange intellectual fulfillment for romantic love. Hateley charts the gendered nature of appropriations of Shakespeare, demonstrating the different uses of several plays for male and female readers:

contemporary children's literature consistently appropriates Shakespeare the man as ideal father to boys, and absent father to girls; *Macbeth* as a (masculine) cautionary tale, or (feminine) model of self-policing; *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as a (masculine) liberatory narrative or (feminine) sexual morality tale; and *The Tempest* as a model of (masculine) future authority, but (feminine) future limitation" (188).

Several of the novels that Hateley discusses use Shakespeare's language as a way of gendering subjects, with male characters provided access to the fantastic discourse of Shakespeare's language that propels their adventures and female characters re-encoding Shakespeare's words as romantic. The pedagogical strategies discussed in chapters one and two, particularly performance-based pedagogies, become repurposed to fuel the romantic plots of these novels. Catherine MacPhail's *Another Me* provides a useful example from England. Cast as Lady Macbeth in a school play, heroine Fay moves from resistance to Shakespeare's language ("Why couldn't they just talk like real people") through grudging acceptance to an eventual ability to

parody her lines (“All the perfumes of Arabia...couldn’t stop me”) (41; 144). When Fay is threatened by a supernatural doppelganger, Shakespeare’s words become crucial in defining herself in the most literal way: the real Fay uses lines from *Macbeth* as a secret code to prove her identity to love-interest Drew each morning. Considering Shakespeare’s use in romance novels, Laurie Osborne argues that “using Shakespeare as a shared language often signals the intellectual compatibility between hero and heroine” (50). However, here, Shakespeare is troublingly used to signal the intellectual inferiority of the heroine. As Hateley notes, “Shakespearean language and ideas are transferred to Drew,” a pattern noticeable in some of the other works she discusses.⁷¹ The self-definition through Shakespeare and capacity for parody (and thus, comprehension) that Fay develops is only possible through the intervention of Drew, who convinces her that the words aren’t that bad and offers the main reason to engage with Shakespeare. The novel culminates not with the performance of *Macbeth*, but with Fay’s success in kissing Drew; Lady Macbeth’s line is reworded rather ridiculously so that all the perfumes of Arabia couldn’t stop Fay kissing Drew. As a parody, this line is only partially successful, with the perfumes of Arabia surely having little interest in thwarting Fay’s romantic development. However, the sense of the line doesn’t matter as Fay has effectively used double reply to re-encode Shakespeare’s language as one with a highly specific personal meaning. As a fantastic discourse, Shakespeare’s language provides a true meaning for Fay in the turbulent time of adolescence, literally validating her identity and ensuring her smooth romantic development. Essentially, engagement with Shakespeare is a way for the girl to get her guy and while comprehension and appreciation of Shakespeare’s language is a side-product of this process, it is the means rather than the end.

⁷¹ See also Penni Russon’s *Undine* where Shakespeare’s language is translated for the heroine by her brainy male friend; Charlotte Calder’s *Cupid Painted Blind*, where the heroine swoons for a waiter adept at quoting *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and uses a school performance to seduce another student; and Zibby Oneal’s *In Summer Light*, where the heroine is schooled on *The Tempest* by her father and his graduate student, who she is attracted to.

I bring up *Another Me* and Hateley's argument to illustrate the damaging canon that *New Moon* is part of, one which uses Shakespeare's language as a naturalizing force to produce gendered subjects and minimize the intellects of female teenagers. Unlike other Shakespearean young adult appropriations, Meyer does not use Shakespeare to sell her series, but rather to lend cultural capital. Each of the four books in the series is very loosely based on a text that Bella encounters in school with *Pride and Prejudice*, *Wuthering Heights* and *The Merchant of Venice* both featuring and providing plot parallels for the other novels. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* also provides an epigraph and serves as a loose inspiration for *Breaking Dawn*, the final novel in the series. Exploring this wider Shakespearean connection reveals the way in which Meyer diverts tragedy towards comedy and re-imagines not just Juliet, but also Portia, as a submissive heroine who is intellectually inferior to the men around her.

Meyer's use of *Romeo and Juliet* initially seems to draw on the lovers' credentials as rebellious teenagers rather than stable romantic consumers. In "Paris," a central chapter in the novel, Bella reflects at length on the parallels between Romeo and Juliet and her own love life, as she is torn between Edward, her absent vampire boyfriend, and Jacob, her werewolf best friend. Considering Jacob as a Paris figure, Bella rejects the idea of a Romeo who would abandon Juliet and leave her to marry Paris:

I was reading too much into the story. Romeo wouldn't change his mind. That's why people still remembered his name, always twinned with hers: Romeo and Juliet. That's why it was a good story. "Juliet gets dumped and ends up with Paris" would never have been a hit (*New Moon* 371).

This meta-textual moment is fascinating, suggesting Meyer's own awareness that her franchise depends on the success of romantic over platonic love to be a hit with its teenage audience, confirmed by the large number of fans declaring their allegiance to "Team Edward" and coveting

Edward as the ideal boyfriend with one fan describing the series' appeal as "It's the idea of Edward...That's what it is...We want that. That's what we want!" (Audrey; Click; Behm-Morawitz 144). Glennis Byron argues that Bella rejects the almost-epiphany that she has in the Paris chapter to succumb to the transgressive appeal of rebellious love: "The call of romantic love is far stronger than that of comfortable companionship; being a modern Juliet, with all its accompanying dangers, is preferable to being an Emily settled down into domesticity" (184).

A climatic confrontation between Edward and Jacob foregrounds this choice, with Bella imagining her suitors as Shakespearean surrogates: "I remembered what had happened to Paris when Romeo came back. The stage directions were simple: *They fight. Paris falls*" (552, original emphasis). When Bella revisits this quotation moments later, there is a subtle change in punctuation: "*They fight; Paris falls*" (555, original emphasis). With idealized Edward as Romeo, Paris's fall is inevitable, the *therefore* of a semi-colon rather than the *then* of a full stop.⁷² Again, Shakespeare's words and punctuation are re-shaped to stress contemporary resonances and provide the allure of rebellious romance: as fire and powder kiss romantically in the epigraph, Paris must inevitably be defeated.

However, as the epigraph promises violent ends that the plot fails to deliver, so too is this tragic punctuation punctured by what actually transpires: this Paris doesn't really fall, but ends up as the lover to Bella and Jacob's vampire-human baby, a bizarre twist legitimated by the literally fantastic discourse of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The overall story that the Twilight series tells is not one where rebellious romantic love trumps companionship but rather where a dangerous love is sanitized, with Bella and Edward becoming happy parents and suburban consumers for infinity. This happy ending is partially achieved by Edward's usurpation of

⁷² The stage direction that Bella remembers is itself a modern interpolation, with neither Q2 or F1 mentioning Paris falling.

Romeo's language. Instead of the classroom scene where Edward recites Shakespeare, the book stages Bella and Edward's encounter with *Romeo and Juliet* in a domestic setting, as the couple watch the Zeffirelli *Romeo and Juliet* on television, suggesting their safe, suburban future. This activity is encouraged by Bella's teacher, who dismisses the other version that Bella has seen (presumably Luhrmann's) and authorizes Zeffirelli's as "the best" and essential viewing to "fully appreciate" *Romeo and Juliet* (11). Bella's enthusiasm for *Romeo and Juliet* is not shared by Edward or Alice, his vampire sister, who "snort[s]" at the idea of watching the movie and accuses Bella of already having the play "memorized" (11). Although Alice's resistance is partially in response to Bella using the film as an excuse not to celebrate her birthday, it is clear that Bella is the only one who has any interest in the play.

Bella's intellectual engagement with *Romeo and Juliet* and intense knowledge of Shakespeare's language crumbles as she watches it with Edward, who competes with the film for her attention. Perhaps unsurprisingly, a teenage vampire on the couch is worth more than any Romeos on screen; Leonards and Leonardos alike fail to compete with Edward's charms:

Edward sprawled across the couch while I started the movie, fast-forwarding through the opening credits. When I perched on the edge of the sofa in front of him, he wrapped his arms around my waist and pulled me against his chest. It wasn't exactly as comfortable as a sofa cushion would be, what with his chest being hard and cold - and perfect - as an ice sculpture, but it was definitely preferable. He pulled the old afghan off the back of the couch and draped it over me so I wouldn't freeze beside his body (16-17).

"Sprawled" over the couch, Edward controls the physical and emotional temperature of the room, ensuring that Bella is aware of his closeness as she watches the movie. While the opening credits are skipped, Edward's foreplay serves as a substitute, establishing who will be the real star. As the film begins, Edward is keen to stake out his status as true hero, criticizing Romeo as "a little fickle" and "not very brilliant" (17). Bella is torn between fealty to her real and fictional crushes: "Romeo was one of my favourite fictional characters. Until I'd met Edward, I'd sort of

had a thing for him” (17). Clearly, Edward has already won the battle: Bella’s feelings for Romeo are rather vague and superficial and the “sort of” thing she harbored for Romeo evaporates upon meeting Edward. Crucially, Edward’s usurpation of Romeo in her affections is achieved through his usurpation of Romeo’s language. Not only does Edward’s presence distract Bella from watching the movie, but when she does resume attention it is only because Edward has situated himself within the story:

The movie eventually captured my interest, thanks in large part to Edward whispering Romeo’s lines in my ear - his irresistible, velvet voice made the actor’s voice sound weak and coarse by comparison. And I did cry, to his amusement, when Juliet woke and found her new husband dead. ‘I’ll admit, I do sort of envy him here,’ Edward said, drying the tears with a lock of my hair. ‘She’s very pretty.’ He made a disgusted sound. ‘I don’t envy him the *girl* - just the ease of suicide,’ he clarified in a teasing tone. ‘You humans have it so easy! All you have to do is throw down one tiny vial of plant extracts...’ (17-18)

Edward’s voice drowns out Romeo’s, making Leonard Whiting’s voice appear “weak and coarse” (perhaps not too great a feat). When Bella cries over Romeo’s death, it is not for his loss, but in sympathy with Juliet’s plight: Romeo has been diminished from her favorite character to Juliet’s “new husband.” While Edward does acknowledge the rivalry between the pair, his mention of envy effectively transitions the conversation to his specific plight, that of being a vampire unable to commit suicide. Though death by the Volturi, the vampire nobility who live underground in Italy, is certainly as fantastical as sleeping potions, in the world of *New Moon*, this is the choice that has the greater tragic weight. Similarly, Bella immediately breaks from the real threat of sexualized violence with her vampire boyfriend (where her heart “drummed hyperactively”) to watch the movie, diminishing its violence through flippant language: “Let’s go watch the Capulets and Montagues hack each other up” (16). Meyer positions her fictional characters within an emotionally true and exhilarating world while Romeo and Juliet can only be fickle, insubstantial ciphers. Significantly, encountering the play through performance serves to

strip Shakespeare's language of its original meaning and instead encodes it as a romantic text with a special secret message that Bella shares with the implied reader.

Edward's eclipse of Romeo is cemented in the last section of the novel, when he claims Romeo's words as his own. As the plot increasingly mirrors *Romeo and Juliet* (falsely presuming Bella to be dead, Edward travels to Italy to kill himself), Edward quotes Romeo upon finding Bella in Italy: "His voice was like honey and velvet. '*Death, that hath sucked the honey of thy breath, hath had no power yet upon thy beauty,*' he murmured, and I recognized the line spoken by Romeo in the tomb" (452). The honey of Edward's own voice claims the line as his own rather than Romeo's and although Bella understands the line within its Shakespearean context it is its second meaning - its use as a romantic code - that is most important. Moreover, while the italics cast Shakespeare's language as unfamiliar and special, italics have been used throughout the book to reference remembered speech (most often Edward's or Jacob's) and to denote the telepathic communication between Bella and Edward. Bella imagines Edward's italicized words as text rather than speech: "the words ran through my head, tonelessly, like I was reading them rather than hearing them spoken" (160).⁷³ Thus, Edward triply appropriates Romeo's words through speech, sound and typography and having effectively supplanted Romeo in Bella's affections, moves towards a rapprochement with the character he has mocked: "I'll never criticize Romeo again" (508). *New Moon's* happy ending allows Edward not only the opportunity to appreciate Romeo but also to offer a better alternative to Romeo: a Romeo that survives, remaining forever young through vampiric life rather than tragic death. Equally, the tone in which Edward voices Romeo's line suggests honey and velvet, luxurious commodities, rather than a rebellious energy.

⁷³ See also *New Moon*, 358; 362; 418; 427

This luxury prepares Bella and Edward for their future as romantic consumers. As Edward is incredibly rich, (thanks to his sister's ability to predict the stock market) he is able to give Bella a fancy car, luxurious honeymoon and cosy cottage. Bella's energies are also directed from attending college to creating the perfect nuclear family, refusing to let anybody kill her vampire baby, even when it tries to eat her from inside, in a thinly-veiled pro-life argument. The Romeo and Juliet that Edward and Bella present demands a serious narrowing of the couple's range of meanings, with the pale and glittering Edward a more appropriate partner for Bella than the Native American Jacob and Meyer's overall story serving to drastically unqueer vampire narratives, with each of Edward's vampire siblings having an opposite sex partner to consume forever alongside. As "vegetarian" vampires, Edward and Bella continually hunt and strip the surrounding woods for meat: while this hunting is presented as sustainable, it nonetheless suggests an extreme anthropomorphic attitude (with Edward's civilized vampire the epitome rather than the antithesis of *humanity*) that allows humans to consume happily "forever and forever and forever" (*Breaking Dawn* 754).

Meyer explicitly positions this happy ending as a revision of Shakespearean tragedy, using two Shakespearean comedies as models to elide a tragic bloodbath:

I'm not the kind of person who writes a *Hamlet* ending. If the fight had happened, it would have ended with 90% of the combatants, Cullen and Volturi alike, destroyed. There was simply no other outcome once the fight got started, given the abilities and numbers of the opposing sides. Because I would never finish Bella's story on such a downer—*Everybody dies!*—I knew that the real battle would be mental... Alice tore a page from *The Merchant of Venice* because the end of *Breaking Dawn* was going to be somewhat similar: bloodshed appears inevitable, doom approaches, and then the power is reversed and the game is won by some clever verbal strategies; no blood is shed, and the romantic pairings all have a happily ever after.
 ("Frequently Asked Questions," original emphasis).

Replacing violent ends with a fairy tale happy-ever-after, Meyers positions her series as a reworking of Shakespearean tragedies, the privileged genre of School Shakespeare, and promotes Edward and Bella as an attractive comedic alternative to the tragic couple. Meyer's use of Shakespeare here, if not quite tragic, is rather depressing. Shakespeare provides the cultural capital to legitimize the regressive gender politics of the *Twilight* series: based on the existing "classic" narrative of *Romeo and Juliet*, *New Moon*'s ideologies are mendaciously inscribed within a longer history. With Bella imagined as Juliet, historically specific and rather sexist readings of Juliet (she swoons on a balcony pining for her Romeo) are naturalized. If Juliet's appearance on her iconic balcony might be defined by a capacity for critical thought, Bella's version of Juliet depends more upon modern misreadings of "wherefore, art thou Romeo": this is a Juliet searching for Romeo's location rather than one who interrogates his ontology. Bella also serves as a poor Portia and the "clever verbal strategies" that Meyer mentions are shifted to Edward and his father in the final book: Bella burns *The Merchant of Venice* after she discovers Alice's message and it is the patriarch of the Cullens who negotiates in the climactic scene, denying Bella the opportunity to channel Portia's eloquence. Despite Bella's increased superpowers once Edward turns her into a vampire, she is a principally a caregiver, replacing devotion to her father with idealization of her husband. As in *Another Me*, interaction with Shakespeare is primarily a means for female characters to sustain their relationships with their male heroes, limiting their initially independent encounter with Shakespeare that began in school.

Looking at the relationship between *Twilight* and Shakespeare in YouTube videos, reveals the complicity of teenage users in the construction of Bella and Edward as a superior version of *Romeo and Juliet*. Some *Twilight* fans have embraced Edward's and Bella's suggested

role as modern Romeo and Juliet figures, crafting YouTube videos that score stills or clips from the Twilight films and relating them to *Romeo and Juliet*, through mash-ups with the film versions, quotations from the play, and the addition of songs which reference *Romeo and Juliet* or of the piece entitled “Romeo and Juliet,” composed for the film of *New Moon* to underscore the School Shakespeare scene.⁷⁴ Many of these clips rewrite the tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet* by ending with Edward and Bella kissing (most frequently closing with a clip of them kissing at her fairy-tale prom or lying hand in hand on a meadow). Mrs. SUNNYGIRL’s video pits Edward and Romeo against each other, mashing clips from *Twilight* with footage from Luhrmann’s film, accompanied by Des’re’e’s “Kissing You.” Set up as a competition from the beginning with a “vs.” inserted between the two titles, the conclusion about the merits of the “two perfect men” is similar to that reached by *New Moon*: the video cuts from a shot of the determinedly dead Romeo and Juliet to its final image of a blissful Edward and Bella, side by side in a bucolic meadow as Des’re’e swoons “I’m Kissing You.” As Romeo and Juliet fade, Edward and Bella kiss and kiss. Shakespeare’s language also makes an appearance in videos, sometimes the epigraph from *New Moon*, sometimes as the excerpt from Romeo’s final speech that Edward delivers in the film version. Skyskert’s video uploads this quotation from 5.3 against a black background dotted with stars, using Shakespeare as a fantastic discourse, a universal language that hangs freely against the backdrop of the universe. However, Shakespeare’s words do not have a universal meaning, but a very specific one and are effectively re-coded as Edward’s words here: the “Romeo and Juliet” score from Twilight accompanies the video and the text is centered and re-punctuated, in a similar fashion to the epigraph from *New Moon*. Another video by jedishm2 takes this even further, using the zephyr font that brands “Twilight” for the

⁷⁴ Some parodies of Romeo and Juliet for school assignments also explicitly use Twilight as an inter-text, such as ML Wolfie’s 2012 “Twilight: Romeo and Juliet Edition” on YouTube.

quotations from the epitaph (which follows Meyer's re-punctuation) and Romeo's/Edward's speech from 5.3, which is similarly centered, broken out of verse and plays as scrolling white text against a black background. The one commentator for this video comments on the font rather than the quotation: "Thanks - i had been looking everywhere for that! what font is the text in - it's the proper twilight 1 and its really cool." These commentators are concerned not with "proper" Shakespeare but with "proper" Twilight and the process by which Edward and Bella supplant Romeo and Juliet extends to the coding and typography of Shakespeare's language.⁷⁵

*"The World is Broad and Wide": Romeo + Juliet beyond "Romeo and Juliet."*⁷⁶

In this section, I will explore an alternative to this perimillennial vision of Romeo and Juliet as romantic consumers, examining *Romeo + Juliet* and its appearances on YouTube. I argue that Luhrmann's film provides visual and acoustic material that teenagers use to create visions of the lovers as romantic consumers, but that the film also facilitates and indeed *suggests* a version of the central couple as countercultural rebels, set in opposition to the media-saturated world that they are imagined in. I contend that Luhrmann presents Romeo and Juliet as rebels because of their distinctive relationship with language and the special soundtrack composed for them, music that is especially useful in articulating their rebellion through a version of excellent dumb discourse that *plays* with and around Shakespeare's language. I also attend to Balthasar's focalizing role in this film, positing that he articulates a queer subject position and serves a *dumb*

⁷⁵ Although jedishm2 does care about textual fidelity enough to add a note acknowledging that he/she has cut out a portion of this speech: "It should be: And shake the yoke of inauspicious stars from this world-wearied flesh" (jedishm2).

⁷⁶ *Romeo and Juliet* 3.3. 16.

teen, a textually marginalized but visually prominent character, used throughout the film to orient spectators emotionally.

Shakespeare's language is very clearly tied to consumer culture in this film, as many critics have noted. In the hyper-kinetic visual and acoustic environment of Luhrmann's Verona Beach, "Shakespeare" is "sutured into the world of advertising and thus within the wider world of film, music and video" as W.B. Worthen puts it ("Drama, Performance and Performativity" 1104).⁷⁷ While Luhrmann sees the saturation of signs as educational, "modern day images and equivalents that could decode the language of Shakespeare" Worthen questions the transparency of such decoding, noting that "like 'sword' the word and the pistol it labels, text and image stand in a dialectical relation of difference" ("Audio Commentary"; "Drama, Performance and Performativity" 1104). It takes an imaginative leap to accept the "swords" as pistols and to decode the language of the film. Furthermore, when the suturing of Shakespeare's language into this fabric principally involves its appearance on commodities (the guns) and on billboards (such as Prospero's whisky, which promises "Such stuff as dreams are made of") this decoding is also part of the film's complex relationship within and criticism of consumer culture. Crucially, while adults are complicit in the production of these signs and this differently coded Shakespeare, it is the youth of Verona Beach who are fluent in reading it. One of the billboard signs suggests this point wittily, with a billboard on a skyscraper announcing that the space is "Retail'd to posterity by Montague Construction," using Prince Edward's impression of the Tower of London from *Richard III*.⁷⁸ Loehlin applauds this touch, noting that "by using 'retail'd' in its modern capitalist sense, and applying the doomed prince's words to one of Montague's hastily erected skyscrapers rather than the Tower of London, Luhrmann's film neatly pinpoints a postmodern world of

⁷⁸ The full quotation from *Richard III* is: "But say, my lord, it were not registered,/Methinks the truth should live from age to age,/As 'twere retailed to all posterity/Even to the general all-ending day" (3.1 75-78).

transience and consumption, where truth lives not from age to age, nor even from minute to minute, but only in a Jamesonian perpetual present” (“Baz Luhrmann’s Millennial Shakespeare” 135). It is not just the skyscraper that is retailed to posterity here, but Shakespeare’s language: Luhrmann’s film was explicitly marketed to a teenage audience and it is the young generation that can appreciate this capitalist use of retail’d and the frenetic camera close-up to the billboard, even if it is only within the momentary minute of popular culture.

This possession extends to the speaking of Shakespeare’s language in this film. While many critics were quick to decry the standard of verse-speaking, the modern cadences are clearly intentional rather than accidental, a project established by the film’s opening sequence, which re-sounds the iambic beat of the chorus as mechanical newspeak. Luhrmann praises di Caprio’s verse speaking in terms that recall Gibson’s, commenting that di Caprio used his “meticulous education” with the text to embrace it and “make it his own” (“Audio Commentary”). This filtering of iambic pentameter through the rhythms of contemporary teenage speak communicated differently across generations. Albanese reports a revealing friction between her reading of the engagement with Shakespeare’s language and her students. Albanese sees language in *Romeo + Juliet* as irrevocably commodified and denied a serious treatment, claiming that the film “does not propose the text as a site for a genuinely critical engagement” (111). In a footnote, Albanese acknowledges that her students disagree with this interpretation:

My students would argue with me that the love scenes between Romeo and Juliet are the exceptions to my rule: as one put it, ‘What would the film even mean if they weren’t sincere?’ Still, I think this response speaks more to the investment in pure romance my students bring to the film than to the film’s representation of that romance. For me the scenes function merely as telling points of semiotic difference, not unlike the pale skin tones given to the lovers (160).

Without making assumptions about Albanese’s age in relation to her students or valorizing either of these readings, this anecdote suggests some of the different readings of the “semiotic

difference” between Romeo and Juliet and the world they inhabit. Certainly, this difference allows for a romantic reading, one clearly visible in some of the YouTube videos I will discuss, but the “sincerity” that one of Albanese students brings up also suggests a rebellious reading of Romeo and Juliet, with the pair articulating sincerity in contrast with a commodified world, daring to *mean* through Shakespeare’s words.

If the youth of Verona can decode the array of signs confronting them, they do not necessarily endorse them, with Romeo and Juliet pointedly removed from consumer culture and the sounds and signs of Verona Beach. Insulated in protective visual spaces (the elevator, swimming pool, bed sheets, solemn Church) their scenes together are afforded an unusual degree of silence for the film and the music that plays while they are alone is soft and reflective, sounding their inner solemnity or empathetic extra-diegetic music, most often Des’ree’s “Kissing You” or the “Slow Movement” theme, which frequently emerges from Des’ree’s song.⁷⁹ Conversely, the music used outside of Romeo’s and Juliet’s scenes is often used anempathically, with the song that pumps from the Montague Boys car, One Inch Nail’s “A Pretty Piece of Flesh,” at odds with Romeo’s mood as he leaves the Capulet party. Pamela Swanigan argues that reading *Romeo + Juliet* as akin to an MTV video mischaracterizes the film, usefully dividing the music’s soundtrack into its uses for fragmentation and assimilation. Through fragmentation, much of the music complements the dialectical process that Worthen describes between text and image, often triggering “a stringent intellectual effort” in spectators (14). Swanigan argues that the music’s empathetic music, used for assimilation, is connected to the lovers, claiming that the repeated extra-diegetic and empathetic use of “Slow Movement” and “Kissing You” “makes

⁷⁹ Radiohead’s “Talk Show Host” plays under Romeo’s poetry writing in 1.2 and Juliet’s epithaleum is underscored with Stina Nordenstrom’s plaintive “Little Star”; *In Unheard Melodies: Narrative Film Music*, Claudia Gorbman distinguishes between “empathetic” music, which underscores a character’s emotions and “anempathetic” music which is indifferent towards the action or clashes with the mood (159).

untenable at least one reading of the film: Luhrmann is not mocking love, and he is not playing Romeo and Juliet's relationship for comedy. He is honoring it with musical beauty" (17).

Swanigan includes Radiohead's "Talk Show Host" as part of the music associated with Romeo and Juliet, arguing that although it does not feature all that prominently in the film, (accompanying Romeo's introduction in Verona Beach and later in Mantua) its use to accompany every item on the DVD menu provides a "consistent musical frame that the cinematic version lacks" and changes the function of this piece, and of Radiohead's music generally, within the film as a whole (15). While I agree with Swanigan's assessment, this distinction belies important differences *within* the empathetic music: the association of Radiohead with countercultural rebellion and of "Kissing You" with romantic consumerism.

This tension within the empathetic use of music is especially pronounced at the end of the film, which both conforms to and subverts Hodgdon's observation about the endings of modern productions of *Romeo and Juliet*. Like Nunn and the Victorians before him, Luhrmann allows Juliet to wake before Romeo dies, giving them a prolonged and poignant last scene together. After Juliet shoots herself with Romeo's "sword," the camera pans slowly upwards as a "greatest hits" montage from the couple's cocooned courtship plays - their meeting through a fish-tank; dawn-tumble in Juliet's white sheets; underwater plunge - until the camera is impossibly far from the lovers and we seem to be looking up at a beautiful fresco rather than down at a blood-stained tragedy. Hodgdon reads this as another "golden image," arguing that "at the centre of their own jeweled ornery, they appear as a treasured artifact, a pair of saintly pilgrims joined in eternal embrace" (*William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet: Everything's Nice in America* 97). As the *liebstd* from Wagner's *Tristan und Isolde* plays softly, the camera freezes on a final "golden image" from their "greatest hits": Romeo and Juliet kissing in the swimming pool,

preserved in the luminous underwater world that is theirs alone. However, the film does not end here. This shot fades to white to reveal a grainy present: Romeo and Juliet ensheathed in body bags and carted into separate ambulances; their weathered parents' crumpled faces; a phalanx of reporters. Loehlin captures the pessimism of the moment:

Luhmann's film offers neither the orderly reconciliation of Zeffirelli's ending, nor the distancing irony of Michael Bogdanov's stage version...the deaths of Luhmann's Romeo and Juliet bring no resolution; they become merely another lurid image for a media-besotted culture, body-bagged victims in a grainy news video, as the film returns to the newscast framework of the opening. The bland anchorwoman recites the closing words of the epilogue, then moves on to the next story as the TV screen dissolves in static snow (Loehlin 130).

However, as Hodgdon notes, the "golden image" of the entwined lovers endures and creates a "double ending" of sorts, letting Luhrmann have it both ways. Though Luhrmann shot much of the final reconciliation scene between the families, he left it on the editing floor, confirming Hodgdon's reading by conceding that at this point "it's all about Romeo and Juliet" (*Romeo+Juliet* Director's Commentary).

The music that plays over the credits performs a similar double ending. After the television screen is absorbed in a cinematic black hole, the strains of Radiohead's "Exit Music (for a film)" fill the space as the credits roll. The strangled sounds of Thom Yorke's voice, while hard to discern, articulate a determination to endure "Today we escape...we escape...Breathe...keep breathing" and as the song reaches a crescendo, its rebellious message is clear: "We hope your rules and wisdom choke you/Now we are one/In everlasting peace/We hope that you choke...that you choke" ("Exit Music (for a Film)").⁸⁰ Though this assures an

⁸⁰ As Swanigan notes, it is uncertain when this song within the narrative of *Romeo and Juliet*. The song seems at once to imagine an alternative narrative for Romeo and Juliet (starting with Romeo telling Juliet to pack her bags before her father finds them, perhaps in 3.5) and also to acknowledge their fate within Shakespeare's play. Swanigan argues that the song's uncertain position, as the ending to the film or a moment outside of its time frame, means that its "indeterminate moods keep us uncertain whether to read the song as poignant in its futility (if we take Juliet already to be dead) or openly hopeful (if we believe that the song's position outside the diegetic world means that it has the power to rewrite)"(18).

“everlasting peace” for the lovers, this bitter indictment of adult authority also serves as a critique of the corporate culture that Montague and Capulet embody in this film. This association is made clear through an earlier use of Radiohead’s “Talk Show Host,” a similarly rebellious anthem: as Montague and his wife pass by in their limousine, Yorke blares “Nothing” over a medium close-up of Romeo, who is certainly oppositional to his parents. Associated with the liminal, countercultural spaces in the film (Verona Beach and Mantua), Radiohead serve as an appropriate coda that punctures the romanticism of the lovers’ “golden moments.” It is not rebellion that has the last word however, with “Exit Music for a film” fading into “Kissing You,” Des’ree’s lush romantic theme hallooing adolescent romance to reverberant audiences.

Teenagers proved especially receptive to the romance and rebellion of the film, with none of these sets of double endings proving ultimate for this film and *Romeo + Juliet* surviving as per Derrida’s formulation. Hodgdon and Loehlin offer a comprehensive survey of the interpretive communities created online in response to *Romeo + Juliet*, in 1996, something of a novelty. These fan sites offered fans (predominantly teenagers) standard features such as still captures from the film, sound clips and links to merchandise but they also proved an immersive and interactive experience, allowing visitors to “attend” Verona Beach school, play a “Do You Bite your Thumb at Me?” game and choose an alternative future for the lovers. In fact, *Romeo + Juliet* created a world as much as it created a version of *Romeo and Juliet*, making it closer to the immersive video games that Hutcheon sees as a new form of adaptation:

It is not that reading a print book and watching a film are not active, even immersive, processes. They clearly are. But that ‘something new and different’ was evident even in the grammar to which I had to resort: some adaptational strategies demand that we *show* or *tell* stories, but in others, we *interact with* them. The verbal transitivity of showing and telling had to be replaced by the prepositional engagement of the ‘with’ that signals something as physical and kinetic as it is cognitive and emotional (*A Theory of Adaptation* xx).

The interaction with *Romeo + Juliet* often saw teenage audiences creating alternate “happy endings” for the film. This mode of adapting *Romeo and Juliet* has been around since at least the 1660s but the interactivity of websites and games allowed teenagers to become participants in the world and to extend the world through time and space.⁸¹ One popular site was run by a teenage girl, “B” who restyled herself as “Juliet Montague,” her pseudonym suggesting a brighter future for that short-lived entity, promising a reconciliatory space where “Juliet Montague” need not be an oxymoron.⁸² As Angela Keam contends, Claire Danes’s Juliet “survives” through her fans and “extra-textual variables, such as her stardom and fan following, refract back onto this moment of cinematic death to create a sense of dissonance” (14). These examples - “Juliet Montague” living beyond a few hours; fans refusing to believe in the death of Danes’s Juliet - speak to the untimeliness of adapting *with* that Hutcheon discusses: fans are able to create alternate time-schemes, to rearrange the *fabula* of *Romeo + Juliet*, reordering clips so that their adaptations tell a different *sujet* and talk back to Shakespeare’s tragic end.

This *untimeliness* of *Romeo and Juliet* is a recurring theme in their appearances in popular music, from Dire Straits’ “lovestruck Romeo” who acknowledges that “the time was wrong” (qtd. in *Shakespeare and Modern Culture* 55) to Maria’s and Tony’s desire to carve out “a time for us” (Laurents et al. 201). For Derrida, this untimeliness makes Romeo and Juliet “the heroes of *contretemps* in our mythology” (170). As Derek Attridge explains, in French, “*contretemps*” has an additional meaning beyond the significance of an inopportune occurrence, also referring to “being ‘out of time’ or ‘off-beat’ in the musical sense, to a sense of bad or

⁸¹ In 1662, the book-keeper for Davenant’s company reported a tragicomic production of the play by James Howard (Levenson 18).

⁸² This website, *Romeo and Juliet, Pictures, News and Links*, is no longer active, but its archive is accessible through The *WayBackMachine* website.

wrong time, ‘counter-time’” (qtd. in *Philosophers on Shakespeare* 215). Derrida argues that language enables *contretemps* even as it tries to limit it, with proper nouns “cast like nets over time and space” but actually producing further *contretemps* as this objective measurement leads to misunderstandings. What is fascinating about adaptations of *Romeo + Juliet* on YouTube is that by breaking away from Shakespeare’s language they are able to depart from its tragic logic that demands that “Romeo” rhyme with “woe”; offbeat from Shakespeare’s tragic script, these videos rearrange scenes from the film to the tune of a *musical* code that ensures the lovers’ survival beyond the language of the play. This is another version of the double survival of “Romeo and Juliet” beyond *Romeo and Juliet* but it also suggests the dismantling of the tragic authority of *Romeo and Juliet*. MJiRock’s YouTube video uses clips from *Romeo+Juliet* accompanied by Taylor Swift’s “Love Story” to suggest a revisionary ending, with the final series of shots showing Romeo and Juliet getting married and ending with the pair kissing in the swimming pool. Commentators read her adaptation as a revision of *Romeo and Juliet*’s ending, expressing approval (“I love the happy ending”; “Glad this one has a happy ending”), dissatisfaction (“I’m not sure about the ending, I think part of the reason I like the play so much is the ending, and she changes it in the song”; “im just saying this song doesnt go with this movie at all, Romeo and Juliet is a tradgedy [sic] and this song is too happy”) and confusion (“but can some one tell me what happens in this movie? i only know what happens in the old shackspire virsion”; “But in the end they’re supposed to die I:<?”). These debates speak to the power of the final shots of YouTube adaptations, the close readings that YouTube viewers engage in and the power of this adaptation to dismantle “the old shackspire virsion,” whose ending one commentator knows but dismisses as irrelevant. While it is of course possible to imagine similar alternative endings of *Romeo and Juliet* that re-arrange Shakespeare’s language it is notable that

one of the popular YouTube *Romeo+Juliet* videos that uses text does so to authorize the tragic version of the story, fulfilling the promise that “A PAIR OF STARCROSS’D LOVERS/TAKE THEIR LIFE” by ending with their suicide and a sped-up version of the fresco sequence that denies its languid romanticism (Wildflowersfield); re-arranging *Romeo and Juliet* around Shakespeare’s language, these videos perhaps also wrest Romeo and Juliet from untimeliness and ensure that they are eternally “out of time.” It must be stressed that YouTube’s format does not demand linear viewing and often commentators direct viewers to specific seconds in videos, encouraging them to move to a specific moment and watch the video out of order.⁸³ Coupled with the “palimpsestuous intertextuality” of audiences who are encouraged by YouTube’s format to watch chains of related videos, the screen clearing as new mash-ups of similar footage takes its place, this mode of viewing allows for the extended survival of Romeo and Juliet (*A Theory of Adaptation* 21).

To read a sampling of YouTube adaptations of *Romeo + Juliet* in a linear fashion, as the commentators for MJiRock’s video do, reveals a resistance to Luhrmann’s coda which sees the lovers exit in bodybags and instead a romantic focus on the lovers who survive through “golden images.” If the videos do end with an acknowledgement of Romeo and Juliet’s death, it is with the “fresco” shot, with the pair serenely surrounded by a sea of candles, the blood on their foreheads tastefully out of view; Luhrmann’s footage of the lovers in body bags seems never to be used in these revisionary narratives. XOohLaLaxx’s video, which pairs *Romeo + Juliet* with “Can You Feel the Love Tonight?” from *The Lion King* (itself, a loose redaction of *Hamlet*) ends on a newspaper picture of Capulet and Montague shaking hands, underneath a headline

⁸³ For example, commentators on “Romeo and Juliet First Meeting Scene (1996)” point viewers to specific moments in the video: “0:38 this is Juliet that didnt get to sleep for the past 5 years..”; “what is your name in music 0:43 ...? please!!!”; “1.12, *Le dies*” (pollyaxoo).

“Reconciliation” shot, reclaiming the Friar’s fantasy montage as reality. Many of the videos replicate MJiRock’s treatment, ending with shots of the lovers in billowing bedsheets, kissing at their wedding, kissing on the elevator, kissing in the swimming pool. The official video for Des’ree’s “Kissing You,” which features too many shots of the diva herself and ends with paired shots of the separated lovers, is disassembled by YouTube users, replaced by ones which take the song’s title more seriously and almost always end with the lovers kissing. Margaret Atwood’s shrewd observation that all narratives, whatever their formal pyrotechnics share the same ending (“*John and Mary die. John and Mary die. John and Mary die.*”) must be modified here where instead of dying, Romeo and Juliet kiss and kiss and kiss (50, original emphasis).

While this romantic revision presents Romeo and Juliet as romantic consumers (the lyrics of “Kissing You” and “Love Story,” two of the most popularly used songs, connecting the couple with a love of material things), *Romeo+Juliet* also supplies the materials for a rebellious reading of the central pair, with footage set to Radiohead’s “Exit Music (for a film)” telling a different story. AllyBazaar’s “Romeo and Juliet - Songs is Exit Music for a film by Radiohead” works as an inverse to the “Kissing You” videos, starting with the couple’s wedding and golden images and ending with the shots of the body-bagged couple, the bleary Montagues and Capulets and the television screen fading into bleak blackness. The countercultural message of the song is accentuated by editing, which pairs the aggressive “We hope that you choke” with shots of the haggard leaders of corporations, Montague and Capulet. bliargh’s use of this song accompanies Romeo’s walk into the tomb and the fresco shot, but without the snapshots of golden moments, which have been purposefully edited out. This version is closer to Luhrmann’s original concept of the ending: the montage of golden images was added after test screenings, as executives encouraged Luhrmann to soften the blow of the end (Pam Cook 79). Clearly, some viewers

prefer the darker *Romeo + Juliet* and Luhrmann's film allows them to select from its pair of double endings, visual and acoustic; if most viewers interact with the romantic consumer ending, there is still the possibility for Romeo and Juliet to be rebels, speaking through Radiohead rather than Shakespeare to express their opposition to teenage culture. Similar rebellious material is found in the character of Balthasar, whose role is greatly amplified in *Romeo + Juliet* to suggest the continuation of Romeo's rebellious energies and to hint at a queer subject position.

The Dumb Teen: Balthasar in Romeo and Juliet

After killing Tybalt, Di Caprio's Romeo looks understandably disheveled: crimson streaks his cheeks, sand and dirt grime his white shirt and rain drenches his anguished face. As he's been through a beach brawl, a car crash and an intense rain-soaked shootout, certain sartorial slips are inevitable. However, when his faithful "valet" speeds up beside him, Jesse Bradford's Balthasar sports a mirroring scar on his right cheek. Where does this scar come from? Balthasar is present for the fight of 3.1 (in Luhrmann's version at least, which greatly amplifies Balthasar's textual role from his Act 5 appearance) but as an observer not a participant. While it's credible that Balthasar sustained this scar in the speed of his pursuit, it's a little odd that it appears in the exact same spot as Romeo's.⁸⁴ A shot from 5.1 emphasizes this, framing Di Caprio and Bradford together, with Di Caprio's right cheek angled to the camera in profile so that the matching wounds of both are visible and they appear scar twins. It almost seems as if Balthasar's scar sprouts up sympathetically, a kind of stigmata that shows his devotion to his hero's suffering; as if the scar is a designer accessory, the perfect way to purchase teen angst.

⁸⁴ It's also possible that this scar was sustained before the brawl (as it seems to be present in 3.1) but whenever it emerges, the crucial point is that it does emerge (it is clearly not present during the wedding sequence in 2.6) and that it does so without explanation.



Fig 1: Balthasar (Jesse Bradford) and Romeo (Leonardo di Caprio) as Scar Twins. *Romeo + Juliet* (1996).

This sudden scar serves in some ways to explain Balthasar's role in *Romeo + Juliet*, where he is reworked as an important emotional filter for the audience as what I call a *dumb teen*, a marginal young figure who is a silent but visually prominent presence throughout a production.⁸⁵ If Balthasar's scar is purchased, it is not with money but with suffering: like Romeo and Juliet, Balthasar is removed from the consumer culture that defines Verona. Balthasar occupies a unique space in the film: most often clothed in simple T-shirt and jeans he lacks the flamboyant fashions of the other Montague boys. Noting the incongruity of a page in a modern setting, Craig Pearce and Luhrmann describe Balthasar as a "young kid" who "idolizes Romeo, but he's poor, one of the downtown kids" ("Audio Commentary"). The Connecticut-born Bradford is hard to read as a "local kid" in the Mexico which stands in for Verona Beach, with his whiteness highlighted when he is flanked by two teenagers of color for the reaction

⁸⁵ I use "dumb" here to mean "mute" and to contain some pejorative charge, as the figures of dumb teens are inserted by adults to ascribe meaning to teenage silence.

shots of 3.1. Albanese notes the problematic racial politics of Luhrmann's film, which exploited the cheap shooting conditions in Mexico, arguing that "the surplus value for *Romeo + Juliet* - its comparative success as a film commodity at the moment of its appearance - that Mexico City makes possible is extracted from the exoticized bodies of performers to whom I've already alluded: Leguizamo's Tybalt and Perrineau's Mercutio, in particular, endow the movie with the stylistic effects of its aspirations to the global postmodern" (108). The non-white children and teenagers who appear in reaction shots in Verona Beach might also be considered part of the surplus value of this film. If Balthasar stands out from this group, distinguished by his central position and his extra close-ups, it is because he is not really being read as a local Mexican kid (in this Verona which also recalls American and Australian cities) but as a white point of identification for the audience; like the digitally-added clouds and the fake palm trees, his presence is a sort of special effect, an imported actor amidst seemingly local extras. Balthasar's special status - poor, but not an exoticised other - allows him to serve an important role as an empathetic node for the audience. Christian Metz distinguishes primary and secondary identification in cinema: primary identification is when the audience identifies with the camera (in its gaze or point of view shots) while secondary identification sees the audience identifying with a character of emphatic choice, one signaled as emotionally significant but whose point of view is not necessarily shared by the camera (qtd. in Clover 7). Balthasar serves as figure of secondary identification in *Romeo + Juliet*, appearing at critical moments within the story to serve as a kind of empathic node, directing the audience's admiration and sympathy.

This admiration is particularly directed towards the Romeo he "idolizes," turning Balthasar into a rebellious figure who also has access to Romeo's sensitivity and romantic side. Where as much of the gazing in *Romeo + Juliet* seems predatory or sexualized (the Nurse ogles

Romeo as he changes; the security guard smiles at a dripping Juliet; Mercutio's gaze contains a homoerotic charge), Balthasar's admiration of Romeo seems purely platonic. It is Balthasar, not Mercutio or Benvolio, who serves as this Romeo's Best Man, allowing him privileged access to one of the couple's sacred spaces. The contented head turn that Balthasar makes towards Romeo as Juliet walks down the aisle illustrates one of the frequent ways in which he is used: the camera cuts immediately to a shot of a smiling Juliet. In a way, Balthasar sees Juliet through Romeo's eyes here, acting as a surrogate for the viewer, a gaze that is both appreciatory and envious of the lovers' bond. It's also a safe gaze that allows viewers to "idolize" the rebel Romeo in a non-threatening way, allowing space for heterosexual male adolescent teens to appreciate the story without relinquishing their masculinity. While Balthasar becomes a sensitive observer of events, he's also *cool*, performing a range of choreographed routines with Romeo: catching keys and blazers, pounding fists and bounding over car bonnets.

Over the course of the film, Balthasar develops from the younger kid hanging out with the rich cool kids at the pool hall (snagging a drag of Romeo's cigarette and living vicariously through their exploits) to the scarred and sensitive observer who acts as confidant to an increasingly isolated Romeo. In the opening scene at the pool hall, Balthasar literally spells out meanings to the audience, mischievously writing Rosaline's name and an arrow-pierced heart on the blackboard to explain Romeo's dialogue. Later, Balthasar evolves from this decoder of perfunctory plot to an interpreter of emotional moments. As well as observing Romeo's wedding, Balthasar is also a key witness to Mercutio's death, the event that tips the film towards tragedy. After Tybalt shoves Romeo into the "backstage" area of the ruined proscenium theatre, Luhrmann cuts to a shot of Balthasar, followed by two younger extras, racing to observe the scene. A panting Balthasar seems winded by the intensity of the encroaching storms,

metrological and emotional, that encircle Verona Beach and a further two close-ups of Balthasar in this sequence suggest a growing maturity: there is no desire to replicate these moves, nothing seductive about the bloody violence on display. Certainly, many figures are singled out in close up in this sequence (including an array of local children) but the point is not necessarily that Balthasar's viewpoint is privileged, but that he is here at all. Pearce and Luhrmann's decision to thread Balthasar throughout the film allows him to grow as a character and provides his perspective with a subtle and cumulative weight. In this scene, he also proves an apt reader of events. When Mercutio laughs after he has been fatally wounded, a medium close-up of Benvolio shows him similarly merry, unaware of what has really happened. Meanwhile, the close-up of a traumatized Balthasar shows that, in key with the ominous extradiegetic music, he *understands* the tragedy of events. Again, Balthasar is configured as a subtle site of secondary identification for the viewer, directing their emotional reading of the scene.



Fig 2: Balthasar (Jesse Bradford) in 3.1. *Romeo + Juliet* (1996).



Fig 3: Benvolio (Dash Mihok) in 3.1. *Romeo + Juliet* (1996).

Balthasar also survives the film as a replacement Romeo, carrying on his rebellious tendencies. Having built up their relationship throughout the film (and allowing them a heartfelt reunion in Mantua), Luhrmann adds especial weight to Romeo’s parting advice to Balthasar: “Live and be prosperous, and farewell, good fellow” (5.3 42). Bradford’s good fellow actually leaves instead of spying on Romeo, driving off as a decoy with copcars speeding after him, his last onscreen action a favor to his friend. This actual departure also allows for the possibility of a “prosperous” future outside of the insular world of the film. It is not clear where Balthasar zooms off to, but it is certainly *from* rather than towards tragedy. Balthasar’s prosperity does not depend upon financial gain: Romeo does not give him any money, as he sometimes does on this line in productions.⁸⁶ Like Romeo and Juliet, Balthasar is separated from the craven consumerist world: he is purer, poorer, simpler. He also *becomes* Romeo, or performs Romeo, in his exit, speeding followed by police cars and helicopters who assume him to be Romeo. While this moment can

⁸⁶ In the 1995 RSC production, Romeo gave Balthasar a purse on this line (*Romeo and Juliet* Prompt Book 1995 162); in the 2006 RSC production, Romeo gave Balthasar coins (*Romeo and Juliet* Promptbook 2006 107).

be read as the poor boy taking on his rich master's burden, the close relationship that the film builds between Romeo and Balthasar suggests a different reading, that Balthasar's departure is out of both idolatry and altruism. Though Balthasar exits as a rebel, with the police cars in pursuit, he is a rebel following Romeo's model rather than Tybalt's: he is removed from the flashy posturing world where Shakespeare's language and religious icons are commodities, helped by the fact that he barely speaks. Like Romeo and Juliet, Balthasar is sincere: the lie he tells in Mantua is swiftly retracted but already undermined by his expression. Luhrmann's revision of Balthasar's story allows him to embody the values of Romeo and Juliet without being defined by them: instead of staying to spy on their story, as he does in Shakespeare's play, Balthasar exits as a rebellious continuation of Romeo.

This rebellious exit also uses Balthasar to hint at a queer subject position and reading of the film. This is not to say that Balthasar desires Romeo sexually but that his independence and survival destabilizes the romantic norms of the story. An inserted shot before 3.5 illustrates this position well. Before cutting to Romeo and Juliet in bed, Luhrmann inserts an establishing shot of the Capulet house to convey daybreak. This thirteen second shot has another function however: beginning with the Capulet house, the camera cranes down to reveal Balthasar alone and asleep in the car, one arm folded across his chest. This shot serves as a match shot for the next: inside Juliet's bedroom, the camera follows a similar movement, swooping down from the ceiling towards the lovers, where Juliet has one arm wrapped around Romeo's chest. This position and movement will again be recalled by the final fresco shot, where Juliet manages to die with an arm wrapped around Romeo as the camera pulls away, eventually revealing the fresco shot.



(Fig 4: Balthasar (Jesse Bradford) in 3.5; Fig 5: Romeo (Leonardo di Caprio) and Juliet (Claire Danes) in 3.5; Fig 6. Juliet (Claire Danes) and Romeo (Leonardo di Caprio) in 5.3).

Although sleeping with an arm around one's chest or a love is not an uncommon sleeping position, the juxtaposition of shots and camera movement in 3.5 clearly parallel Balthasar's position with Romeo's and Juliet's and the addition of Balthasar to what could easily have been an exterior establishing shot *embeds* him within this wider gestural vocabulary. That Balthasar is embracing himself allows a queer reading of this position and moment, suggesting his ultimate independence from the lovers and a future outside of their all-consuming love.

This queer subject position might be considered the Balthasar function, testifying to some of his additional appearances in iterations of *Romeo and Juliet* in the twentieth and twenty first century. A survey of the RSC promptbooks of recent productions of *Romeo and Juliet* sees Balthasar usually added into additional scenes and almost always playing the part of the second Montague serving man who fights alongside Abram in 1.1.⁸⁷ This clearly makes economic sense and Balthasar's additional appearances in 1.4, 1.5, 2.4 and 3.1 also use him as a number to bolster the Montague boys. However, Balthasar is also used as more than just another Montague body, performing an important empathetic function and sometimes suggesting a hopeful future outside of "Romeo and Juliet." In the 2006 production, which began with an interpolated scene brawl before 1.1, Balthasar entered with Romeo, removed from the fight, and was handed the

⁸⁷ Balthasar appears in 1.1 in 1973, 1980, 1997, 2000, 2004 and 2006. He makes additional appearances in 1.4 (in all the above productions except 2004), 1.5 (in 1973, 2000 and 2006 productions), 2.4 (1973 and 2006) and 3.1 (all the above except for 2000 and also in the 1995 production). In the 1997 production, Abram became Balthasar (speaking Balthasar's lines in 5.1) fulfilling a similar Balthasar function as Abram. It should be noted that what is important here is that Balthasar appears as a sustained character (whether or not an audience recognizes him as such) so that while the actor playing Balthasar may have played multiple roles in other performances, especially in the early modern theatre, these productions make an effort to present him as the *same* character.

Prince's stick as the Prince exited with a little girl, inserted into the opening as a symbol of innocence (*Romeo and Juliet* Prompt Book 2006 56). As the prince saved this little girl, he also cultivated Balthasar's maturity, signaling him apart from the other Montagues as trustworthy. Though Balthasar was also present for the brawl in 1.1, he fulfilled his empathetic and supportive role in 3.1, when he caught Mercutio's body and helped carry him out (110-111). In 1997, Mercutio called for Abram in an interpolated line when he died, (in this production, Abram took on Balthasar's lines and function) calling for the character's physical help but also his emotional support (*Romeo and Juliet* 1997 Prompt Book 43). The multiple hugs that Balthasar provided for Romeo in 5.1 in the 1980 production made him almost a substitute Juliet, again emphasizing his function as a supporter rather than a fighter (*Romeo and Juliet* 1980 Prompt Book 106). This function was perhaps most ostentatiously displayed by Rupert Goold's 2010 production, where Balthasar sang his lines in a distinctive falsetto, marking his speech as different to match the non-verbal function he often performs. Michael Coveney reports Balthasar's role as an outside observer: "The last words are now spoken by Balthasar, whom Gruffudd Glyn transforms into a chillingly impassive observer with a fine falsetto singing voice" (Coveney). What Coveney reads as "chillingly impassive," an alienating rather than empathetic effect, could also be seen as Balthasar's queer function: he destabilizes Shakespeare's language here, providing the rebellious counter-music of survival rather than the tragic closing coda. Peter Kirwan reports that Balthasar's "tonally disruptive" function here was ultimately comic, "it was presumably meant to be a ritualised moment of mourning, but instead had the audience laughing" (Kirwan). However, this alienating laughter also suggests the possibility of release, of a comedic future outside of the lovers' tragedy. Balthasar's inserted presence in these productions, while often very subtle, speaks to his important function: to serve as a site of

secondary identification (usually empathetic) and to suggest a more hopeful future outside of the play. It is because he is a *dumb teen*, because his appearances are free from Shakespeare's script, that directors are able to assign him this role: by reducing his lines (due to the severe editing that Hodgdon often reports in Act 5) but increasing his appearances, directors shift his role from rash messenger to important observer.

Balthasar's extra-textual appearances in Zeffirelli's *Romeo and Juliet* further illustrates the personalized journey that Balthasar can be used to tell and suggests his role as a potentially queer subject position. Balthasar's *bildungsroman* is a subtle subplot in Zeffirelli's film: from the opening scene, when the young Balthasar conveys shock at the intrusion of violence in Verona's marketplace, he is threaded throughout the film as a mute observer of events. Principally, Balthasar is one of the Montague boys, joking with them in 2.4 at the expense of the nurse, enjoying the playful violence of 3.1. However, Romeo's departure to Mantua reveals a more sensitive side: as well as his heartfelt farewell to Juliet, an interpolated scene shows Romeo leaving Balthasar, who presses the horse-backed Romeo's hand against his cheek before he departs. Balthasar closes his eyes for this embrace, giving the moment an almost erotic charge. The nature of his relationship with Romeo suggests tenderness rather than tumescence and a shot of a saddened Balthasar watching Romeo gallop away positions him as a shrewd interpreter of events, someone who anticipates the tragedy to come.



Fig 7: Balthasar (Keith Skinner) and Romeo (Leonard Whiting) after 3.5. *Romeo and Juliet* (1968).



Fig 8. Balthasar (Keith Skinner) in 3.5 after Romeo leaves. *Romeo and Juliet* (1968).

Of course, Balthasar is far from shrewd at interpreting the events of Act 4, misreading Juliet's death and catapulting Romeo towards tragedy. Both Zeffirelli's and Luhrmann's films show Balthasar overtake the Friar's messengers, presenting a youth who is quite literally "too rash, too unadvised, too sudden" (*Romeo and Juliet* 2.1 160). However, the sincerity of Zeffirelli's Balthasar (whose initial lie to Romeo is cut) absolves him of blame and distinguishes him from the manipulative linguistic communication of the Friar. The closing moments emphasize Balthasar's journey from naïve and playful youth to a more mature figure: as the families process away from the bodies of Romeo and Juliet, there is a noted softening as each pair of Montagues and Capulets pass through an archway towards the camera, from the determinedly separate strides of Montague and Capulet to the icy formality of their wives to the Nurse's friendly tap of Benvolio. Balthasar builds on the Nurse's affectionate rapport with Benvolio by embracing the Capulet servant he is paired with, who has been signaled out for an empathetic reaction shot in the previous scene. This moment firmly places the reconciliation between Montagues and Capulets in the literal hands, or arms, of the younger generation, associating Balthasar with the flower power hippie spirit that Romeo embodied. It also destabilizes an ending that focuses solely on the "golden images" of the lovers. While it is hard to read this Balthasar as a rebellious figure, he also embodies a future beyond romantic consumerism or absorption into romance; unlike the Actors at Work *Romeo and Juliet* Intensive, which supplied a happy ending through the romantic union of Actors 2 and 3 and the reconciliation of the elder generation that ends Shakespeare's play, this happy ending hinges upon the empathetic and political power of the younger generation to make hugs not war.

As the narrator of Michael Cox's young adult novel, *William Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet Retold*, Baz (the Balthasar figure) offers a critical subject position of the consumer culture

that this modern retelling swamps its characters in. Although as a narrator, Baz is clearly not a dumb teen, he is pointedly at a remove from Shakespeare's language, offering a subject position that denies a solely romantic reading of Shakespeare's text. This perspective is one that Baz encourages the implied reader to share, assuming a cosy familiarity with the implied reader by imagining the narratee as one of his friends: "My name's Barry. But you can call me Baz. All my mates do" (10). He also distinguishes his story from the official narrative of the police and media: "If you want to know what *really* went on, then I'm the lad to tell you" (13, original emphasis). Positioned as a countercultural authority, Baz tells a story that is oppositional not just to the language of the police and the media but also to Shakespeare, whose romanticism is parodied. Although Shakespeare's text is not acknowledged here, language from *Romeo and Juliet* occasionally erupts into the text, only to be held at a comic distance. For example, Baz reports on Romeo's and Juliet's meeting and contrasts the solemnity of Shakespeare's language with his contemporary idiom: "The party starts up again and Romeo wastes no time making his move on Juliet. Before you can say 'Star-crossed lovers!' they're pecking and necking! Yes, it's taken about two minutes for them to go completely nuts about each other" (27). Baz's perspective here is one at a remove from both Shakespeare's language and romantic consumerism and throughout the novel he reports Romeo's and Juliet's passion from a wry distance: the inclusion of some of Shakespeare's lines from the balcony scene is continually mediated through Baz's more cynical perspective, with the sweet sorrow of parting followed by Baz's befuddlement: "So Romeo legs it. And starts planning how to fix their wedding. Sounds crazy, but that's what love does to people. Not that I'd know" (30). Not a lover, Baz seems happy enough that way, especially as love in this run-down estate is associated with a romantic consumerism that Baz both idealizes and finds distasteful. This estate is one of easy and

meaningless consumption, with Baz introduced kicking a Pepsi can outside Blockbuster and the fetid mood of 3.1 established by flies “buzzing round the KFC family buckets and McDonalds wrappers that have been dumped in the broken fountain” (37). Unlike Luhrmann’s lovers, this Romeo and Juliet are part of the gaudy materialist world around them, with Juliet’s room described in detail. While Baz admires the collection of swag that the Capulet gang has accumulated, he is somewhat critical of Juliet’s wardrobe of designer clothes: “I’m telling you, that Juliet was well spoilt!” (69) Similarly, as Romeo’s runner, Baz’s relationship with Romeo is primarily economic rather than emotional: when Romeo bids him farewell he is sure to give him “a big wadge of tenners” (83). The novel ends with the literal golden image of Romeo and Juliet, but this is kept at a critical distance, denying a romantic identification with the pair: Baz notes that the Montagues and Capulets have each paid one thousand pounds for statues to grace the bleak estate:

It’s gonna be gold statues of Romeo and Juliet. And they’re gonna be standing in the middle of the precinct, where the whole sorry story started.

I just hope they don’t get vandalized (91).

Baz denies a happy ending to *Romeo and Juliet*, exposing the shallowness of the consumer culture that fuelled their relationship, vandalizing the romanticism of their golden image himself through his critical distance. As a countercultural voice pitted against authority and parodying Shakespeare’s language, Baz offers a destabilizing perspective on the story’s closure and suggests a critique of Romeo and Juliet as romantic consumers.

The function of Balthasar, to observe the romantic and feud plots from the outside, is amplified in *West Side Story*, whose Balthasar figure, Anybodys, is “a scrawny teen-age girl, dressed in an outfit that is a pathetic attempt to imitate that of the Jets” (141). While Anita actually fulfills Balthasar’s plot function in this adaptation (conveying the false message that

Maria, the Juliet figure, is dead), Anybodys fulfills his symbolic role: an observer at the fringes of the action, she is the one figure supportive of Tony in the equivalent of Act 5 and survives beyond the play, exiting before Tony's climactic death and thus outside of both the tragedy and reconciliation of the musical's close. Anybodys suggests a much queerer subject position than the other Balthasar figures discussed here, a girl who refuses to dress like the vapid girlfriends of the Jets, performing gender in a way that denies Maria's bland prettiness. One of the cut numbers, "Like Anybody Else," articulated Anybodys' subversive desire to conform to masculine stereotypes: "I swear and I smoke and I inhale/Why can't I be male/Like everybody else?" (qtd. in Simeone 59). Being male for Anybodys is not just about performing gender but also subverting sexuality: "I ain't never gonna get married: too noisy" (Laurents et. al 169). Marriage is clearly associated with romantic consumerism in *West Side Story*: not only do Maria and Tony perform a wedding using the dummies in the bridal shop, but Maria's dream of usurping Miss America ("Miss America can just resign!") (197) twins her prettiness with the values yearned for by the Puerto Rican teenagers in the "America" song and scene: the Cadillacs and televisions of a chrome consumer culture. Anybodys' refusal to perform the part of a pretty romantic consumer makes her "an American tragedy" in Graziella's estimation, but by performing the Balthasar function, Anybodys actually suggests a comedic survival, a world beyond the romantic consumerism that ends tragically (172). Although Anybodys is denied the prosperous future that Balthasar is promised, dismissed by Tony with a savage "You're a girl: *be a girl!* Beat it" (222, original emphasis), her retreat is not necessarily a submission and Anybodys survives beyond *West Side Story* but also beyond the romantic consumerism that everybody else becomes involved in, as they exit the stage carrying Tony's body in a procession

that deliberately recalls Maria's dream ballet from "Somewhere," thus embedding the communal healing at the end in the visual language of romantic consumerism.

All of these examples suggest a subtle but important Balthasar function in many contemporary iterations of the *Romeo and Juliet* story: a need for a figure outside of the romantic story to suggest a future beyond romance and romantic consumerism. This queer subject position that Balthasar suggests is enabled through his class as a servant and his marginal textual role in Shakespeare's play, allowing productions to use him to tell an alternative counter-story outside of Shakespeare's language. Anybodys also suggest the ways in which this alternative story can further queer romantic norms by positioning the Balthasar beyond marriage and beyond "Romeo and Juliet"; expanding *Romeo and Juliet* beyond its central pair allows an equivalent expansion of definitions of the teenager.

Thus with a Kiss I Queer: Private Romeo and Romantic Rebellion.

The expansion of "Romeo and Juliet" is furthered by *Private Romeo* (2011), Alan Brown's film which takes place in an all-male military academy. *Private Romeo* is one of many perimillennial texts which offer a gay or queer version of *Romeo and Juliet*.⁸⁸ *Private Romeo* is a particularly illuminating example to consider in relation to the other works discussed in this chapter because it uses some of the tactics discussed - double reply, excellent dumb discourse, music - to reshape Romeo and Juliet as rebels and offer a happy ending that moves beyond romantic consumerism. Double reply is especially important to the logic that drives *Private Romeo*'s plot:

⁸⁸ Other notable examples include Joe Callarco's *R&J*; gay versions of *Romeo and Juliet* for school projects and the popular Sassy Gay Friend on YouTube, who saves Shakespearean heroines from their tragic fate (The SecondCityNetwork).

following *R&J*, the conceit of *Private Romeo* is that eight cadets, left behind while the rest of the military school is on a trip, read *Romeo in Juliet* in class and gradually begin to act out the play. *Private Romeo* is more complex than *R&J*, including some modern dialogue and breaking free from the claustrophobic world of a 1950s preparatory school, and the constraints of *Romeo and Juliet*, to include shots of the teenagers playing basketball, meandering around the deserted campus and recording YouTube videos of themselves. Although their use of Shakespeare's language originates in the classroom, this premise is soon left behind, as the text of the play becomes a code for the teenagers to express themselves. Very quickly, the teenagers use double reply to add their own individualized meanings to Shakespeare's language: in later classroom scenes, the text continues to convey Shakespeare's words, but is loaded with the subtext the actors bring. The actors are not so much playing Romeo, Juliet and company, as students using these characters and their words to play out their own interpersonal dynamics. This gets quite complex, especially when Mercutio survives to morph into Capulet, and sometimes the literal meaning of Shakespeare's language gets lost, most especially when the students speak of Paris, who doesn't appear. However, to try and map Shakespeare's word onto the events of the film is to miss the point somewhat: Matt Doyle, who played Juliet, explains the process in an interview, discussing the difficulty of representing an absent Paris:

So the idea of 'Paris' became just that Josh was coming in to tell me that it needs to stop. It's gone too far. 'Paris' was the idea of it ending. So in some instances like that, you could say, 'Well that doesn't work at all!' But to us it did. [Laughs] Not everything needs to be that literal. I think that's what the film goes back and forth on. Sometimes when the text really works and it's really clear, it can be completely magical. You just sit back and go, oh my gosh, I can't believe that in this context it's perfect. You know? And I never would have looked at the text that way and think that it would say something like that. And other times you'd say, well, that doesn't work so much, but let's push forward. And we sat down with one another and communicated to each other in our own language what we were trying to say, and then tied it back into the text – and accepted that we were doing something experimental. To make it literal is doing a disservice to the piece, and is defeating the purpose (“Matt Doyle Talks to Rob Hartmann”).

Often, Shakespeare's words make very little literal *sense* in *Private Romeo*: neither Mercutio nor Tybalt die, Romeo and Juliet don't get married, nor do they die. Nonetheless, the talented actors convey an emotional sense through the words, with Shakespeare's words a code for exuberant gay sexuality, but one whose tragic script doesn't have to be followed to the letter. Some of the most successful moments in the film are when the camera captures this ebullience and awkwardness of the lovers: in 1.5, the camera ducks around the pair as they dip their toes into their shared sonnet. Although the film's attitude towards the homophobia one might expect to find in an all-male setting is rather obscured, the stakes of this moment are clear and the actors' naturalistic performance of this scene works well. As Shakespeare's words are recodified, the citational grammar of *Romeo and Juliet* is also reset. Like Luhrmann, Brown avoids setting the balcony scene on anything like a balcony. Instead, the scene takes place in a dark classroom, with the actors using flashlights. This recodification of the classroom as a space for subversive romance is especially effective, with the students moving beyond the limited scripts of CSS exercises to rebelliously repurpose Shakespeare's words: as Glen/Juliet speaks of marriage, the camera focuses on the actor's thigh, as Sam/Romeo's hand moves along it, creating a dissonance between word and image that runs throughout the film. The dissonance that double reply creates allows the film to escape from *Romeo and Juliet*'s tragic script, with all of the teenagers surviving, and exuberant romance and tentative reconciliation usurping tragedy.

If this alternative narrative is hard to track following Shakespeare's words, it is easier to follow in the musical scenes that Brown adds. The first shows the students who play Mercutio, the Friar and Benvolio lip-synching to Bishop Allen's "Busted Heart" in their dorm room. Recording a video of themselves, the students perform for the laptop in front of them: playing with a flashlight as a microphone in stark light. This first song is interspersed with shots of

Sam/Romeo, wandering about the campus after the balcony scene. Again, Romeo and Juliet are removed from the chaotic sonic world that surrounds them and Romeo's calm is at odds with the frenetic performance of the other teenagers and the thumping soundtrack. This performance leads directly to the one moment that seems to acknowledge homophobia, with the amped up teenagers hazing Glenn/Juliet, dragging him from his bed and leaving him outside tied to a chair, clingfilm wrapped around his almost naked body, duct tape across his mouth. This moment is starkly contrasted with the second YouTube song, which follows Juliet's swallowing of the poison in 4.5 and features just Mercutio and the Friar, morosely staring at the camera as they lip synch to a more subdued Bishop Allen song "The Magpie." While these moments are also deliberately obtuse, paired together they chart the emotional narrative of the secondary characters: from rebellious masculine energy to more sober reflection. These songs serve as excellent dumb discourse, allowing the actors to communicate through silly pranks, to fill in the gaps that double reply does not allow. This chain of musical signification is completed by the closing number: after Romeo and Juliet both revive, and kiss in each others' arms, the camera cuts to Doyle, singing a pop version of "You Make me Love You" by James V. Monaco and Joseph McCarthy, closing the film with an expression of *jouissance*.

It is important not to idealize *Private Romeo*. If anything, the characters conform to teenagers' position within consumer culture, with 1.5's sonnet beginning with Sam admiring Glenn's brand of trainers. *Private Romeo* offers a very narrow consideration of race and gender, with no female voices or performers and its one non-white actor confined to the role of observer. Equally, the military setting is something of a fantasy, addressing homophobia only obliquely and not considering the larger political context or world that these teenagers are training to fight in. Nonetheless, the reclamation of Shakespeare's language to tell a gay story that does not end

in tragedy is rebellious and especially significant considering Shakespeare's use as a dangerous code in modern gay theatre. Unlike *R&J*, which closes off the possibilities of subversive reading by killing Romeo and Juliet and ends with its Juliet denying any queer romance, the subversive space that Shakespeare creates in *Private Romeo* flourishes beyond the play. In another interview, Doyle situates this choice within the political context of 2010:

Larry Murray: I certainly enjoyed it, both for its classicism and its novelty. At the end we don't have a double suicide, which with both characters being gay would have fulfilled the old Hollywood Code where homosexuals were never allowed to do anything but end up dead or in jail.

Matt Doyle: We did the filming about the time all those teenage suicides were taking place and bullying were in the news. Alan wanted to send out a message of choosing life, and hope rather than despair and death. To be brave, to accept the love, that it was an ok thing to do ("An Interview with Matt Doyle").

There is something rebellious about a gay Romeo and Juliet that celebrates the love of two male teenagers and refuses to be defined by homophobia or the tragic script that governs both Shakespeare's play and the Hollywood code that punishes gay characters. By departing from the script of *Romeo and Juliet* (ending with a burst of comedic song) and repurposing Shakespeare's language through double reply, *Private Romeo* expands the definition of "Romeo and Juliet," as romantic consumers and *Romeo and Juliet* as a tragedy. Its use of a small ensemble also pushes beyond "Romeo and Juliet": while the film is focused on Sam and Glen, the personal stories of the other cadets are also critically important. This is not to suggest that the only positive encounters between teenagers and Shakespeare are ones that adopt a queer perspective, but rather that by using the strategies that teenagers employ to resist problematic aspects of School Shakespeare, representations of *Romeo and Juliet* can broaden the world of the play to include a wider range of teenage identities and create a rebellious space outside of consumer culture.

Afterword.

The Moons of Miranda and the Orbit of Teenage Shakespeare.

It is fitting that in 1948, four years after *Seventeen* ushered in the teenager, Miranda became the first mortal Shakespearean character to name a moon, following Titania, Oberon, Uriel and Ariel to name Uranus's fifth moon, and asserting a teenage stamp on the universe.⁸⁹ In 2010, nine years after another moon of Uranus had been christened Ferdinand, Miranda was placed at the centre of the cosmos in Julie Taymor's film of *The Tempest*. In lieu of the masque, Prospera creates a spectacular show that superimposes Miranda and Ferdinand over a digital paradise of swirling constellations in an ocean of indigo. As Shakespeare's language is a tool to claim English ownership over rocks in outer space, this wedding masque claims the entire universe as Miranda's and Ferdinand's, with all the stars swirling to celebrate their wedding.



Fig. 9: Ferdinand (Reeve Carney) and Miranda (Felicity Jones) in 4.1. *The Tempest* (2010).

⁸⁹ The moons of Uranus are named after characters from Shakespeare or Alexander Pope's *The Rape of the Lock*. The other four moons listed were discovered in the 18th century. After Miranda's discovery, twenty two other moons of Uranus have been discovered by humans, with one named after Belinda from *The Rape of the Lock* and the others being named after Shakespeare characters and references, including Sycorax and Setebos (United States. National Aeronautic and Space Administration).

This afterword considers the emergence of dumb teens in perimillennial films and stage performances. Focusing on the representation of Miranda as a romantic consumer in Julie Taymor's film, I argue that the depiction of Shakespearean characters as dumb teens and romantic consumers is especially troubling in the context of Disaster Shakespeare: Shakespearean teenagers who are silent witnesses to ecological and political catastrophes or giddy lovers who ensure a happy ending through romantic consumption are worrying role models for teenage audiences who are continually directed to make Shakespeare relevant to their lives. I am not trying to argue that Miranda must be presented as a climate change activist, but rather that as *The Tempest* is related to climate change whether directly, with Prospero viewed as a modern "ecoterrorist," or indirectly, through its anthropomorphic view perspective on environmental issues, Miranda means something different in perimillennial productions, especially when she is given increased visual prominence (Boelhower 10).⁹⁰ As Libby presented Ferdinand and Miranda as the eugenicist apotheosis of both humanity and Shakespeare's style, the couple is close to becoming a symbol of humanity's indifference towards the planet we are endangering through overconsumption.

From the beginning of *The Tempest*, Taymor situates Miranda as a central focalizing presence and as a budding romantic consumer. The opening titles feature an elaborate sandcastle, revealed to be cupped in Miranda's hands. As the storm dissolves these towers, Miranda looks on sadly. Taymor describes the sandcastle as a "symbol of civilization" and Miranda as "the perfect princess" ("Audio Commentary: *The Tempest*"); the initial depiction of Miranda frames

⁹⁰ The collection of essays edited by Sharon O'Dair in *Borrowers and Lenders*, "Shakespeareans in The Tempest: Lives and Afterlives of Katrina" (2010), speaks to some of the ways in which Shakespeare speaks, or has been made to speak, to climate change.

her as a teenager lamenting the loss of her pretty piece of property, a princess yearning to leave the savage surrounds of the island for a romantic palace.



Fig. 10. Opening credits, *The Tempest* (2010).



Fig. 11. Miranda (Felicity Jones) in the opening scene. *The Tempest* (2010).

Miranda finds her prince almost immediately as shots of Miranda racing through the storm are inter-cut with Ferdinand on the ship. One early shot of Miranda determinedly running towards

camera cuts directly to a shot of Ferdinand, opening a door and striding towards the camera: the editing of this film ineluctably pairs Miranda and Ferdinand, transferring her initial display of empathy for the fate of the survivors into a subconscious fear for her prince. Taymor's take on Miranda and Ferdinand is surprisingly conservative and she directs their first scene together as a "Romeo and Juliet moment of absolute purity" ("Audio Commentary"). The purity that Miranda embodies in this film is also one of ecological harmony: barefooted and with leaves wreathed in her hair for her wedding, this Miranda is part of the island's ecosystem, even as she dreams of a palace. Taymor shot 3.1 in dusty red sand dunes, to "match the red hair" of Miranda, turning the environment into a fashion accessory ("Audio Commentary"). The environment's implicit endorsement of the union of Miranda and Ferdinand here is especially significant considering the activity that brings the pair together: the transportation of logs, appropriate fuel for their romantic consumption and Prospera's civilized existence on the island. Although Miranda clearly has more lines and a larger part than Balthasar, Taymor effectively turns her into a dumb teen by using her as a site of secondary identification and beginning the film from her mute perspective. What Miranda *means* here is rather problematic: her romantic union with Ferdinand allows for the ecological trauma of the opening storm to be replaced by a happy ending and for Miranda's initial role - as a dissenting voice against Prospera's ecological manipulation - to be stabilized into the familiar figure of the romantic consumer. While Taymor is certainly not thinking about climate change here, the presentation of young people at the centre of the universe, using the environment as an accessory or as fuel to fall in love, suggests an anthropomorphic perspective that redirects concern for environmental instability towards romantic consumerism.

Other dumb teens are to be found on perimillennial screens: Princess Elizabeth, ensuring a happy romantic ending for Richmond in Richard Loncraine's film of *Richard III* (1995) or appearing throughout The War of the Roses cycle in Benedict Andrews' 2009 Sydney production as a mute witness and scarred survivor of atrocity; Marcella in Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet*, imbuing her part with a teenage sensibility and ensuring that Horatio will not be absent from romantic felicity for too long; Fleance in Geoffrey Wright's *Macbeth*, the scarred survivor who totters towards an uncertain future.⁹¹ The constructions of the teen subject that these films present imagine female dumb teens as romantic consumers, "wholesomely sexy" bodies, in Ian McKellen's description of Princess Elizabeth, who ensure that tragedy will be tempered with a romantic union (56); another alternative for the dumb teen is the symbolic role of scarred witness, with Fleance and Elizabeth traumatized by the violence they have witnessed but unable to change the tragic scenes they have been inserted into as observers. While Carol Chillington Rutter condenses that the increased presence of children on perimillennial Shakespearean stages allows for a recuperative gaze and that "looking like a child" can be redemptive (*Shakespeare and Child's Play* xvii), I would argue that these productions enmesh these symbolic children and teenagers into an empire of meaning through silence, making it difficult to recommend their gaze; the destabilizing silence of children and animals that Baudrillard evokes is redirected through the figure of the dumb teen, who is *meaningfully* present, an empathetic witness, but unable to change any action. Rutter understands the limitations of this symbolic reading of children and argues that through performance the "muted voices" of children get to speak, "sturdily themselves, anarchically upsetting tales" (*Shakespeare and Child's Play* xxvii; xvi).

⁹¹ These dumb teens can be related to Carol Clover's idea of the "Final Girl," the scarred but resilient survivor of horror movies. See Clover for a discussion of the Final Girl and Starks for an exploration of how Young Lucius in Julie Taymor's *Titus* can be read as a "Final Boy."

Similarly, through a rebellious excellent dumb discourse, teenagers are also able to wrest free of the narrow conceptions of teenage identity that such performances stage, anarchically rewriting the tragic tales they are presented with in school and parodying the presentation of teenagers as romantic consumers. Such an excellent dumb discourse allows teenagers to talk back to Shakespeare and the trope of dumb teens but we could also wish for pedagogical and performance practices that resist presenting Shakespearean characters as role models or analogues for contemporary teenagers. It seems clear that, for the short term future at least, teenagers in Australia, England and the United States will continue to encounter Shakespeare, in classrooms and on YouTube, in tweets and twangling music: as the next generation of Shakespeare reloads, we might hope that teenagers will encounter a greater variety of Shakespeares and that Shakespeare will cultivate a greater variety of teenage subjects, beyond romantic consumers and rebels and towards political actors.

As Romeo and Juliet kiss and unkiss and Ophelia drowns and is revived, the moons of Uranus revolve to a different beat. It seems probable that Miranda the moon will outlive Miranda the romantic consumer; as the idea of the teenager dissolves, we might also hope for cultural use of Shakespeare that goes beyond ownership, of names and places, and instead positions humans within a wider ecosystem, Shakespeare and young people as part of an interconnected universe, with neither at its centre.

Bibliography

- Abunimah, Ali. "Film review: a Middle Eastern Romeo and Juliet set in contemporary Gaza Strip." 30 Mar. 2013, 8:15 a.m. Tweet.
- Adams, Richard, ed. *Teaching Shakespeare: Essays on Approaches to Shakespeare in Schools and Colleges*. London: Robert Royce, 1985. Print.
- "adolescence, n.". OED Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. 19 April 2013
<<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/2650?redirectedFrom=adolescence>>.
- Aers, Lesley. "Shakespeare in the National Curriculum." Aers and Wheale 30-39.
- Aers, Lesley and Nigel Wheale, eds. *Shakespeare in the Changing Curriculum*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.
- Albanese, Denise. *Extramural Shakespeare*. New York: Palgrave, 2010. Print.
- Albee, Edward. *The Goat or Who is Sylvia? (Notes toward a Definition of Tragedy)*. New York: Overlook, 2000. Print.
- Amber. Rev. of *Dating Hamlet: Ophelia's Story*, Lisa Fiedler. *Goodreads*. 24 Dec. 2009. Web. 24. Feb. 2013.
- Anderson, Robert. *Tea and Sympathy*. New York: Random House, 1953. Print.
- Ariès, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. Trans: Robert Baldick. New York: Random House, 1962.
- Ashley. Rev. of *Dating Hamlet: Ophelia's Story*, Lisa Fiedler. *Goodreads*. 23 Jul. 2009. Web. 24 Feb. 2013.
- Atwood, Margaret. *Good Bones and Simple Murders*. New York: Doubleday, 1994. Print.
- Avi. *Romeo and Juliet: Together (And Alive!) at Last*. New York: Orchard Books, 1987. Print.

- Aubrey, Jennifer Stevens and Elizabeth Behm-Morawitz and Melissa A. Click, eds. *Bitten by Twilight: Youth Culture, Media, & the Vampire Franchise*. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- “Audio Commentary.” *The Tempest*. Narr. Julie Taymor. Dir. Julie Taymor. Miramax, 2010.
- “Audio Commentary.” *William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet*. Narr. Baz Luhrmann, Catherine Martin, Craig Pearce and Don McAlpine. Dir. Baz Luhrmann, 1996. Special Edition DVD. Twentieth Century Fox, 1996.
- Baily, Joan E. Letter to Young Elizabethan Players. 22 Jun. 1961. Box 33, ms. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.
- Baraka, Amiri. *The Baptism and The Toilet*. New York: Grove Press [1967, c.1963]. Print.
- Barkham, Patrick. “YouTube Five Years On.” *The Guardian*. 22Apr. 2010. Web. 19 Apr. 2013.
- Barry, Bruce and Bill Stephens. Oral History. 30 Sept. 1998. Oral History Collection, Canberra: National Library of Australia. (3 Tapes).
- Barthel, Angie. Rev. of *Dating Hamlet: Ophelia’s Story*, Lisa Fiedler. *Goodreads*. 28 Aug. 2010. Web. 24. Feb. 2013.
- Barthes, Roland. *The Pleasure of the Text*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wang, 1973. Print.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans Sheila Faria Glaser. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1994. Print.
- Baxter, Kent. *The Modern Age: Turn-of-the-Century American Culture and the Invention of Adolescence*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press. 2008. Print.
- Beckwith, Sarah. *Signifying God Social Relation and Symbolic Act in the York Corpus Christi Plays*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001. Print.
- Bell, John. *The Time of My Life*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 2002. Print.

Bell Shakespeare Company. 'Bell Magazine. 1 (1998)' Box 1, ts. Bell Shakespeare Collection.

Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney.

- *Bell Magazine 2* (1998) Folder A-L, TS. Theatre Programmes Collection. Sydney: Mitchell

Library, State Library of New South Wales.

- *Bell Magazine 10* (2003) Box 1, ts. Bell Shakespeare Collection. Sydney: Mitchell Library,

State Library of New South Wales.

- *Bell Magazine 15* (2008) Box 1, ts. Bell Shakespeare Collection. Sydney: Mitchell Library,

State Library of New South Wales.

- 'Bell Shakespeare Newsletter, 1997.' Box 1, ts. Bell Shakespeare Collection, State Library of

New South Wales, Sydney.

- 'Education Newsletter, 1995.' Unprocessed, ts. Tony Gilbert Papers. Mitchell Library, State

Library of New South Wales, Sydney.

- *Henry 5 Program*. Folder: Bell Shakespeare, M-Z, ts. Theatre Programmes Collection.

Sydney: Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales. 1999.

- *The Winter's Tale Program*. Folder: Bell Shakespeare, M-Z, ts. Theatre Programmes

Collection. Sydney: Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales. 1997.

Bennett, Alan and Nicholas Hytner. *The History Boys: The Film*. London: Faber and Faber,

2006. Print.

Bennett, Alan. *The History Boys*. London: Faber and Faber, 2004. Print.

Bennett, Susan. *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception*. 2nd Ed. London and

New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Best & Co. Advertisement. *Seventeen* (Oct. 1968): 26-30. Print.

- Biondo-Hench, Susan C. "Shakespeare Troupe: An Adventure in Words, Fluid Text, and Comedy." *English Journal*, 99.1 (2009). 37-43. Print.
- Blackwood, Gary. *Shakespeare's Scribe*. USA: Puffin, 2000. Print.
- "Shakespeare Speaks: Getting the Language Right." Miller 74-80.
 - *Shakespeare's Spy*. USA: Puffin, 2003. Print.
 - *The Shakespeare Stealer*. USA: Puffin, 1998. Print.
- Blockside, Martin, ed. *Shakespeare in Education*. London and New York: Continuum, 2003. Print.
- Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. London: Fourth Estate, 1999. Print.
- Boelhower, William. "Owning the Weather: Reading *The Tempest* After Hurricane Katrina." *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation*. 5.2 (2010) Web. 15 Apr. 2013.
- Bottoms, Janet. "Of Tales and Tempests." *Children's Literature in Education* 27.2 (1996) : 73-86. Print.
- Bourgeois Richmond, Velma. *Shakespeare as Children's Literature, Edwardian Retellings in Words and Pictures*. Jefferson, North Carolina and London: McFarland & Company Inc, 2008. Print.
- Braithwaite, Barbara. Letter to Young Elizabethan Players. 17 Aug. 1961. Box 33, ms. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.
- Brown, John Russell. "The Royal Shakespeare Company 1965." *Shakespeare Survey* 19 (1966): 111-118. Print.
- Buchanan, Judith. *Shakespeare on Silent Film: An Excellent Dumb Discourse*. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2009. Print.

- Burt, Richard. "Shakespeare (')tween Media and Markets in the 1990s and Beyond." *Shakespeare and Childhood*. Ed. Kate Chedgzoy, Susanne Greenhalgh and Robert Shaughnessy. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2007. 184-200. Print.
- *Unspeakable ShaXXXspeares: Queer Theory and American Kiddie Culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998. Print.
- Byron, Glennis. "'As one dead': Romeo and Juliet in the 'Twilight' Zone." *Gothic Shakespeares*. Ed. John Drakakis & Dale Townsend. New York: Routledge, 2008. 167-185. Print.
- Callarco, Joe. *Shakespeare's R&J: an Adaptation of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. London: Methuen, 2003. Print.
- Campbell, Colin. *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism*. New York: Blackwell, 1987. Print.
- Carmichael, Emily. "Fight Girl Power." Shandler 273-276.
- Cartelli, Thomas and Katherine Rowe, eds. *New Wave Shakespeare on Screen*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007. Print.
- Cart, Michael. *Young Adult Literature: from Romance to Realism*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2011. Print.
- Chedgzoy, Kate. "What, are they children?" Chedgzoy, Greenhalgh and Shaughnessy. 15-31.
- Chedgzoy, Kate, Susanne Greenhalgh and Robert Shaughnessy, eds. *Shakespeare and Childhood*. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2007. Print.
- Chaudhuri, Una. "The Silence of the Polar Bears: Performing (Climate) Change in the Theater of Species." *Readings in Performance and Ecology*. Ed. Wendy Arons and Therese J. May. New York: Palgrave, 2012. 45-57. Print.

- Clarke, Mary Cowden. *The Girlhood of Shakespeare's Heroines: A Series of Fifteen Tales*. London: Bickers and Son, 1879. Print.
- Clarke, Mandy. "Stage Manager's Report for *Romeo and Juliet*." Box 4, Folder 25, ts. Bell Shakespeare Company Records. Melbourne: Performing Arts Museum, 1993.
- Cline, Patsy. "You Made Me Love You Lyrics." *The Music Lyrics Database*. The Music Lyrics Database. 21 Dec 1962. Web. 20 Apr. 2013.
- Clover, Carol J. *Men, Women and Chain Saws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1992. Print.
- Coe, George A. "The Morbid Conscience of Adolescents." *Transactions* 3. (1898): 97-106. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.
- Cohen, Elliot E. "A Teen-Age Bill of Rights." *The New York Times*. 7 Jan. 1945. Web. 12 Jan. 2011.
- Colnan, Shauna and Liam E. Semler. "Shakespeare Reloaded (2008-10): A School and University Literature Research Collaboration." *Australian Literary Studies for Schools 1*. (2009). Web. 15 Apr. 2013.
- Comenius, John Amus. *Orbis Pictus*. 1659. Syracuse : C.W. Bardeen, 1887. Print.
- Cook, H. Caldwell. *The Play Way: An Essay in Educational Method*. London: William Heineman, 1917. Print.
- Cook, Pam. *Baz Luhrmann*. London: Palgrave, 2010. Print.
- Cook, Patrick J. *Cinematic Hamlet: The Films of Olivier, Zeffirelli, Branagh and Almereyda*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2011. Print.
- Cookson, Linda. "Knowing Hawks from Handsaws." Adams 170-183.
- Cooper, Susan. *The King of Shadows*. New York: Margaret K. McElderry Books, 1999. Print.

Coveney, Michael. Rev. of *Romeo and Juliet* dir. Rupert Goold. *The Independent*. 24 Mar. 2010.

Web. 15 Apr. 2013.

Cox, Michael. *William Shakespeare's Romeo & Juliet: Retold*. London: A. C. & Black, 2007.

Print.

Crowl, Samuel. *Shakespeare and the Cineplex*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003. Print.

Crozier, Scott. "Performing Shakespeare." *English in Australia* 125 (1999) 62-74. Print.

Crystal, David. *Think on my Words: Exploring Shakespeare's Language*. Cambridge: CUP, 2008. Print.

Cunningham, Hugh. *Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500*. New York:

Longman, 1995. Print.

Damn its TRUE! "Forget about Romeo and Juliet, forget about Edward and Bella, the perfect love story I want to make is our own, You and I. ♥" 19 Oct. 2012. 4:01p.m. Tweet.

Davidson, Graeme. "Driving to Austerica: The Americanization of the Postwar Australian City."

Approaching Australia: Papers from the Harvard Australian Studies Symposium. Ed.

Harold Bolito & Chris Wallace-Crabbe. Boston: Harvard Australian Studies Symposium, 1997. 159-184. Print.

Dawson, Anthony B. *Shakespeare in Performance: Hamlet*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995. Print.

De Jongh, Nicolas. *Not in Front of the Audience: Homosexuality on Stage*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Derrida, Jacques. "Aphorism, Countertime." 1994. Trans. Derek Attridge. *Philosophers on Shakespeare*. Ed. Paul A. Kottman. Stanford: UP of Stanford, 2009. Print.

- Desmet, Christy and Robert Sawyer eds. *Shakespeare and Appropriation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Desmet, Christy. "Paying Attention in Shakespeare Parody: From Tom Stoppard to YouTube." *Shakespeare Survey* 61 (2008):227-236. Print.
- "Teaching Shakespeare with YouTube." *English Journal*. 99.1 (2009): 65-70. Print.
- Des'ree. "Kissing You." *The Music Lyrics Database*. The Music Lyrics Database. 1996. Web. 20 Apr. 2013.
- Dobson, Michael. "Shakespeare Performance in England, 2004." *Shakespeare Survey* 58. (2005):268-297. Print.
- Doherty, Thomas. *Teenagers and Teenpics: The Juvenilization of American Movies*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002. Print.
- Doyle, Matt. "An Interview with Matt Doyle on acting, coincidences and playing Juliet in Private Romeo." *BerkshireonStage*. 5 Jun. 2012. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.
- "Matt Doyle Talks to Rob Hartmann." *Stagebuzz*. Mar. 2012. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.
- Duncan, Lois. *Killing Mr. Griffin*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1978. Print.
- Dunstone, Bill. "Dinkum Shakespeare? Perth, Empire and the Bard." *Golder and Madelaine* 163-179.
- Edgerton, Matthew. Personal Interview. 28 Jul. 2010.
- Erzen, Tanya. *Fanpire: The Twilight Saga and the Women Who Love It*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2012. Print.
- Fiedler, Lisa. *Dating Hamlet: Ophelia's Story*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2002. Print.

Flaherty, Kate and Penny Gay and L.E. Semler, eds. *Teaching Shakespeare Beyond the Centre: Australasian Perspectives*. Sydney: Palgrave, 2013. Print.

Flaherty, Kate. *Ours as We Play It*. Crawley: UP of Western Australia, 2011. Print.

- "Looking for Richard." Barker College, Sydney. 14 Sept. 2010. Lecture.

- *Richard III* Lesson. Barker College, Sydney. 14 Sept. 2010. Class.

Flynn, Rosaline M. "Shakespearean Slide Shows." *English Journal*. 92.1 (2002) 62-7. Print.

French, Jackie. *Macbeth and Son*. Sydney: Harper Collins, 2006. Print.

Fotheringham, Richard. "Audiences as Performers: Laughter and Interpretative Repertoires in a Performance Season for Young People." *NJ*, 25.2 (2001) 67-75. Print.

- "Shakespeare in Queensland: a Cultural-economic Approach." Golder and Madelaine 218-235.

Foucault, Michel. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977. Print.

Gaby, Rose. "'Here's a Marvellous Convenient Space for our Rehearsal': Shakespeare in Australian Space." *Australasian Drama Studies* 46 (April 2005). 124-136. Print.

Garber, Marjorie. *Coming of Age in Shakespeare*. Ed. Kent Baxter. London and New York: Methuen, 1981. Print.

- *Shakespeare and Modern Culture*. New York: Pantheon, 2008. Print.

Gardner, Lyn. Rev. of *Hamlet* dir. Dominic Drumgoole. *The Guardian*. 5 May 2011. Web. 10 Apr. 2013.

Gay, Penny. "International Glamour or Home-grown Entertainment, 1948-64." Golder and Madelaine 180-199.

- Personal Interview. 30 June 2010.

- "A Shakespeare Brief Immersion Method for Undergraduates." Flaherty, Gay and Semler 153-167.
- Gellert, Roger. "Quaint Honour." 1958. *Gay Plays Volume Two*. Ed. Michael Wilcox. London and New York: Methuen, 1985. 9-50. Print.
- Gibson, Rex. *Critical Theory and Education*. London: Hodder, 1986. Print.
- *The Language of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: CUP, 2001. Print.
 - "'O, what learning is': Pedagogy and the Afterlife of *Romeo and Juliet*." *Shakespeare Survey* 49 (1995) Print.
 - *Secondary School Shakespeare Classroom Practice: A Collection of Papers by Secondary Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Print.
 - *Stepping into Shakespeare: Practical ways of teaching Shakespeare to Younger Learners*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000. Print.
 - *Teaching Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Print.
- Gilliatt, Penelope. "Ophelia, Prince of Stratford." Rev. of *Hamlet*, dir. Peter Hall. *The Observer*, 22 Aug 1965. n.pag. Print.
- Gillies, William. *Simple Studies in English History for Young Australians*. Melbourne: Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd, Melbourne, n.d. [1900s] Print.
- Gillis, John R. *Youth and History: Tradition and Change in European Age Relations 1770-Present*. New York and London: Academic Press, 1974. Print.
- Golder, John and Richard Madelaine, eds. *O Brave New World: Two Centuries of Shakespeare on the Australian Stage*. Sydney: Currency Press, 2000. Print.
- Gorbman, Claudia. *Unheard Melodies: Narrative Film Music*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: UP of Indiana, 1987. Print.

- Gratz, Alan. *Something Rotten: A Horatio Wilkes Mystery*. New York: Penguin, 2006. Print.
- Gregory, Sue. "Making Shakespeare our Contemporary: Teaching *Romeo and Juliet* at Key Stage Three." *Blockside* 20-39.
- Griffiths, Paul. *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England 1560-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Print.
- Hall, G., Stanley. *Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion, And Education*. 2 Vols. New York: D. Appleton, 1904. Print.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Michael Almereyda. Miramax, 2000. DVD.
- "Hamlet - but with less deaths and a happy ending!" Rev. of *Dating Hamlet: Ophelia's Story*, Lisa Fiedler. *Amazon*. 15 Apr. 2006. Web. 24. Feb. 2013.
- Hamlet Intensive*. By Ned Manning and William Shakespeare. St. Catherine's College, Sydney. 24 Aug 2010. Performance.
- Hateley, Erica. *Shakespeare in Children's Literature: Gender and Cultural Capital*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Hawkes, Terence. *Meaning by Shakespeare*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Hatchuel, Sarah. *Shakespeare, from Stage to Screen*. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2004. Print.
- Hetzel, E. Rev. of *Dating Hamlet: Ophelia's Story*, Lisa Fiedler. *Amazon*. 23 Aug. 2010. Web. 24. Feb. 2013.
- Higginbotham, Jennifer. *The Girlhood of Shakespeare's Sisters: Gender, Transgression, Adolescence*. Edinburgh: UP of Edinburgh, 2013. Print.
- Hodgdon, Barbara. "Absent Bodies, Present Voices: Performance Work and the Close of *Romeo and Juliet's* Golden Story." *Theatre Journal* 41.3 (1989) 341-359. Print.

- “*William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet: Everything’s Nice in America?*” *Shakespeare Survey* 52 (1999): 88-98. Print.
- Holderness, Graham, ed. *The Shakespeare Myth*. Manchester: UP of Manchester, 1988. Print.
- Holland, Peter. “Performing Shakespeare for the Web Community.” *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace*. Ed. Alexander C.Y. Huang and Charles S. Ross. West Lafayette: UP of Purdue, 2009.
- Hornbrook, David. “‘Go play, boy, play’: Shakespeare and Educational Drama.” Holderness 145-159.
- Howard, Jean E. “Shakespeare and Authenticity: Teaching the Real Thing.” *Word and Self Estranged: Topographies of Meaning in Early Modern England*. Ed. Philippa Kelly and L.E. Semler. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010. 93-106. Web. 20 Mar. 2013.
- Hudson, Henry. *Essays on English Studies*. Boston, New York, London and Chicago: Henry N. Hudson, Ginn & Company, 1906. Print.
- Hudson, Kenneth. *A Dictionary of the Teenage Revolution and its Aftermath*. London: Macmillan, 1983. Print.
- Hudson, Kenneth. *The Language of the Teenage Revolution: The Dictionary Defeated*. London: Macmillan, 1983. Print.
- huffpostgay. “Texas’s “Romeo and Juliet” law could expand to include gay teens.” 10 Apr. 2013, 8:30 p.m. Tweet.
- Hulbert, Jennifer and Kevin J. Wetmore, Jr. and Robert L. York, eds. *Shakespeare and Youth Culture*. New York: Palgrave, 2006.
- Hulbert, Jennifer. “‘Adolescence, Thy Name is Ophelia!’ The Ophelia-ization of the Contemporary Teenage Girl.” Hulbert, Wetmore Jr. and York 199-220.

- Hunt, Maurice, ed. *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. New York: MLA, 2000. Print.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*. NY and London: Methuen, 1985. Print.
- Hutcheon, Linda with Siobhan O'Flynn. *A Theory of Adaptation*. 2nd Ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2013. Print.
- Irish, Tracy. "Teaching Shakespeare: A History of the Teaching of Shakespeare in England." *Royal Shakespeare Company*. Royal Shakespeare Company, 2008. Web. 11 Aug. 2011.
- Irving, Terry and David Maunders and Geoff Sherrington. *Youth in Australia, Policy, Administration and Politics: A History Since World War II*. Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia, 1995. Print.
- Isaac, Megan Lynn. *Heirs to Shakespeare: Reinventing the Bard in Young Adult Literature*. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann, 2000. Print.
- Iyengar, Sujata and Christy Desmet. "Rebooting Ophelia: Social Media and the Rhetorics of Appropriation." Peterson and Williams 59-78.
- Jackson, Russell. *Shakespeare Films in the Making: Vision, Production and Reception*. Cambridge: CUP, 2007. Print.
- James, Heather. "Coming of Age in Shakespeare." *Coming of Age*. Ipswich: Salem Press, 2013. 108-125. Print.
- Jazzy4ever-94. Weblog Comment. *Bell Shakespeare Company*. Bell Shakespeare Company, 3 Aug. 2010. Web. 2 Feb. 2011.
- "Jeans Views Differ." *The Herald Sun*. [Sydney] 4 Feb 1958. Print.

- Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press, 2006. Print.
- Johnson, Laurie. "Unthinking *Hamlet*: Stage, Page and Critical Thought." Flaherty, Gay and Semler 62-74.
- Jules, Gary. "Mad World." 2001. Music Lyrics Database. Music Lyrics Database, n.d. Web. 19 Apr. 2013.
- Kahn, Coppelia. "Ophelia Then, Now, Hereafter." Afterword. Peterson and Williams 231-244.
- Karen. Weblog Comment. *Bell Shakespeare Company*. Bell Shakespeare Company, 31 Jul. 2012. Web. 30 Mar. 2013.
- Kavoori, Anandam. *Reading YouTube: The Critical Viewers Guide*. New York: Peter Lang, 2011. Print.
- Keam, Angela. "The "Shakesteen" genre: Claire Danes's Star-Body, Teen Female Fans, and the Pluralization of Authorship." *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation*. 2.1 (2006) Web. 20 Apr. 2010.
- Kidnie, Margaret Jane. *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Kiernander, Adrian. "John Bell and a Post-colonial Australian Shakespeare, 1963-2000." Golder and Madelaine 236-255.
- Kirwan, Peter. Rev. of *Romeo and Juliet* dir. Rupert Goold. *The Shakespeare Review*. 26 Mar. 2010. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.
- Klein, Lisa. *Ophelia*. New York and London: Bloomsbury, 2006. Print.
- Klein, Naomi. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Henry Holt, 2007. Print.

- Kliman, Bernice W. *Shakespeare in Performance: Macbeth*. 2nd Ed. Manchester: UP of Manchester, 2004. Print.
- Lang, Lucy Jane. "A First-Person Narrative on First Love." *Shandler* 218-221.
- Lanier, Douglas. *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Print.
- Laurents, Arthur and Leonard Bernstein, Stephen Sondheim and Jerome Robbins. *West Side Story*. 1957. *Romeo and Juliet, West Side Story*. New York: Random House, 1965. Print.
- Leach, Susan. *Shakespeare in the Classroom: What's the Matter?* Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1992. Print.
- Lee, Christina. *Screening Generation X: The Politics and Popular Memory of Youth in Contemporary Culture*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2010. Print.
- Leonard, Kendra Preston. "The Lady Vanishes: Aurality and Agency in Cinematic Ophelias." *Peterson and Williams* 101-118.
- Levenson, Jill L. *Shakespeare in Performance: Romeo and Juliet*. Manchester: UP of Manchester, 1987. Print.
- Lewis, C.S. *The Magician's Nephew*. 1955. New York: HarperCollins, 2000. Print.
- Lewis, Jon. *The Road to Romance and Ruin: Teen Films and Youth Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Libby, M.F. "Shakespeare and Adolescence." *The Pedagogical Seminary*. (1901) 163-205. Print.
- Loehlin, James N. "'These Violent Delights have Violent Ends': Baz Luhrmann's Millennial Shakespeare." *Shakespeare, Film, Fin de Siècle*. Ed. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray. 2000. 121-136. Print.

LoMonico, Michael. "Shakespearean Ruminations and Innovations." *English Journal*. 99.1

(2009): 21-28. Print.

Love's Magic. By Ned Manning and William Shakespeare. Eltham College, Melbourne. 12 Oct

2010. Performance.

Macbeth. Dir. Geoffrey Wright. Starz, 2006. DVD.

Macbeth Intensive. By Ned Manning and William Shakespeare. Eltham College, Melbourne. 12

Oct 2010. Performance.

McKellen, Ian and Richard Loncraine. *William Shakespeare's Richard III: A Screenplay*.

London: Doubleday, 1996. Print.

MacPhail, Catherine. *Another Me*. London: Bloomsbury, 2003. Print.

Maher, Mary Z. *Modern Hamlets and their Soliloquies*. Iowa City: UP of Iowa, 1992. Print.

Manning, Ned. Personal Interview. 15 Sept. 2010.

Manning, Ned and William Shakespeare. *Love's Magic*. Personal Copy. 2010. Print.

- *Macbeth Intensive*. Personal Copy. 2010. Print.

- *Romeo and Juliet Intensive*. Personal Copy. 2010. Print.

- *Trust and Betrayal*. Personal Copy. 2010. Print.

Margolis, Sally. "Book Review." Rev. of *The Shakespeare Stealer*. *School Library Journal*, 44.6,

1998. Print.

MariamHazem. "I don't want what Romeo and Juliet had, I want what Khadija and Mohamed

had ♥" 9 Apr. 2013, 3:40 p.m. Tweet.

Marks, Jan. *Heathrow Nights*. Oxford: Heinemann Educational Publishers, 2000. Print.

Marsden, John. *Hamlet: A Novel*. Melbourne: Text Publishing, 2008. Print.

Marshall, Cynthia. ““Who Wrote the Book of Love?’: Teaching *Romeo and Juliet* with Early Rock Music.” Hunt 98-107.

Massoni, Kelley. *Fashioning Teenagers: a Cultural History of Seventeen Magazine*. California: Left Coast Press, 2010. Print.

Meyer, Stephanie. *Breaking Dawn*. London: Atom, 2008. Print.

- “Frequently Asked Questions: *Breaking Dawn*.” *Stephanie Meyer*. Stephanie Meyer. Web. 14 May 2011.

- *New Moon*. London: Atom, 2006. Print.

Miller, Claire Cain. “YouTube Ads Turn Videos into Revenue.” *The New York Times*. 2 Sept. 2010. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.

Miller, Naomi J. ed. *Reimagining Shakespeare for Children and Young Adults*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Mills, James. Letter to Neil Hutchinson. 16 Oct. 1961. Box 33, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.

Mills, John A. *Hamlet on Stage: The Great Tradition*. London: Greenwood Press, 1985. Print.

Mobris, Helen. Letter to Young Elizabethan Players. 27 July 1961. Box 33, ms. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.

Monk, Nicholas. *Open-space Learning: A study in Transdisciplinary Pedagogy*. With Carol Chillington Rutter, Jonothan Neelands and Jonathan Heron. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011. Print.

Nhi. Weblog Comment. *Bell Shakespeare Company*. Bell Shakespeare Company, 5 Aug. 2012. Web. 30 Mar. 2013.

“*O*.” Dir. Tim Blake Nelson. Lion’s Gate Films, 2001. DVD.

- O'Connor John. *Shakespearean Afterlives: Ten Characters with a Life of Their Own*. Cambridge: Icon Books, 2003. Print.
- O'Dair, Sharon, ed. *Shakespeareans in the Tempest: Lives and Afterlives of Katrina. Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation*. 5.2 (2010) Web. 15 Apr. 2013.
- Oneal, Zibby. *In Summer Light*. New York: Starfire, 1986. Print.
- Osborne, Laurie E. "Romancing the Bard." *Desmet and Sawyer* 47-64.
- Osgerby, Bill. *Youth in Britain since 1945*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998. Print.
- Palladino, Grace. *Teenagers: An American History*. New York: Harper Collins, 1996. Print.
- Parkes, Christopher. *Children's Literature and Capitalism: Fictions of Social Mobility in Britain, 1850-1914*. New York: Palgrave, 2012. Print.
- Partee, Morriss Henry. *Childhood in Shakespeare's Plays*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006. Print.
- Peterson, Kaara L. and Deanne Williams, eds. *The Afterlife of Ophelia*. New York: Palgrave, 2012. Print.
- Piesse, A.J. "Character Building: Shakespeare's Children in Context." *Shakespeare and Childhood*. Ed. Kate Chedgzoy, Susanne Greenhalgh and Robert Shaughnessy. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2007. 64-79. Print.
- Pipher, Mary. *Reviving Ophelia*. New York: Putnam, 1994. Print.
- Private Romeo*. Dir. Alan Brown. *Netflix*. Netflix. 2011. 15 Apr. 2013.
- Potts, M. and Year 7 Students. *Macbeth Lesson*. Barker College, Sydney. 15 Sept. 2010. Class.
- Quinlan, Phyllis. "Letter to *Seventeen*." Box 17, Folder 9, ms. The Estelle Ellis Collection. Washington D.C.: Archives Center, National History Museum, n.d.

Radiohead. "Exit Music (for a Film) Lyrics." *The Music Lyrics Database*. The Music Lyrics Database. 1996. Web. 20 Apr. 2013.

- "Talk Show Host." *The Music Lyrics Database*. The Music Lyrics Database. 1996. Web. 20 Apr. 2013.

Richard III. Dir. Richard Loncraine. Mayfair, 1995. DVD.

Robertson, Malcolm. Program Note. "Young Elizabethan Players South Australia Program 1966." Box 1, ts. Ephemera Collection of Programs. Canberra: National Library of Australia.

Rocklin, Edward L. *Performance Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare*. Urbana: NCTE, 2005. Print.

Romeo and Juliet Intensive. By Ned Manning and William Shakespeare. St. Catherine's College, Sydney. 24 Aug 2010. Performance.

Romeo and Juliet Pictures, News and Links. Geocities. Montague, Juliet. n.d. Web. 14 May. 2010. Access through *WayBackMachine*.

Rothwell, Kenneth S. *A History of Shakespeare on Screen*. Cambridge: CUP, 1999. Print.

Royal Shakespeare Company. *The Royal Shakespeare Company Magazine 15*. (Summer 1997). Stratford-upon-Avon: Edward Fox. Print.

- *Flourish: The Royal Shakespeare Company Newsletter 7* (Autumn 1966). Print.
- *Flourish The Royal Shakespeare Company Newsletter 2.3* (Summer 1969). Print.
- *Romeo and Juliet Program*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1958.
- *Romeo and Juliet Program*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1976.
- *Romeo and Juliet Program*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1986.
- *Romeo and Juliet Program*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2004.

- *Romeo and Juliet Program*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2008.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 1973*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1973.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 1976*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1976.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 1980*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1980.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 1986*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1986.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 1995*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1995.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 1997*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 1997.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 2000*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2000.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 2004*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2004.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 2006*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2006.
- *Romeo and Juliet Promptbook 2008*. ts. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2008.

Rowling, J.K. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. London: Bloomsbury, 1998. Print.

- Rozett, Martha Tuck. *Talking Back to Shakespeare*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994. Print.
- Russon, Penny. *Undine*. Sydney: Random House, 2004. Print.
- Rutter, Carol Chillington. *Shakespeare and Child's Play: Performing Lost Boys on Stage and Screen*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- Ryan, Tess. "Stage Manager's Report for *Henry 4*." Box 13, Folder 73, ts. Bell Shakespeare Company Records. Melbourne: Performing Arts Museum, 1998.
- Salinger, J.D. *The Catcher in the Rye*. New York: Little Brown, 1951. Print.
- Samantha. Weblog Comment. *Bell Shakespeare Company*. Bell Shakespeare Company, 7 Aug. 2012. Web. 30 Mar. 2013.
- Savage, Jon. *Teenage: the Prehistory of Youth Culture 1875-1945*. London: Penguin, 2008. Print.
- Sedgwick, Fred. *Shakespeare and the Young Writer*. London & New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Semler, Liam and Year 12 Students. Drama Lesson. Barker College, Sydney. 14 Sept. 2010. Class.
- Seventeen. "How to Write to a Boy." *Seventeen* (June 1969): 102-106+ Print.
- "Seventeen Promotional Flier." Box 38, Folder 5, ts. Estelle Ellis Collection. Washington, D.C.: National History Museum, n.d. [1940s].
 - "Shakespeare as You Like It!" *Seventeen* (July 1954):74-75. Print.
 - "Show us your Style!" *Seventeen 72.1* (Jan 2013): 60. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.
 - "Teens in the News." *Seventeen*. (September 1949) 112-113. Print.
 - "Velvet Couples: Romeo and Juliet." *Seventeen* (Oct. 1968): 108-116. Print.

- "What Boys Look for in Girls." *Seventeen* (Mar. 1969). 151-152. Print.

Shakespeare in Love. Dir. John Madden. Universal and Miramax, 1999. DVD.

"Shakespeare...with a dash of hep." *The Herald*. [Melbourne.] 14 Mar. 1967. Box 618, ts.

Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.

"Shakespeare's Plays at Tumut." *The Times Tumut*. [Tumut] 30 June 1959. Print. Box 618, ts.

Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.

Shakespeare, William. *Cambridge School Shakespeare Hamlet*. Ed. Richard Andrews and Rex Gibson. 2nd Ed. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2005. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Cambridge School Shakespeare Henry V*. Ed. Marilyn Bell, Elizabeth Dane and John Dane. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 1993. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Cambridge School Shakespeare Julius Caesar*. Ed. Timothy Seward. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 1992. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Cambridge School Shakespeare King Lear*. Ed. Elspeth Bain, Jonathan Morris and Rob Smith. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2010. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Cambridge School Shakespeare Macbeth*. Ed. Rex Gibson. 2nd ed. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2005. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Cambridge School Shakespeare Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Rex Gibson. 1st ed. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 1992. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Cambridge School Shakespeare Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Rex Gibson. 2nd ed. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 1999. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *No Fear Shakespeare Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. John Crowther. New York: Spark Publishing, 2003. Print.

- Shakespeare, William. *Oxford School Shakespeare Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Roma Gill. Oxford: UP of Oxford, 2005. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard and Katharine Eisaman Maus. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies*. London, 1623. Rpt. *The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare*. 2nd Ed. Ed. Charlton Himnan. New York: Norton, 1996. Print.
- Shandler, Sara, ed. *Ophelia Speaks: Adolescent Girls Write about their Search for Self*. New York: Harper Collins, 1999. Print.
- Shaughnessy, Robert. "Romeo and Juliet: The Rock and Roll Years." *Remaking Shakespeare: Performance across Media, Genres and Cultures*. Ed. Pascale Aebischer, Edward J. Esche and Nigel Wheale. New York: Palgrave, 2003. Print.
- Showalter, Elaine. "Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism." *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. Ed. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. New York and London: Methuen, 1985. 77-94. Print.
- Simeone, Nigel. *Leonard Bernstein, West Side Story*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2009. Print.
- Simon, Henry W. *The Reading of Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges, an Historical Survey*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1932. Print.
- Sinfield, Alan. "Give an account of Shakespeare and Education, showing why you think they are effective and what you have appreciated about them. Support your comments with precise references." *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. 2nd ed. Ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994. Print.

- *Out on Stage: Lesbian and Gay Theatre in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: UP of Yale, 1999. Print.

S.K. "Letter to Seventeen." *Seventeen* (September 1949). Print.

Solis, Lara. "True romance isn't Romeo and Juliet who died together but grandpa and grandma who grew old together ♥" 28 Mar. 2013, 9:58 p.m. Tweet.

Solomon, Lucy and Year Eleven Students. *Othello* Lesson. Barker College, Sydney. 20 Jun. 2010. Class.

- *Othello* Lesson. Barker College, Sydney. 21 Jun. 2010. Class.

Staniford, Elizabeth B. Letter to Young Elizabethan Players. Box 33, ms. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, n.d.

Starks, Lisa S. "Cinema of Cruelty: Powers of Horror in Julie Taymor's *Titus*." *The Reel Shakespeare: Alternative Cinema and Theory*. Ed. Courtney Lehmann and Lisa S. Starks. London: Associated University Presses, 2002. 121-142. Print.

Stephens, John. *Language and Ideology in Children's Fiction*. London and New York: Longman, 1992. Print.

Strangelove, Michael. *Watching YouTube: Extraordinary Videos by Ordinary People*. Toronto: UP of Toronto, 2010. Print.

Strickland, J. Letter To John Trevor. Box 33, ms. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, n.d. [1961]

Styan, J.L. "Direct Method Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 25.2 (1974) 198-200. Print.

- "Shakespeare off the Page." *Teaching Shakespeare Today: Practical Approaches and Productive Strategies*. Ed. James E. Davis and Ronald E. Salomone. Urbana: NCTE, 1993. 61-71. Print.

Swanigan, Pamela. "Music as Facing-Page Translation in Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet*."

Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation. 7.2 (2012)

Web. 4 Apr. 2013.

Swift, Taylor. "Love Story." 2008. *The Music Lyrics Database*. The Music Lyrics Database, n.d.

Web. 20 Apr. 2013.

swimlikeafish. Rev. of *Dating Hamlet: Ophelia's Story*, Lisa Fiedler. *Amazon*. 12 Feb. 2003.

Web. 24. Feb. 2013.

Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present*.

New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989. Print.

Taylor, Neil. "An Actress Prepares: Seven Ophelias." Peterson and Williams 43-58.

"teenager, n.". OED Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. 19 April 2013

<<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/198559?redirectedFrom=teenager>>.

The Tempest. Dir. Julie Taymor. Miramax, 2010. DVD.

Thompson, Ann. "Does it matter which edition you use?" *Shakespeare in the Changing*

Curriculum. Ed. Lesley Aers and Nigel Wheale. London and New York: Routledge,

1991. Print.

Thompson, Ayanna. "Unmooring the Moor: Researching and Teaching on YouTube."

Shakespeare Quarterly. 61.3 (2010):337-356. Web. 5 Mar. 2013.

Thompson, Malissa. *Seventeen* 55.11 (Nov 1996): 132-133+ Print.

Tillyward, E.M.W., *The Elizabethan World Picture*. New York: Macmillan, 1944. Print.

Titus. Special Edition. Dir: Julie Taymor. 20th Century Fox, 2000. DVD.

Tozzi, Carissa Rosenberg and Elisa Benson. "Seventeen's Hot Guys Special! *Seventeen* 70:10

(Oct 2011): 81. Web. 15 Mar. 2013.

Tran. Weblog Comment. *Bell Shakespeare Company*. Bell Shakespeare Company, 5 Aug. 2012.

Web. 30 Mar. 2013.

Trevor, John. Letter to Graham Little. Box 45, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records.

Canberra: National Library of Australia, n.d. [1965]

- Letter to Neil Hutchinson. 22 Oct 1960. Box 33, ms. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.
- Letter to S. Sinclair. 11 Feb 1964. Box 45, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.
- Notes of a meeting between Miss Helmrich, Mr Horswell & John Trevor. Box 679, Folder 3, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1965.
- Press Release for New South Wales Tour. Box 679, Folder 3, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1964.
- "Young Elizabethan Players Notes." Box 32, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1963.

Trevor, John and William Shakespeare. *Julius Caesar*. Box 663, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1959.

- *Macbeth*. Box 664, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia. n.d.
- *The Merchant of Venice*. Box 664, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, n.d.
- *Richard II*. Box 664, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, n.d.

- *The Story of Prince Hal*. Box 664, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records.
Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1958.
- *The Taming of the Shrew*. Box 664, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records.
Canberra: National Library of Australia, n.d.
- *The Tempest*. Box 665, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National
Library of Australia, 1963.
- *Twelfth Night*. Box 665, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra:
National Library of Australia, n.d.

Trust and Betrayal. By Ned Manning and William Shakespeare. St. Catherine's College,
Sydney. 24 Aug 2010. Performance.

The Twilight Saga: New Moon. Dir. Chris Weitz. Temple Hill, 2009. DVD.

Tyler, Peter J. Letter to John Trevor. 10 Dec 1964. Box 45, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre
Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia.

United States. National Aeronautic and Space Administration. "Miranda: Overview." *Solar
System Exploration*. National Aeronautic and Space Administration, 4 Mar 2011. Web.
16 Apr. 2013.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason. *Shakespeare in Performance: The Tempest*. Manchester: UP of
Manchester, 2011. Print.

Victorian Universities and Schools Examinations Board. "English Leaving Certificate
Examination, 1966" ts. Melbourne: Victoria Archives, 1966.

Wall, Barbara. *The Narrator's Voice: The Dilemma of Children's Fiction*. New York: St.
Martin's Press, 1991. Print.

- Wallace-Crabbe, Chris. "The Repeated Rediscovery of America." *Approaching Australia: Papers from the Harvard Australian Studies Symposium*. Ed. Harold Bolito & Chris Wallace-Crabbe. Boston: Harvard Australian Studies Symposium, 1997. 89-96. Print.
- Wetmore Jr., Kevin. "'Are You Shakespearied?' Rock Music and the Production of Shakespeare." Hulbert, Wetmore Jr. and York 117-146.
- William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet*. Special Edition. Dir. Baz Luhrmann. Twentieth Century Fox, 1996. DVD.
- Williams, Melissa. *Seventeen* 55.8 (Aug 1996): 244. Print.
- Williams, Tennessee. *The Glass Menagerie*. 1945. New York: New Directions, 1999. Print.
- Worthen, W.B. "Drama, Performativity, and Performance." *PMLA* 113 (1998):1093-1105. Print.
- "Performing Shakespeare in Digital Culture." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture*. Ed. Robert Shaughnessy. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 2007. 227-247. Print.
 - *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance*. Cambridge: UP of Cambridge, 1997. Print.
- Worthy, David. "Production Manager's File." Box 4, Folder 25, ts. Bell Shakespeare Company Records. Melbourne: Performing Arts Museum.
- Yardley. Advertisement. *Seventeen* (Nov. 1968): 52. Print.
- Young Elizabethan Players. "1958 Program." Box 679, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1958.
- "1959 Program." Box 679, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1959.
 - "1960 Program." Box 679, ts. Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia, 1959.

- "Promotional Flier for the Young Elizabethan Players Southern Company." Box 679, ts.

Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust Records. Canberra: National Library of Australia,
n.d. [1960].

York, Robert L. "'Smells Like Teen Shakespirit' Or, the Shakespearean Films of Julia Stiles."

Hulbert, Wetmore Jr. and York 57-116.

Zabus, Chantal. *Tempests After Shakespeare*. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.

YouTube Filmography

- AllyBazaar. "Romeo and Juliet - Songs is Exit Music for a film by Radiohead." *YouTube*. YouTube, 14 Apr. 2012. Web. 8 Apr. 2013.
- bliargh. "Radiohead - Exit Music (For a Film) - Romeo & Juliette." *YouTube*. YouTube, 30 Nov. 2010. Web. 8 Apr. 2013.
- DeathKnightPooter. "Romeo and Juliet Enlish 1 Project." *YouTube*. YouTube, 24 Apr. 2012. Web. 2 Apr. 2013.
- Harper, Holly. "Romeo and Juliet in Under 5 Minutes." *YouTube*. YouTube, 25 Mar. 2012. Web. 2 Apr. 2013.
- jediism2. "New Moon Song #4: Romeo and Juliet." *YouTube*. YouTube, 25 Jan. 2010. Web. 8 Apr. 2013.
- kakabonito. "romeo & juliet-o consumation night." *YouTube*. YouTube, 13 Nov. 2012. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.
- Labebachula20. "Taylor Swift/Love Story." *YouTube*. YouTube, 12 Dec. 2008. Web. 14 May 2010.
- Layton, Hayley. "Love Story - Taylor Swift [Twilight - Bella and Edward]." *YouTube*. YouTube, 1 Dec. 2008. Web. 8 Apr. 2013.
- MJiRock. "Taylor Swift-Love Story-Romeo and Juliet." *YouTube*. YouTube, 21 Mar. 2009. Web. 14 May 2010.
- MLWolfie. "Twilight: Romeo and Juliet Edition." *YouTube*. YouTube, 11 Jun. 2012. Web. 8 Apr. 2013.
- mrhahnrocks. "Romeo and Juliet in 5 minutes." *YouTube*. YouTube, 13 May 2010. Web. 30 Aug. 2010.
- mrsSUNNYGIRL. "Twilight (Edward (Robert)+ Bella (Kristen) - Romeo + Juliet." *YouTube*. YouTube, 20 Apr. 2008. Web. 30 Aug. 2010.
- MsFunnyvids. "The Magical Tale of Romeo and Juliet (spoof)." *YouTube*. YouTube, 16 July 2009. Web. 2 Apr. 2013.
- mustermann, gabi. "Lunesta You Can't stop thinking? Suicide by Butterflies! American Commercial FAIL." *YouTube*. YouTube, 25 Apr. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2013.
- pollyaayxoo. "Romeo and Juliet First Meeting Scene (1996)." *YouTube*. YouTube, 26 Jan. 2008. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.

- PrimaViolinist. "Hamlet's Obsession." *YouTube*. YouTube, 19 Jun. 2008. Web. 28 Feb. 2013.
- "Ophelia's Immortal." *YouTube*. YouTube, 21 Jan. 2008. Web. 28. Feb. 2013.
- Pudgezilla. "Romeo and Juliet Parody." *YouTube*. YouTube, 5 Jun. 2007. Web. 2 Apr. 2013.
- Reed, Tiffany. "Ophelia." *YouTube*. YouTube, 20 Jan. 2010. Web. 10 Apr. 2013.
- The SecondCityNetwork. "Sassy Gay Friend - Romeo & Juliet." *YouTube*. YouTube. 8 Mar 2010. Web. 20 Apr. 2013.
- Skysert. "Romeo & Juliet. William Shakespeare. Act 5, Scene 3, piano." *YouTube*. YouTube, 28 Jul. 2010. Web. 8 Apr. 2013.
- toldarmin, shawn. "Funny Lunesta Commercial." *YouTube*. YouTube, 13 Mar. 2007. Web. 2 Apr. 2013.
- Tsipos, Jorge. "Romeo and Juliet in 5 mins." *YouTube*. YouTube, 18 Sept. 2006. Web. 30 Aug. 2010.
- W, Frances. "Barbie Hamlet Part One." *YouTube*. YouTube, 19 May 2009. Web. 10 Apr. 2013.
- "Barbie Hamlet Part Two." *YouTube*. YouTube, 20 May 2009. Web. 10 Apr. 2013.
- "Barbie Hamlet Part Three." *YouTube*. YouTube, 20 May 2009. Web. 10 Apr. 2013.
- Wildflowersfield. "Romeo and Juliet - Sacrifice." *YouTube*. YouTube, 23 Sept. 2007. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.
- Wright, Chris. "Romeo Juliet (Ghetto...Skool Version lol)." *YouTube*. YouTube, 23 Feb 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2013.
- XOohLaLaxx. "~Romeo + Juliet - Can You Feel the Love Tonight~." *YouTube*. YouTube, 30 Dec. 2007. Web. 14 May 2010.