

Shakespeare unbard

O'Brien, Richard; Bradley, Hester

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

O'Brien, R & Bradley, H 2018, Shakespeare unbard: negotiating civic Shakespeare. in E Fernie & P Edmondson (eds), *New Places: Shakespeare and Civic Creativity*. 1st edn, The Arden Shakespeare, pp. 41-62.
<<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bham/reader.action?docID=5326827&ppg=66>>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Checked for eligibility: 27/03/2019

This is the accepted manuscript version of a paper accepted for publication in *New Places: Shakespeare and Civic Creativity*. The final version can be found at: <https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/new-places-shakespeare-and-civic-creativity-9781474244558/>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Hester Bradley and Richard O'Brien

Shakespeare Unbard: Negotiating Civic Shakespeare

Insert figure 1:

CAPTION: *Kate Alexander as the Fairy Queen and Ronan Hatfull as Young Falstaff (photo courtesy of Steve Horobin)*

In December 2013, we formed part of the first cohort of seven students on the University of Birmingham's Shakespeare and Creativity MA programme, a collaboration with the Royal Shakespeare Company, the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, and the Library of Birmingham. Part of its ethos is to study and re-create Shakespeare not just in the seminar room and the theatre, but in the civic world beyond. In this capacity, we devised and performed a half-hour piece, *Shakespeare Unbard*, in the front-of-house areas of the Royal Shakespeare Theatre which explored the value and cultural implications of celebrating Shakespeare. This performance, and the conversations behind it, formed part of an ongoing conversation about the stakes, functions, and potential pitfalls of 'civic Shakespeare'. In what follows, we will attempt to situate and define that term as it had meaning for us as the script's lead authors at the time of composition, and reflect on the different valences some of the issues raised—particularly themes of cultural privilege and national identity—have taken on at three years' distance in a time of increasing national and global division. We will also contextualize and re-embody the process behind and the final product of a creative-critical project which took audience members on a promenade—inspired by David Garrick's participatory procession through the streets of Stratford—through the colourful and chequered history of spotlighting Shakespeare in civic contexts.

Looking back from 2016 at our creation of a Shakespeare celebration three years ago, the problems highlighted by the cultural materialist movement of celebrating a reified and singular

version of Shakespeare seem more important than ever. Boris Johnson's shelved Shakespeare biography, *Shakespeare: The Riddle of Genius*, which had been scheduled for release in October 2016, was a book which was promoted explicitly as a celebration of Shakespeare rather than a critical challenge to his dominance and the ideologies which gave it form: the publisher's website describes the book's examination of Shakespeare as 'the true British icon' and 'the most venerated playwright in history', framing the history of his celebration as the reason for its continuance.^[i] This press copy fits Gary Taylor's description of the 'gravity well' effect accruing to its subject, granting Shakespeare a self-perpetuating dominance in British culture and its definition.^[ii] The publisher stated that the book would outline 'Shakespeare's genius in a simple and readable way', presenting accessibility and veneration as necessarily related to one another.^[iii]

The proposed book thus presents a celebratory version of Shakespeare which is both nationalist and uncritical and perpetuates the notion that this Anglocentrism is the *raison d'être* of Shakespeare celebration. Johnson was unable to deliver the book because of his promotion to Foreign Secretary and his involvement with organizing Britain's departure from the European Union. His projected celebration of Shakespeare is indistinguishable from the forces surrounding Brexit, its nationalistic undertones, and a broader increasing movement towards isolationist politics. It therefore seems necessary, in the wake of Brexit, to consider critically any celebration of Shakespeare, and indeed the history of Shakespeare celebration, with an eye to the operation of these forces. Returning to our own piece, we saw some elements of the script with fresh eyes: even as *Shakespeare Unbard* engaged with some of the nationalistic tendencies underlying David Garrick's 1789 Jubilee performances, it was not immune from replicating them in certain respects.

'What do we mean when we speak of remembering, or commemorating, 'Shakespeare?'' ask Clara Calvo and Coppélia Kahn.^[iv] Bearing in mind the version of Shakespeare put forward

by Johnson and his publishers, one potential answer to this question might be Alan Sinfield's description of Shakespeare as 'one of the places where ideology is made'.^[vi] Both statements appear particularly pertinent when applied to the challenges involved in a public celebration of Shakespeare. We did not have *Shakespeare: The Riddle of Genius* as an example of the common ideological tendencies underlying Shakespeare celebration when we created our own performance, but, in hindsight, the stakes were possibly higher than we thought.

Taking place in a context distinct both from the theatrical performance of a work by Shakespeare and from the academic analysis of those works, a series of implications attach to civic Shakespeare: the banner under which such celebrations fall. Calvo and Kahn also note that in commemoration, 'the slippage between the man and his works in the familiar metonymy becomes problematic', and this slippage and the latitude it allows creative practitioners contribute to a number of the following observations.^[vii] Civic Shakespeare is not bound to academic expectations of coherence, completeness or truth, however contested and whatever other truth-expectations might replace these; it encourages treatment of Shakespeare's canon as a grouping of separable parts rather than engaging with individual plays as integral wholes, as commonly expected in the theatre; and it directs itself towards an audience which need not itself feel bound by academic or theatrical expectations.^[viii] Examples from Garrick's 'Ode' to the pre-war history pageant attest to the second of these points. In a high-profile example from 2012, it was the fundamental *separability* of Civic Shakespeare which allowed Kenneth Branagh, in the opening ceremony to the London Olympic Games, to deliver a decontextualised speech written for Caliban in *The Tempest* in the costume of the 19th century industrialist Isambard Kingdom Brunel. Clearly, audiences were not meant to 'read' Brunel himself as the subjugated resident of a colonised island; instead, Caliban's speech spoke *as* Shakespeare, independently of its narrative location *within* Shakespeare.

Furthermore, unlike theatrical or academic engagement with Shakespeare, works produced in a civic context exist at a greater conceptual distance from the established texts as external referents to which the new works can be compared. This distance allows for the various kinds of distortions of those texts such works might introduce, as the Brunel-Caliban collision illuminates. Like all the factors described above, the freedom to distort can be enormously liberating for creative practitioners such as ourselves in putting together a civic Shakespeare celebration. It does, nonetheless, beg the question of what ethical issues might arise from infidelity to our Shakespearean sources. What percentage of the millions of home viewers of the 2012 Olympic Opening Ceremony will have followed the television screening by turning to a scholarly edition of *The Tempest*? If that percentage is low, does it really matter? Director Danny Boyle's use of these lines (the speech beginning 'Be not afeard; the isle is full of noises') masks, if not obfuscates, their context in Caliban's oppression. Is the absence of that context a form of complicity which has any consequences?

On aesthetic grounds, references to Prospero as the island's master would be at best confusing to the global audience. Withholding these references nonetheless allows for a version of Shakespeare, consumed by millions — many of whom might not pick up and read the full play — which is silent on the politics of colonising foreign islands. By extension, it allows for a version of Britain to be globally broadcast, supported by Shakespeare, where this concept also goes unspoken. As practitioners considering a comparable appropriation of elements of the Shakespearean text to Boyle and Branagh's, we therefore have to ask what degree of distance from the source plays' context we consider justifiable.

Civic Shakespeare offers the practitioner the opportunity to make a series of choices about what Shakespeare to present (more freely than in the theatre or the academy, where a monograph or production's omissions and emphases are subject to well-established systems of

critique). Because of this, it also foregrounds the process of ideological making inherent in these choices. Sinfield explores how Shakespeare ‘has been appropriated for certain practices and attitudes, and can be reappropriated for others’, and the process of selection required in devising a celebratory performance makes this appropriation visible and inevitable.^[viii] In the historical research underpinning our performance, we needed to ask ourselves, as Calvo and Kahn recommend, ‘how [celebrations] perpetuate Shakespeare, and what kind of Shakespeare they perpetuate’, before turning this lens on our own developing project.^[ix] In so doing, we found ourselves negotiating not only the history of civic appropriations of Shakespeare, but also a diversity of ideological viewpoints and perceptions of Shakespeare’s political resonance among the seven members of the devising group.

Unsurprisingly, the result was a mixture of voices and performances which was not entirely consistent in its ideological focus. Our piece began with a largely kind, upbeat (though nonetheless steely) character, the Fairy Queen (Kate Alexander), distributing flowers to children while singing ‘Sweet Willy-O’, a song from Garrick’s Jubilee which took a fairly traditional view of the Swan of Avon. Her regal ‘fit of rhyme’ extolling Shakespeare, heralded by a Minstrel (Georgie Cockerill) on the trumpet, was interrupted by a loud, crass character, Young Falstaff (Ronan Hatfull). He dismissed the cultural capital of Shakespeare and the history of his veneration as ‘Boring’ while gleefully announcing his intention to make literal capital from the Bard business: to, as he says, out of context, ‘put money in [his] purse’.^[x] Young Falstaff went on to tear up a copy of the Complete Works and stick it back together out of order, declaring his intention to ‘give an old brand a makeover’. This intervention caused characters to appear in new and surprising arrangements: allowing these fictional figures to exist as independent entities created a dramaturgical space for the competing ‘readings’ of Shakespeare and his cultural meanings each offered to come into direct, embodied conflict. This was manifested in two

scenes: Romeo (Richard O'Brien) serenading Richard III (Charlotte Horobin) and Hamlet (Richard O'Brien) attempting to direct the mechanicals (Alex Whiteley, Charlotte Horobin).

Behind these readings, the superficially more singular viewpoint of Shakespeare offered by the 1769 Stratford Jubilee haunted the performance. The Queen attempted to introduce Garrick (Hester Bradley) near the beginning of the piece, before the audience was derailed by the chaotic actions of Young Falstaff. When she returned to his introduction later, Young Falstaff's interjection 'Alas, more Garrick', reflected the emphasis on the background presence of Garrick throughout. When Garrick did appear, he was underwhelming and his attempt at presenting his 'Ode' was squandered. His character was outshone by the appearance of Gwen Lally (Alex Whiteley), a pageant-master and Shakespearean actor active throughout the first half of the twentieth century whose contributions to the history of celebration are less well-known. As the audience were introduced to Garrick and Lally, they were led through the front-of-house areas of the RSC to the location of the piece's denouement, Gertrude Hermes's 1932 fountain surrounded by costume-clad mannequins and a spiral staircase. Here, the full cast performed a concluding song, 'Shakespeare Style', whilst distributing badges and sing-along sheets. This movement enacted a transition from performance into celebration, and the oppositions between the Fairy Queen, Young Falstaff and his Shakespearean creations were sublimated within the participatory atmosphere.

In the rest of this chapter, we will pay particular attention to the ways in which we navigated the relationship between Shakespeare celebration and nationalism, and between criticism and affirmation. Our observations will follow the structure of the performance, moving from the 'idolatry' represented by the Fairy Queen and its potential dark side, hinted at in Garrick's 'Ode', through the complex and conflicting impulses involved in our presentation of the Shakespeare industry, where different parts of the canon spoke to and for a variety of

heterogeneous perspectives. Our portrayal of David Garrick and the interwar pageant-master Gwen Lally highlights some of the problems involved with the questioning of celebration that formed the basis of our project: we will consider our flattened-out portrayal of Gwen Lally as a key example of this tension in practice. At moments, the script walked a fine line between exposing and reproducing the cultural hegemony that underscores aspects of Shakespeare's celebration. We will close-read one revealing instance from our practice in the figure of the 'foppish Frenchman' who interrupted Garrick's performance. Although our negotiations risked creating an unbalanced whole, the questions and oppositions, the uneasy union of disparate views, at the root our performance warned against considering Shakespeare's works as a singular wholly positive entity: we therefore demonstrate—through our own practice and this subsequent self-reflection—that any inclusive and impactful celebration of Shakespeare should be critical, and that such projects have a duty to question themselves.

*

Beginning work on our project, we felt a powerful tension between criticism (of the forms Shakespeare celebration had taken) and affirmation (of the work itself, and of the impulse to celebrate). On the one hand, the group was in agreement that a great number of people had found the works of Shakespeare to be a repository of love, compassion, humanity, redemption and beauty: this was essentially the view taken by the Fairy Queen, the character who opened our piece by staking out the well-attested claims for the singular beauty and achievement Shakespeare represented. Many of us were nonetheless drawn to reflect on the elements of Shakespeare's works which presented seemingly opposing qualities in equally powerful and resonant language: the impact made by characters such as Richard III and Iago, who have come to symbolize jealousy, hatred, malevolence and prejudice, was difficult to account for within the context of a

work in praise of Shakespeare. What could the Fairy Queen say to, or about, these characters? How could her version of celebration find room for these destructive forces?

There is something about celebration itself which continues to be regarded as innately uncritical. The words ‘celebration’, ‘festival’, and ‘jubilee’ invoke happiness, announcing and disseminating appreciation, consumption and satisfaction, triumph and victory, and uncontrollable overflow of emotions.^[xii] In this regard, Susan Sontag’s famous statement from half a century ago is still importantly incendiary:

The truth is that Mozart, Pascal, Boolean algebra, Shakespeare, parliamentary government, baroque churches, Newton, the emancipation of women, Kant, Marx, Balanchine ballets, *et al.*, don’t redeem what this particular civilization has wrought upon the world. The white race is the cancer of human history; it is the white race and it alone—its ideologies and inventions—which eradicates autonomous civilizations wherever it spreads, which has upset the ecological balance of the planet, which now threatens the very existence of life itself.^[xiii]

It would be disingenuous to pretend that such thoughts were occupying the minds of all members of our ensemble equally (if at all) during the devising process. Nonetheless, the challenge they offer is an important one. Celebration, as something which is particularly uncritical, anti-intellectual, mysticizing and, according to Mark Thornton-Burnett, ‘in denial of informing material contexts’, is an affront to new historicist and cultural materialist readings of Shakespeare.^[xiv] Using Sontag, celebration of Shakespeare in itself can be seen as disgusting, dangerous, and supremacist; a desperate attempt to compensate for the terrorism of white culture — then again, ‘the terrorism of white culture’ was never raised as a discussion point in the rehearsal room. At the time of the creation of *Shakespeare Unbared*, we were perhaps more

concerned with how a Shakespeare celebration might be embarrassing rather than how ethical it was. At the heart of our project, however, was the question of whether a celebration of the features of western, white, dominant culture, as represented in the figure of Shakespeare, always had to be a victory march or a declaration of power, or if it could contain a concession to its most embarrassing and unsettling parts. Civic Shakespeare had begun to overlap with issues of civic responsibility.

The concept of responsibility to others in our society informed another perspective — one which was especially important to the module for which we developed the piece. Celebration is a vehicle for civic engagement, a pragmatic method for wider involvement, and an escape from our own academic echo-chambers. Joy and hope are arguably motivational steps towards questioning engagement. In producing our project, we felt this dilemma: whether the creation of something which was accessible, child-friendly, and joyful, as well as being a working piece of theatre, necessitated a condensation and de-problematizing of the material with which we were working. It therefore felt important to us in the devising process to confront the difficult questions raised in the public presentation of Shakespeare. Holderness wryly assesses attempts by academics to distance *their* work and rituals from a form of commemoration which seeks ‘to shape a sense of “English” national identity by reference back to a sanitised and de-historicised past [...] a nationalist, patriotic, nostalgic, heritage Shakespeare’.^[xiv] These were aspects of the history of commemoration that we did not wish to repeat — they embarrassed us, and risked embarrassing the audience. Would it, however, be disingenuous for our performance not to acknowledge that they existed? Would ignoring these uses of Shakespeare to promote our own be a kind of silent complicity?

Wondering how to account for the complexities Shakespeare celebration was at risk of whitewashing, we found surprising encouragement in the historical example of David Garrick.

Garrick's 'Ode Upon Dedicating A Building, And Erecting A Statue, To Shakespeare, At Stratford Upon Avon' has traditionally been held as the high-watermark of Bardolatry in declaring its subject 'The god of our idolatry': a phrase, and a way of relating to Shakespeare, which hangs heavily over all subsequent celebratory projects.^[xv] Indeed, the 1769 Jubilee has been conceived of as the Shakespeare celebration to haunt all Shakespeare celebrations: for Christian Deelman, 'all subsequent Shakespeare festivals ... have their roots in the first Jubilee'.^[xvi] The Bardolatrous strain found its way into our script in lines like these, delivered in the opening sequence by the Fairy Queen:

Hard to believe that mortal skin
enwrapped that mind that richly wrought
such substance out of pure thought,
and wound it to a shimmering skein
which now, we must unwind again ...

The creation of a singular culturally conservative version of Shakespeare is what Cultural Materialism tends to oppose and dismantle, but the Jubilee itself has nonetheless been singularized and canonized. Festivals and celebrations are not usually scrutinized for the same potentially radical or dissident material as Shakespeare's 'texts' themselves, but conceived of as cementing a singular un-contestable version of Shakespeare. It is therefore noteworthy that Garrick's 'Ode' contains a powerful countercurrent in a striking vision of Shakespeare as a figure to whom Nature has given 'absolute command' and 'unbounded pow'r'. Though Garrick seems anxious to assert that these godlike abilities are harnessed for good, the poet is figured sitting upon a 'darken'd throne' in 'dreadful state', capable of commanding 'awful silence' and summoning 'the Demons of the deep' to do his bidding. Shakespeare here is capable of commanding slavering subjection from the 'subject passions': 'they all foaming, trembling, own

him for their Lord.’ As such, the following passage poses a disturbing moral question which it cannot adequately evade:

What tho’ with more than mortal art,
Like Neptune he directs the storm,
Lets loose like winds the passions of the heart,
To wreck the human form;
Tho’ from his mind rush forth, the Demons to destroy,
His heart ne’er knew but love, and gentleness, and joy.

A central issue for our group thus became how, in what was meant to be a context of civic celebration, we could grapple to our own satisfaction with the ‘Demons’ Shakespeare had always been held capable of unleashing. The solution we arrived at, which informed the whole course of the performance, involved embracing the wholesale deconstruction of Shakespeare into independent, sometimes conflicting, component parts which had been so comprehensively embraced by the tourist and heritage industries. Although the Fairy Queen was neither blinkered nor elitist (‘His works belong to all of us’, she declared at one point, turning her forcefulness towards inclusive rather than hierarchical ends), we introduced Young Falstaff as a rival figurehead who embraced the implications of an unscrupulously mercantile Shakespeare industry. His role, as a representative of venal, corporeal and commercial forces, was primarily to interrupt and trouble the Queen’s focus on a purely aesthetic appreciation of Shakespeare’s ‘transcendent beauty’.

The first confrontation between the two allowed us to contrast two images of Shakespeare: the Fairy Queen sang, operatically and *a cappella*, of the ‘Sweet Swan of Avon’, to a

tune composed by Thomas Arne, only to find herself interrupted by the heavily-strummed guitar chords of Young Falstaff's rendition of Garrick's 'Warwickshire. A Song':

Ye Warwickshire lads, and ye lasses,
See what at our Jubilee passes,
Come revel away, rejoice and be glad,
For the lad of all lads, was a Warwickshire lad ...^[xvii]

In our modernized version, we wanted to emphasize the modern connotations of 'lad', as used in the sense first attested in the *OED* in 1986: 'A young man [often] characterized ... by attitudes or behaviour regarded as irresponsible, sexist, or boorish'.^[xviii] The lyrics were also altered in places to fit with Young Falstaff's celebration of the commercial over the moral: for instance, 'Be proud of the charms of your county' was altered to 'Be proud of the scams of your county'. This in fact followed in the footsteps of the original, which noted that 'The thief of all thieves was a Warwickshire thief'. These two songs lent themselves to our purposes in offering competing accounts of their subject, but both originated in the context of Garrick's Jubilee. They therefore allowed us to highlight a tension similar to that inherent in Garrick's demonic passage, demonstrating that the Jubilee could simultaneously contain two conflicting accounts of Shakespeare. The platitudinous, near-blasphemous exaggerations in the lyrics to 'Thou soft-flowing Avon' (its account of 'hallowed ... turf' pillowing a blessed head reminiscent of the later carol 'Away in a Manger') were performed by professionals for a listening audience. The boisterous local populism represented by the 'Warwickshire Lad', on the other hand, was disseminated in a commercially-produced songbook, *Shakespeare's Garland*, sold for the express purpose of mass participation. Both formed part of the same originating event.

As such, our initial opposition between a high-minded appreciation for poetry and the sale of cut-price tea-towels and ‘authentic Elizabethan breath mints’ was a binary that kept collapsing: ‘Why would you celebrate Shakespeare with a scented candle?’ asked the Queen, even as her own text drew directly on Garrick, who himself spurred the trade in Shakespeare souvenirs. Nonetheless, it allowed for a more polyvocal, contested understanding of commemoration to emerge. For instance, Branagh’s *Caliban-Brunel*, to our hawker, was an example of how commercial imperatives were never merely that, overlapping with a complex web of aesthetic, national, and pragmatic values and priorities:

Bit out of context, but that doesn’t matter. Split him up and sell him off, that’s what I say. Key rings and fridge magnets, tea towels and tat. It’s all for the good of art, innit? ‘The Shakespeare industry’... well, fair enough. Got any other national industries to speak of? Didn’t think so.

Young Falstaff’s onstage destruction of a copy of the *Oxford Complete Works of William Shakespeare* was also a creative act, producing new dramatic scenes. This intervention prioritized rehearsal over remembrance. As a form of commemoration, ‘rehearsal’, Holderness comments, is keen to ‘acknowledge the constructed nature of the contemporary collision’.^[xix] In performance, however, this particular event resulted in gasps from the audience of Shakespeare scholars and patrons of the RSC. This audible shock at the defacing of a mass-market textual artefact suggested an underlying conception of the works of Shakespeare as a sacred text (an association explored at length by scholars including Jem Bloomfield) even among a crowd containing many with a more-than-superficial knowledge of the constructedness of all modern editions.^[xx] Some of the surprise we noted may also have been generated by the de-contextualisation and de-materialisation that ripping up the *Complete Works* implies. This was, of course, part of our aim — to bring different versions of what ‘Shakespeare’ represents in varying contexts into open

conflict, and to actively foreground the question: what do we talk about when we talk about Shakespeare?^[xxi]

The most sustained example of the ‘battle for Shakespeare’ this de-materialisation unleashed in our piece came in a debate between Richard III (portrayed by Charlotte Horobin in a McKellen-inspired military jacket and peaked cap) and Romeo (Richard O’Brien, clutching a cuddly pink pig). Richard’s argument in this scene was largely a challenge to Romeo over the extent to which Shakespeare could be said to be ‘good for you’, the sanitized sweet swan of Bardolatry: ‘Your “love” kills almost everyone you know. Do you think you’re a good romantic role model?’ At the time of writing, three years after the event, their dialogue feels somewhat gauche and on-the-nose — at least to me (Richard) as its author. Romeo’s pure love felt humourless, whereas Richard’s audience-directed deviousness allowed him, once again, to have all the best lines: ‘I am Richard, Duke of Gloucester, misunderstood king and long-term Leicester resident’. This in itself reveals something of the character of the problem, however — how to engage with idolatry, in its naked unselfconsciousness, without the defences of contemporary irony:

ROMEO:

But Shakespeare wasn’t like other men, was he? Shakespeare saw inside us all, inside our secret hearts. He unleashed the full tide of human feelings!

RICHARD III:

And do you think that’s a good idea?

ROMEO:

His words were for all time!

RICHARD III:

Well - exactly. Just because you wouldn't put my speeches on a fridge magnet, doesn't mean you won't remember them. Did you know I coined the phrase 'A tower of strength'? And do you really want to be quoting me? Do you want me on your lips?

ROMEO:

That's one phrase! Shakespeare showed us how to love — he gave us a whole language of attraction, of affection, of forgiveness, of redemption —

RICHARD III:

— and of rage, and hatred, horror, and disgust.

The second of the collisions Young Falstaff set in motion turned more explicitly on the tension between elite and popular Shakespeares. Throughout the piece, popular engagement was viewed from different angles at different times, sometimes negatively inflected:

YOUNG FALSTAFF:

So - what would these fools pay for... for example, (*He calls out*) this very fine brooch made from the very strongest branch that was cut from the very first mulberry tree planted by the one and only Sweet Willy-O?

In the second 'mash-up' the character created, however, the elitist was explicitly denigrated in favour of the popular. Hamlet appeared as a mid-twentieth-century actor, in the mould of Olivier, trained at 'WADA (the Wittenberg Academy of Dramatic Arts)'. He chastised Bottom, and by implication, any amateur for daring to presume to appear in a Shakespeare play:

This isn't 'showbusiness', you piping fool. This is Culture - though I've seen yoghurts with more ambitious cultures than yours.

His plummy pronouncements were nonetheless dismissed by his more practical scene partner, who eventually crowned this champion of exclusionary approaches with his own asses' ears:

It's always anguish with you. I'm worn out.

If you could just get on with things, then we might have some *drama*, and not all this doubt.

This dispute led into our performance's most sustained engagement with ideas of participatory and popular Shakespeare: the much-heralded appearance of David Garrick. Discussion of Garrick leading up to this point took up almost as many lines as the character himself was given: in the final script, to which there were some amendments in performance, the Fairy Queen has approximately 33 verse lines introducing Garrick and the 1769 Stratford Jubilee while Garrick himself speaks 34 lines in prose and verse. On arrival, Garrick directly addressed the audience as though they were the patrons at his Jubilee. As such, the part of *Shakespeare Unbard* which specifically dealt with the 1769 Jubilee took place at a juncture between its more performance-based aspects and its more celebratory conclusion: a space in which an audience could both detachedly judge Garrick's celebration of Shakespeare and be implicitly involved in it, placed contextually, as the Fairy Queen remarked, 'back in 1769'.

Writing this section, we found a stage-direction from Garrick's post-Jubilee play striking: '*Every character tragic and comic join in*', instructing volunteers taken from the street outside the theatre to form a procession of Shakespearean characters across the stage together.^[xxiii] This stage

direction attests to the problems of inclusivity in civic Shakespeare. On one hand, it suggests an attractive and carnivalesque generic instability that might see the Nurse from *Romeo and Juliet* partying with Falstaff and the bear from *The Winter's Tale* hand-in-hand with Iago, or the unlikely teaming together of the characters who ideologically opposed one another in our piece. But by combining in procession disparate Shakespeare characters and creating a visual display of them walking in one direction as a single mass, Garrick's stage-direction also asks for an audience to tacitly condone each of these characters' individual moral viewpoints and indulge in a respite from their fraught interrelations. The momentary reprieve resonates with a secondary definition of 'jubilee' as a year appointed for 'remission from the penal consequences of sin'.^[xxiii] The remission implied by making Shakespeare characters join in with one another indicates a neutralizing of panic, a downplaying of Richard III's 'rage, and hatred, horror, and disgust' and an abandonment of outrage. But although the characters are presented physically together and moving in the same direction in a celebration of Shakespeare, the eccentricity of their unity, the fact that they are from different (arguably opposing) genres, is obvious in the stage direction. It attests to troubling differences within the umbrella of Shakespeare veneration: in imagining why the individual characters might celebrate Shakespeare, it is easy to suppose (as our 'mash-ups' made clear) that some or all of them might support him for the 'wrong' reasons.

Our version of Garrick was preoccupied with the creation of this procession of Shakespearean characters (which was cancelled due to rain at the Jubilee itself). His prerogative was to bring together the contrasting elements of Shakespeare which had informed the earlier scenes of our performance. His demand for a procession involved the glorification of both the light and dark elements of Shakespeare that we found in his 'Ode'. At the same time, though this impulse and the presence of Garrick was felt throughout the piece, on appearance he was child-like, underwhelming and ridiculous:

Good evening, sweet Warwickshire! And sweeter Stratford! Upon the sweetest Avon!
And we're here to celebrate the sweetest and most nice-scented work of the sugary-est,
pastry-like, iccreamiest, most delectable, and sweetest bard of them all...

[looks to the QUEEN for help]

Garrick's Shakespeare was in one sense a hyperbolic version of the Fairy Queen's, exposing through exaggeration the vague, saccharine, and uncritical elements of her perspective. While Garrick presented an anaesthetized version of Shakespeare, he was also impressed by a range of Shakespearean characteristics which included the 'demonic' representations of 'rage, and hatred, horror, and disgust'. He espoused a luxuriating enjoyment of the wickedness of the world that Shakespeare creates, particularly in Falstaff, who like the world, is 'wicked and round'. As suggested in his original 'Ode', he especially enjoyed the juxtaposition of Shakespeare's 'Demons to destroy' with his 'gentleness, and joy'.^[xxiv] When the Fairy Queen informed Garrick that there were not enough characters on stage to create a procession, Garrick turned to the audience, demonstrating a binary approach to Shakespearean character:

Hmmm... You! *[to the audience]*,

Are any of you Shakespearean characters? ...

Aye or nay?

If nay, why nay?

If aye, then who and why?

Are you tragic or comic?

Angelic, demonic?

Fat and round

And wicked

Like the globe itself...?

Or hungry and lean?

Generous or mean?

What I'm *trying* to convey -

Is that there isn't half an array

A great enough load

To fit in an ode!

Which (if I may?)

[*cough*] I mean to say.

And this ode itself begins with a question... a question easily answered!

Questioning was at the root of *Shakespeare Unbard*, reflected elsewhere in our use of the Twitter campaign '#DearShakespeare' to garner audience questions towards Shakespeare, which we set in a sound installation.^[xxv] Garrick's direct questioning, geared towards the individual audience member, demanded that they identify with a character. This questioning almost became an interrogation, especially his 'If nay, why nay?', which insisted that the audience member must have a good reason for not making this creative leap of identification. Our version of Garrick was portrayed as someone who did not feel that anyone should be allowed to exclude themselves from the ubiquity of Shakespearean characteristics without adequate excuse.

Garrick in our production went on to ask a 'question easily answered' with the opening four lines of the 'Ode':

TO what blest genius of the isle

Shall gratitude her tribute pay,

Decree the festive day,

Erect the statue, and devote the pile?

The ease by which this question can be answered according to Garrick was part of the problem with his perspective. His inability to deal with the interference of an alternate answer offered by a ‘foppish Frenchman’ (a character planted in the audience, portrayed by Chris Gleason) revealed the narrow-mindedness of his stance. It exposed Garrick’s anachronistic desire to unequivocally celebrate Shakespeare and his unwillingness to view the horror in Shakespeare as problematic instead of delightful. This was perhaps reflected in the way that our own performance struggled to interrogate rather than simply encourage an enjoyment of the ‘dark’ parts of Shakespeare.

The ‘foppish Frenchman’ insisted on the brilliance of Voltaire instead of Shakespeare, echoing a similar planned incident at the Jubilee in 1769.^[xxvi] Our version of the incident walked a fine line between highlighting xenophobic elements in the 1769 Jubilee and reproducing them, with stereotyping present in the Frenchman’s speech:

FRENCHMAN:

Voltaire!! It’s Voltaire!!

GARRICK: [*affronted*]

He’s not of the isle! He’s French!

FRENCHMAN:

A pox on you insular English! Everything has to be about ‘Shakespeare’. If it’s not Shakespeare it’s roast beef, I mean, come on! What a culinary disaster!

Overdone steak! Overdone plays! No sensitivity, just blood and guts. It makes me cry... yes... tears of laughter!

The FRENCHMAN starts laughing uncontrollably

Garrick's defense that Voltaire is 'not of the Isle - he's French' was obviously a weak one. Although the fop was escorted away by other characters, Garrick lost the debate: the Frenchman returned for the final song, 'Shakespeare Style', to advocate for the European qualities of Shakespeare (interjecting after the line 'characters that made this country famous' with 'though most were Italian or Danish'). The interference of the 'foppish Frenchman' in the 1769 Jubilee was used as a mode to cement the superiority of Shakespeare rather than to invoke the potential validity of dissenting voices. Elizabeth Montagu's *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespear ... with some remarks upon the misrepresentations of Mons. de Voltaire*, for instance, published in the same year as the Jubilee, attests to a requirement to correct the opinion of Voltaire by invoking the worth of Shakespeare.^[xxviii] The Frenchman in our performance was a crass national stereotype who also pointed out the limits of nationalism. Three years before Brexit, he highlighted the connection between insularity and the presupposition of the cultural superiority of Shakespeare.

Garrick's failed attempt at a procession of Shakespeare's characters was salvaged by our version of the early 20th century pageant master and Shakespeare performer Gwen Lally. Lally's inclusive idea of Shakespeare as representative of a continuing and achievable human creativity won out against Garrick's view of him as 'unparalleled, unsurpassable, superhuman':

GARRICK:

For our age and for all time! We shall never look on his like again!

LALLY:

Shall we not? I wouldn't be so sure. What about you lads or lasses? For the new Shakespeare might be a girl. Will one of you ever write as well or as all-

encompassingly or as beautifully sinisterly as our Swan of Avon? What do you think? Can there be another Shakespeare? Why not?! Is there a Shakespeare here?

Lally's democratization of Shakespeare encapsulated some of our ambivalence. Although we did not wish to tidy away entirely the 'beautifully sinister', too great an emphasis on this angle was likely to risk souring the participatory atmosphere. Our praise for Shakespeare was, like Jonson's, 'on this side idolatry', but it nonetheless required the collapsing of a few complexities to serve the purpose of an exhortation to future creativity in the time we had available. There was much about the discomfiting cultural freight of Shakespeare, in terms of the works' complicity in systems of class, race and gender hierarchy, that we did not have the space or perhaps, in this context, the intellectual tools to adequately unpack.^[xxviii]

Some (but not all) of these issues were highlighted in Lally's address to the audience:

Who is here?
And who isn't?
Who can put quill to paper,
Create whole worlds from pure vapour?
... And ... listen ...
Should you ...
Celebrate me!? Celebrate him!?
Celebrate all of those middle class men?
And celebrate Britannia,
What happens then?
You've been listening to our idle chatter.

But what do *you* think – doesn't that matter?

GARRICK *gazes at LALLY longingly*

At this point in the performance Garrick approached Lally and tied a modernized version of the 1769 jubilee's rainbow ribbon (originally distributed amongst festival-goers to represent the 'endless variation' of Shakespeare) around her wrist. Both Garrick and Lally were played by women and the union of the two characters, emblemized by the ribbon, added a queer element to the Shakespeare celebration. We wanted Lally's view of Shakespeare to rival (and surpass) Garrick's, but we also wanted to show a unity between them despite their different viewpoints. Lally's questions to the audience were an attempt to empower the viewers' judgements, as well as to think about viewpoints that were not represented by us or within our audience ('Who is here? / And who isn't?'). The audiences for which the piece, in its two live incarnations, was performed—those present in the RSC bars and foyers in the lead-up to an evening's performance of *Wendy and Peter Pan*, and the invited guests of the University of Birmingham's Annual General Meeting, chief among them the institution's Chancellor, Lord Bilimoria—were unlikely to have represented the wide social sweep which Garrick and Lally's projects originally sought to include. This is not in itself an assessment of the extent to which *Shakespeare Unbard* could truly speak to audiences outside the theatre and the academy (though we note that the audience for an RSC children's show is not, *ipso facto*, a Shakespeare audience, and the attendees of a University AGM may have very little connection to academic work in the humanities). It certainly is an admission that this ambition of the piece has not been fully tested. Indeed, it is one of the major ironies of the project that it was a show about the history of public engagement conceived by practitioners with a foot in the academic camp, and a show whose own public engagement value remains partially theoretical; but we tried at least to open up academic activity to wider perspectives.

Our use of Lally as character partly represented the historical figure's engagement with questions of gender, inclusivity, and citizenship. In the performance at the RSC, when Lally appeared, it was to great applause by the audience (her actor, Alex Whiteley, had to shush the crowd and then gesture for them to pick it up again), and our project almost became a celebration of her as well as of Shakespeare. The fact that she is less well known than Garrick did not seem to detract from the appreciative welcome she received. But as a historical figure she also presents an uneasy relationship with nationalism and the role of Shakespeare in articulating English national identity. *The Pageant of England* (1935) at Langley Park, Buckinghamshire, of which Lally was the pageant master, with 4000 public performers, ended with John of Gaunt's 'this scepter'd isle' speech from *Richard II*.^[xxx] Peter Merrington describes pageantry between the wars as an active mode assuming collective and personal responsibility for a triumphant English past: '[t]hose who attended the performance would, surveying and approving their own past rehearsed before them, and paying active homage through the singing of national anthems, themselves be cast as players in the national drama'.^[xxx] (It is, however, worth noting here that many scholars challenged any sense of the historical pageant movement as univocally nationalistic or politically conservative at the first major conference to address this form of civic theatre, held at University College London in September 2016.)^[xxx]

We presented Lally as a national hero, boasting of her portrayal of Henry V in the First World War as an indication of how 'women were fighting for Britain on the stage'. But by emphasizing her radical gender politics but not her role in cementing a troubling national identity we failed to expose the nationalistic narratives she served in her historic role, propagating the tendency of a blinkered feminism which fails to account for ethnic diversity. We partially pasted over this problem by having Lally directly address nationalism and Britannia as concepts to be questioned, rather than expose those issues as endemic to an ideology that was part of the

conception of her character. We could have emphasized what it was that we felt she should be celebrated for without concealing the more problematic elements in her history, although perhaps we did not have the space and time to do so. We took advantage of a lack of public knowledge about Lally to make her into a more liberal figure, and possibly it was inappropriate to use her, as a character, as a vehicle for these ideas. One redeeming feature is that she did ask ‘Should you... / Celebrate me!’ putting her own heroism and veneration into question.

Lally’s final question, ‘But what do *you* think – doesn’t that matter?’, looks at personal voice as something that is not necessarily directly correlated with ideology, but is material and individual. Unlike Garrick’s address which asked whether the audience member was a character, Lally’s address asked if they were a creator and asked them to assume an agent rather than passive role in the creation of culture. At this point, we invited children in the audience to participate by meeting the Fairy Queen, who gave them writing materials to produce their own work. Lally’s version of Shakespeare was one that called for the necessity of alternative Shakespeares and interpretations. If our celebration claimed that another Shakespeare is possible and desirable, it also insisted that there would have to be a lot of them, following on from a critical prerogative to expose the ideal construct of a singular Shakespeare. Though *Shakespeare Unbard* had disparate and sometimes contradictory goals, and revealed the dilemmas of Shakespeare celebration more than it provided answers to them, this was not necessarily antithetical to Lally’s hopeful message that dominant cultural forces might be dismantled and recreated by a multiplicity of diverse personal voices.

Though we might not have conceived of it in such terms at the time, our route through the varying public and civic uses of Shakespeare was essentially a dialectical one – opposing versions of what Shakespeare could mean (high culture and pop; forbidding and participatory; politically radical and politically conservative; beautifully comforting and enchantingly

dangerous) were brought into conflict. They were also, eventually, brought into a somewhat uneasy equilibrium on at least one front, in a truce between our two principal combatants. Defining Shakespeare respectively as ‘A steady stream of revenue’ and ‘An icon for eternity’, Young Falstaff and the Fairy Queen came to a mutual understanding that the subject of their debate is both unique and inexhaustible, and that from a certain distance the aesthetic argument looks a lot like the commercial:

You think you’ve squeezed the last drop out of him, but if you go back to him there’s always something more you can get.

In some ways the project of celebration, however much we wished to question it, seemed to compel us to conclude on a provisionally positive note. Though the history of Shakespeare celebration might have unleashed some dark forces, latent in societies and in the plays themselves, to conclude a performance part-sponsored by the RSC, in their own front-of-house space, with a demolition of the concept of commemoration itself would have felt like a kind of sacrilege against ‘the God of [our] idolatry’. Just as the present chapter—an assessment of the strengths and failings of our prior foray into civic Shakespeare as much as an account of its making—seems to be hard-coded against an entirely self-critical conclusion, *Shakespeare Unbard* had to justify its own existence without gnawing off the hand that fed it.

Insert figure 2:

CAPTION: *Georgie Cockerill, Richard O’Brien, Charlotte Horobin, Alex Whiteley, Kate Grace, Ronan Hatfull, and Hester Bradley sing the closing number, ‘Shakespeare Style’, at the RSC (photo courtesy of Keith Payne)*

The practical nature of the devising process necessitated more than purely theoretical thought about the aims and methods of engagement with a wider audience: a concept,

increasingly central to the academic career progression on which as early career scholars we are beginning to embark, which we were not only studying in historical accounts but actually pursuing in the present moment. It therefore at least opened up a conversation between the study of participatory civic Shakespeare and its methods and effects in creative practice. It remains in some ways unusual to begin a postgraduate career with a project in which such questions as ‘Who is this for?’ and ‘How do we keep them interested?’ are inescapable, and these kinds of enquiries are nothing if not salutary. It is perhaps a testament to the usefulness of working on *Shakespeare Unbard* that both of our own subsequent projects as researchers have continued to operate on, and in some cases blur, the boundaries between academic study and public performance. And in this spirit, perhaps nothing more comprehensively represents the project’s conflicted attitude toward the ideals of inclusive celebration which it nonetheless pursued than ‘Shakespeare Style’.

This participatory song closed our performance, and was delivered both by the seven creators and, from sing-along sheets, by the gathered audience of theatre-goers, students, lecturers, and interested passers-by. It emblemizes not only the issues our project set out to confront, but also the unique contribution of a creative method where the traditional academic dialectic seems unable to resolve all of the issues raised. Where the language of debate exhausts itself in tentative, provisional conclusions, the language of artistic response begins. We conclude this examination of our own past project, therefore, with what we feel is a representative transition from the critical to the creative. As in *Shakespeare Unbard* itself, our discursive impulses must eventually give way to a different tactic. Here, then, are the affirmatory, sometimes contradictory, sung words to which our audience left the performance space: the text of ‘Shakespeare Style.’

The QUEEN leads the audience over the course of this dialogue into the fountain space between the bar and the cafe, takes up a position at a keyboard, and leads YOUNG FALSTAFF and the audience in a song which, although he is at first reluctant to join in with, soon appeals to his mischievous nature. The song begins in a faux-military, reverent, 'Rule Britannia' style, but gradually degrades into a looser, jazzier performance, becoming a more boisterous and rowdy celebration. All members of the company eventually join in.

QUEEN and YOUNG FALSTAFF:

Shakespeare's style – the pride of all the nation

This sacred isle's just right for veneration

We like a laugh,

Fathom and a half

And we like commiseration

So let's do it in that good old Shakespeare style

Local lad, the child of a glover

Absent dad, the patron saint of lovers

We like craft beer

And we like Shakespeare

And we're glad he's ours, not others

So let's do it in that good old native soil Shakespeare style

A son of Stratford, Birmingham and Warwick

Manufactured Prince Hal and Poor Yorick

We like sloe gin

And we like to join in

Yeah we like it something choric

So let's do it in that good old civic movement, native soil, Shakespeare style

On the green in thousands see them marching

One sole theme is clear and overarching

If there's no one else

We must praise ourselves

Since the candle left us darkling

So let's do it in that good old village pageant, civic movement, native soil, Shakespeare style

Characters that made this country famous

Though most were Italian or Danish

But we'll act their plays

Dream of bygone days

And we'll quote them something shameless

In that good old Merrie England, village pageant, civic movement, native soil,
Shakespeare style

So what now? What's our place in the story?

Do we bow before our own history?

And who are we,

And should that still be

A question we're exploring

In that good old all-inclusive, Merrie England, village pageant, civic movement, native soil Shakespeare style?

- ^[i] Andrew Dickson, 'Brexit, pursued by a bear: Boris Johnson shelves his Shakespeare biography', *Guardian*, 23 July 2016 <<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/jul/23/boris-johnson-shakespeare-biography-brexit-riddle-of-genius>> [accessed 15 November 2016].
- ^[ii] Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (London: Hogarth Press, 1990), p. 411.
- ^[iii] Anon., 'Shakespeare: The Riddle of Genius By Boris Johnson' <<https://www.hodder.co.uk/books/detail.page?isbn=9781473648135>> [accessed 15 November 2016].
- ^[iv] Clara Calvo and Coppélia Kahn, 'Introduction: Shakespeare and commemoration', in Clara Calvo and Coppélia Kahn (eds), *Celebrating Shakespeare: Commemoration and Cultural Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 4.
- ^[v] Alan Sinfield, 'Introduction: Reproductions, interventions', in Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (eds), *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), p. 132.
- ^[vi] Calvo and Kahn, 'Introduction', p. 4.
- ^[vii] This passage draws in part on the description of 'public and popular 'remembrance' offered in Ton Hoenselaars and Clara Calvo, 'Introduction: Shakespeare and the Cultures of Commemoration', in *Critical Survey* 22 (2010), p. 1. Much of the above and the observations which follow, however, relate equally to 'rehearsal' – Hoenselaars and Calvo's term for a distinct and somewhat opposed form of commemoration, elaborated by Graham Holderness ('Remembrance of things past: Shakespeare 1851, 1951, 2012', in Calvo and Kahn (eds), *Celebrating Shakespeare*, pp. 79-80).
- ^[viii] Alan Sinfield, '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', in Dollimore and Sinfield (eds), *Political Shakespeare*, p. 137.
- ^[ix] Calvo and Kahn, 'Introduction', p. 8.
- ^[x] Hester Bradley, Ronan Hatfull, and Richard O'Brien, *Shakespeare Unbard* (University of Birmingham, 2013). All subsequent references to this unpublished script are integrated into the text. While the three named authors had specific responsibility for writing individual scenes, the script was formed in the rehearsal room with the full participation of Kate Alexander, Georgie Cockerill, Charlotte Horobin and Alex Whiteley: these performers also contributed lyrics, musical compositions and arrangements throughout the piece.
- ^[xi] See, for example, "celebration, n.", *OED Online*, December 2016. Oxford University Press. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/29415?redirectedFrom=celebration>> [accessed 03 January 2017]; "festival, n.", *OED Online*, December 2016. Oxford University Press. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/69567?redirectedFrom=festival>> [accessed 03 January 2017]; "jubilee, n.", *OED Online*, December 2016. Oxford University Press. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/101849?rskey=4zhRXO&result=1&isAdvanced=false>> [accessed 03 January 2017].
- ^[xii] Susan Sontag, 'What's Happening in America (A Symposium)', in *Partisan Review* 34:1 (1967), pp. 57-58. <<http://hgar-srv3.bu.edu/collections/partisan-review/search/detail?id=326075>> [accessed 15 November 2016].
- ^[xiii] Mark Thornton-Burnett, 'Shakespeare Exhibition and Festival Culture' in Mark Thornton-Burnett, Adrian Streete and Ramona Wray (eds), *The Edinburgh Companion to Shakespeare and the Arts* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), p. 460.
- ^[xiv] Holderness, 'Remembrance', p. 82.
- ^[xv] David Garrick, 'An Ode Upon Dedicating A Building, And Erecting A Statue, To Shakespeare, At Stratford Upon Avon', in *The Poetical Works Of David Garrick, Esq. Now First*

Collected Into Two Volumes With Explanatory Notes (London: George Kearsley, 1785), pp. 52-71.
<http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxyd.bham.ac.uk/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&xri:pqil:res_ver=0.2&res_id=xri:lion&rft_id=xri:lion:ft:po:Z000631862:0> [accessed 03 January 2017].

^[xvii] Christian Deelman, *The Great Shakespeare Jubilee* (New York: Viking Press, 1964), p. 5.

^[xviii] For the Queen's song, see the 'Air' beginning 'Thou soft-flowing Avon' in Garrick, 'Ode', p. 69. For 'Warwickshire', see David Garrick, *Shakespeare's garland. Being a collection of new songs, ballads, roundelays, catches, glees, comic-serenatas, &c. Performed at the jubille [sic] at Stratford [sic] upon Avon. The musick by Dr. Arne, Mr. Barthelimon, Mr. Ailwood, and Mr. Dibdin* (London: printed for T. Becket, and P. A. de Hondt, 1769), pp. 4-6.

<http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=bham_uk&tabID=T001&docId=CW109966904&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE> [accessed 03 January 2017].

^[xix] "lad, n.1", *OED Online*, December 2016. Oxford University Press.

<<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/104972?rsk=y=qCKYRw&result=1&isAdvanced=false>> [accessed 03 January 2017]. See the 2001 Draft additions.

^[xx] Holderness, 'Remembrance', p. 79.

^[xxi] See, for instance, Jem Bloomfield, *Words of Power: Reading Shakespeare and the Bible* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2016).

^[xxii] A formulation offered by David Ruiters, in response to Raymond Carver, during 'The White Guy in the Room: Shakespeare and Me at the Edge of Texas/Justice' — a lecture delivered at The Shakespeare Institute, Stratford-upon-Avon, on 14 January 2015.

^[xxiii] The stage-direction appears in the Huntington MS of *The Stratford Jubilee: A new comedy of two acts* (1769-70 season, published 1769) written in David Garrick's own hand, detailing the grand procession of characters, The Pageant, at the end of the play. It is discussed in Vanessa Cunningham, *Shakespeare and Garrick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 114-116.

^[xxiv] "jubilee, n.", *OED Online*, December 2016. Oxford University Press.

<<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/101849?rsk=y=4zhRXO&result=1&isAdvanced=false>> [accessed 03 January 2017]. See sense 2.

^[xxv] Garrick, 'Ode'.

^[xxvi] Responses to this prompt are gathered at

<https://twitter.com/search?q=%23dearshakespeare&src=typd>; see

<https://soundcloud.com/ronanhatfull/unbard-soundscape> for a compilation of some of the questions we received, arranged by Ronan Hatfull.

^[xxvii] See Kate Rumbold, 'Shakespeare and the Stratford Jubilee' in Fiona Ritchie and Peter Sabor (eds), *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 259-260.

^[xxviii] Elizabeth Montagu, *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespear, Compared with the Greek and French Dramatic Poets with Some Remarks Upon the Misrepresentations of Mons. de Voltaire* (London: Printed for J. Dodsley, Pall-mall; Mess. Baker and Leigh, York Street, Covent-garden; J. Walter, Charing-cross; T. Cadell, in the Strand; and J. Wilkie, 78 St. Paul's Church-yard: 1769).

^[xxix] Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, in David Bevington, Martin Butler, Ian Donaldson (eds), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*.

<<http://universitypublishingonline.org.ezproxye.bham.ac.uk/cambridge/benjonson/k/works/discoversies/>> [accessed 03 January 2017].

^[xxx] See Bartie, Angela, *et al.*, 'The Pageant of England', *The Redress of the Past: Historical Pageants in Britain* <<https://histpag.dighum.kcl.ac.uk/pageants/1151/>> [accessed 15 November 2016].

^[xxxi] Peter Merrington, "'New Pageantry' and British Imperial Identity" in Susan Lawrence (ed.), *Archaeologies of the British: Explorations of identity in Great Britain and its colonies 1500-1945* (London: Routledge, 2003), p. 257.

^[xxx] Work of this kind included Amy Binns, ‘New Heroines for New Causes: How provincial women promoted a revisionist history through post-suffrage pageants’; Daryl Leeworthy, ‘A Chorus of Greek Poignancy’: Memory, Popular History, and the South Wales Miners’ Pageants of 1939’; Paul Readman, ‘The redress of the past: historical pageants in Britain 1905- 2016 (papers presented at ‘History In The Limelight: Performing The Past, c.1850 To The Present’, UCL Institute of Education, London, September 8-10, 2016).