

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM



37th International Shakespeare Conference

'Shakespeare and War'

Conference Report

Sponsored by:
University of Birmingham

In association with:
Shakespeare Birthplace Trust
And the Royal Shakespeare Company



The Shakespeare Institute
Stratford-upon-Avon

22nd July – 27th July 2018

Advisory Committee:

Péter Dávidházi
Paul Edmondson
Ewan Fernie
Andreas Höfele
Peter Holland
Tetsuo Kishi
Jill L Levenson
Lena Cowen Orlin
Jesús Tronch Pérez
Martin Procházka
Ann Thompson
Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin
Stanley Wells

Chair:

Michael Dobson

Secretary:

John Jowett

Summaries of Papers Presented at the Conference

Monday 23rd July:

Zoltan Marcus:

“The Lion and the Lamb: Hamlet in London during World War II”

In his *Shakespeare on the English Stage*, J. C. Trewin suggests that theatre disappeared from London during World War II: “London was by now a touring date” and, as such, it became a “provincial city.” Although, based on the sheer number of Shakespeare productions and the withdrawal of the Old Vic theatre from London, this observation might ring true, from a more general perspective it is hardly justifiable. The air-raids and the occasional waves of evacuations notwithstanding, London throughout the war remained one of the largest metropolises in the world and the power center of not only the United Kingdom but an empire of half a billion people. Despite the early paralysis in September 1939, the devastation of the Blitz in 1940/41, and the general hardship of everyday life throughout the war, the city remained very much “alive”, and its cultural production was significant even during the most difficult of times.

By discussing the paradoxical history of Shakespeare productions in wartime London (including Donald Wolfitt’s ‘Lunchtime Shakespeare’ series), this talk claims that *Hamlet* productions in 1944 in general and the Haymarket Theatre’s staging (*Hamlet*: John Gielgud; director: George Rylands) in particular succeeded in re-establishing Shakespeare as a cultural icon of a national(istic) tradition and unity.

Elizabeth Bronfen:

“Shakespeare’s Serial Wars: Dramatic Representations of Politics with Other Means”

Peter Bradley, Theatre Director:

“Staging Combat”

Eric M. Johnson:

“An Archer’s-Eye View: Early Modern Warfighting and Henry V’s Audiences”

Modern views about warfare have distorted our understanding about the battle of Agincourt, whereas Shakespeare and his audiences probably understood that battle – and Henry V’s campaigns – reasonably well, even after two centuries had elapsed. This paper examines the pertinent historical facts we have received from the autumn of 1415, and uses standard military tactics to explain in detail why the English victory did indeed completely depend upon the low-born archers standing their ground against the noble French men-at-arms. It compares these facts to what contemporaries of Shakespeare were likely to have known about the king and his famous victories when *Henry V* made its stage debut in 1599. Further, it shows that the ways in which we envision Agincourt have been shaped by theatrical and cinematic depictions of warfare, and they almost certainly bear little relationship to the methodical, disciplined killing that prevailed on that October day.

Andrew Hiscock:

“Shakespeare, A Midsummer Night’s Dream and the Motions of War and Peace”

This presentation considered the status and functions of conflict as a narrative drive in one of Shakespeare’s best-known comedies, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. In the course of discussion, attention was paid not only to Athens’ warring past with the Amazon tribe of Hippolyta, but also the way in which the battles of word, thought and deed (most especially dance, in this context) are negotiated in the interactions (and collisions) between three worlds of dramatic experience: Oberon and Titania’s realm; the Athenian elite; and the ‘mechanicals’. Particular attention was paid to early modern evaluations of conflict, of the ‘commixing’ of different social strata in organised events, and the perceived liaisons between dance and the arts of war. Drawing upon

legal and parish records from the length and breadth of early modern England and beyond as well literary, philosophical and court documents from the period, this presentation offered the possibility of reconsidering the potential for conflict within one of the most well-known and widely-studied examples of Shakespearean comedy.

Tuesday 24th July:

Gabriel Egan:

"Scholarly Method, Truth, and Evidence in Shakespearian Textual Studies"

Although their raw materials are often the same, the methods of Shakespearian textual scholarship can be markedly different from those of Shakespearian literary- dramatic criticism, which are different again from those of theatre history. Ours is a diverse scholarly community. Recently a new methodological division has emerged with the rise of computational stylistics (also known by the old name of stylometry) which claims to give new insights into authorship attribution problems and the characterization of writing styles.

This talk considered these methodological differences, showing that computational stylistics is closer to theatre history than literary-dramatic criticism, most noticeably in its truth claims. Most distinctive of the new computational methods is the nature of the evidence they present, which is primarily numerical (the counts of occurrences of phenomena) and statistical in its interpretation (asking whether chance might produce the numbers found). Humans are notoriously poor at judging from coincidences, and part of this talk considered why we need the much-maligned culture of statistics to make sense of this evidence.

The talk ended with some practical tips for how those unfamiliar with this new area of Shakespearian study may distinguish reliable from unreliable investigations, briefly covering the notions of scientific replicability, the empirical demonstration of a method's discriminatory power, and some examples of best scholarly practice regarding the selection of datasets and tools.

Siobhan Keenan:

"In Search of the Author of the Arbury Hall Plays (MS A414): Evidence, Interpretation and Manuscript Drama"

In 1967 Roland Barthes announced the 'death of the author'; but our fascination with writers and their part in shaping their works has been slow to die, as is exemplified by the renewed interest in authorship studies in relation to the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Most of this research has focused on the evidence afforded by printed texts, but there is similar work still to be done when it comes to the authorship of some of the period's manuscript dramas. This is a body of writing that presents slightly different challenges and opportunities to the scholar interested in questions of authorship, as I discovered when I came to edit an anonymous seventeenth-century tragedy preserved (along with three other unsigned dramas) in a manuscript miscellany owned by Lord Daventry of Arbury Hall in Nuneaton, Arbury Hall Manuscript A414: *The Emperor's Favourite*. Superficially, the play charts the rise and fall of Crispinus, a corrupt and powerful court favourite of tyrannical Roman Emperor, Nero; but various internal allusions make it clear that Crispinus' story is used to offer a veiled critique of the career of infamous Stuart royal favourite, George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham (1592-1628). Keen to bring the play to a wider audience and to learn more about who might have written it, I submitted a proposal to the Malone Society to edit *The Emperor's Favourite* for their Reprints series. This proposal was accepted and so began my quest to find out what I could about the play's provenance, including its authorship. In this paper I reflect on my investigation and what it illustrates about the evidence that we can use, and the challenges that we face, when seeking to establish authorship when working with manuscript, rather than printed, dramas.

Emma Depledge:

"Hamlet, Julius Caesar and Late Seventeenth-Century Print Wars"

Eoin Price:

“War Without Shakespeare”

My paper focused on the curious absence of Shakespearean editions during the English Civil War, 1642-1649. No Shakespeare plays are printed at all during this period of internecine conflict. But while Shakespeare’s plays were not printed during these years, the period saw the printing of a hugely significant volume of work: the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647. This volume was explicitly marketed as royalist by the publisher Humphrey Moseley, who used Beaumont and Fletcher’s plays to speak to the anguish of the times. My paper explored what is at stake in using Beaumont and Fletcher, rather than Shakespeare, to address the burning political issue of the century.

Wednesday 25th July:

Erica Sheen:

“Shakespeare Goes Nuclear: Into the Cold War with Olivier and Selznick”

Clara Calvo:

“HMS Shakespeare”

Michael Hattaway:

“‘Thou Laidst No Sieges to the Music Room’: Anatomising Wars, Staging Battles”

I review the evidence, from early modern stage directions, for the staging of siege scenes in particular and battle sequences in general in the plays of Shakespeare and Marlowe. This reveals that combats were often ritualised or emblematised, and very often minimalised. It is plausible that they were less prominent than in many contemporary stage productions and in most screen versions. This calls into question the notion of a bellicose Shakespeare. On-stage fighting was often avoided, implicitly disparaged – as in the tribute by Jasper Mayne to Ben Jonson that forms part of my title. Sometimes the patterns of battles were narrated rather than enacted; sometimes they were reduced to duels. Newly excavated foundations for the stage at the Curtain suggest it was particularly suited for duel sequences. Sieges were easily accommodated by basic stage structures and required fewer players than hand-to-hand conflicts between two armies. Two levels might create a greater effect than a ‘skirmish’ or ‘excursion’, or the penetration of a walled city, depicted by an attack on the stage doors. There is a recurrent formulaic technique: an exit to an off-stage battle ‘within’ followed by a re-entrance. I float the notion of a ‘battle-box’ – not a word to be found in the period – but one that conjures an unseen off-stage area where appropriate music and sound effects were generated. Film-makers, in contrast, can film on location and exhibit the vasty fields of France, but they tend to magnify pitched battles, make them both more life-like and also more climactic than they originally were. Olivier’s film of *Henry V* is an exemplary manifestation of this, but concludes with a vision of peace, a sequence of seasonal images that recalls Spenser’s ‘*Mutability Canto*’.

Irena R. Makaryk:

“‘Antic dispositions’: Shakespeare, War, and Cabaret”

How can cabaret function in wartime or in the horror of its aftermath? What purposes might it serve? This paper maps out some of the connections between the characteristics and strategies of the early avant-garde cabaret and its subsequent use when married with Shakespeare -- not for the purposes of light entertainment, distraction, nor of morale-boosting propaganda, but as direct engagement with, and, indeed, reflection of the madness of war. Taking a cue from Kenneth Burke’s 1930s essay, ‘War, Response, and Contradiction,’ my paper proposes that, in today’s world, the Hamletsque ‘antic disposition’ of cabaret – its grotesque, satirical, adversarial, yet playful and intelligent nature – may be one of the few ways to respond critically and with authenticity to war, fake news, and the madness of its strongman adherents.

The core of the paper examines two salient uses of cabaret in Ukraine: Soviet Ukrainian stage and film director Les Kurbas' radical 1924 *Macbeth* and, nearly 90 years later, the Dakh Daughters' "Freak Cabaret" which drew inspiration from the opening quatrain of Shakespeare's Sonnet 35. With its galvanizing mix of the lyrical and the aggressive, the ugly and the beautiful, the funny and the touching, the intellectual and the irrational, the use of cabaret, like Hamlet's antic disposition, is an oblique, wild and whirling way pointing to and reflecting the madness of the world. Offering neither morality, nor text, nor lesson, cabaret strategies focus not on propaganda but on the complexity of the human.

Thursday 26th July

Erica Whyman, Royal Shakespeare Company

Simon Barker:

"Illyrian Knights: Shakespeare, Comedy, War"

The last two decades have seen a substantial body of scholarship devoted to the relationship between Shakespeare's plays and warfare, ranging from analysis of the historical concerns early-modern thinkers had with the state, its armies and the military subject, to modern interpretations of the plays in the context of contemporary conflict. This work has opened new pathways into our understanding of the canon, Shakespeare's period, and our own. However, the emphasis of this work has been on Shakespeare's history plays, the classical plays and the tragedies – all of which touch to a degree upon issues of warfare. Beginning with an evocation of the historic Illyria and the present-day states which emerged from the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, this contribution considered the trajectory of this critical work and advocated a generic expansion of the primary material which it has addressed. Many of Shakespeare's comedies contain allusions to impending or past wars, and they frequently present figures or groups of figures who have been fashioned either by the experience of war or a frustration over the absence of war. This fashioning is sometimes the cause of violence, or a threat of violence in the comedies, and often exploits – by inversion or parody – the tropes of militarism found in the histories, the classical plays, and the tragedies as well as in the contemporaneous body of prose which addressed military matters and the qualities and identities associated with soldiers, courtiers and gentlemen. A theme common to the canon as a whole is the representation of gender, and it was argued that this universal is explored quite distinctly in Shakespearean comedies through the subtle nature of their association with militarism and violence. The focus text is *Twelfth Night* but the argument extends to a range of plays classified as comedies in the 1623 Folio.

Sharon O'Dair:

"To the Edge of All Extremity': On the Eco-necessity for War and Ruin"

Shakespeareans tend to ignore the place of war in Shakespeare's plays and if they don't, they argue that Shakespeare was a pacifist or became one as his career progressed. Recently some critics have argued differently, suggesting that Shakespeare was a man of his times and would have seen war as a sometimes necessary or justified expense, the result of the fallen nature of mankind. Developing this idea by taking an ecocritical approach, this essay observes that early moderns sometimes also saw war (and colonization) as means of population control. As a thought experiment, this essay brings into play, among others, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, written sometime between 1600 and 1603 and published in quarto in 1609, American poet Joyelle McSweeney's *Necropastoral: Poetry, Media, Occults*, a volume of criticism published in 2014, and English novelist and essayist Rose Macaulay's *Pleasure of Ruins*, published in 1953. As a thought experiment, this essay takes ecocritical Shakespeare to what Shakespeare calls "the Edge of All Extremity" and to what McSweeney, using the same phrasing (*à Outrance*), calls necropastoral excess, appropriate to the "ecological endtimes" she calls the Anthropocene. Outlining the eco-necessity for war and ruin, the essay's argument in short: we are inherently violent; everything we do, including art, is violent, aiming toward ruin. Ecocritically, humans are no longer the center of the

story; the planet is. And if the goal is to save the planet, which will survive anything we do, then war and ruin, famine and disease, is an exceptionally good way to hasten our demise.

Randall Martin:

“Economies of Gunpowder Warfare and Ecologies of Peace. Accounting for Sustainability”

The early modern gunpowder revolution disrupted classical myths that war and peace alternate in self-balancing cycles, and that the spoils of war, including symbolic ones of masculine honour, routinely offset or exceed its financial costs. The resource and production costs of gunpowder -- rapidly expanding within early modern contexts of competing nation-states, globalization, and imperialism -- also introduced a modern paradigm of unlimited economic growth accompanied by long-term environmental degradation. This paper explores Shakespeare's representative discourses of quantification and reappraisal that challenged the nascent gunpowder-and-growth worldview, and proposed an alternative paradigm of accountability and sustainability to support new social and ecological arguments for peace. Shakespeare critiques conventional attitudes towards war-spoils in plays such as *Troilus and Cressida*, *Henry IV Part One*, *Henry V*, *Hamlet*, and *Coriolanus*. This paper traces Shakespeare's critical viewpoint to his personal knowledge of bookkeeping, and illuminates it by analogy with Sir Robert Cotton's *Warrs with Forreign Princes Dangerous to our Common-wealth: or, Reasons for Forreign Wars Answered*, written in the same year as Shakespeare's most pacific play, *Cymbeline* (1610). Cotton's ground-breaking treatise expands what counts as a deficit to include social and environmental costs. And it uses numerical calculations to support his material arguments for peace-oriented foreign policies. Cotton's analysis anticipates today's Ecological Full-Cost Accounting, and outlines a vision of sustainable prosperity advocated by post-growth economists such as Tim Jackson. Shakespeare's implicit critique of unlimited consumption and growth likewise gestures towards a contemporary horizon of unstable but ecologically reshapable futurity, and reveals his plays' cultural potential for inspiring new environmental thinking in the Anthropocene.

Friday 27th July

Diana Henderson:

“Beyond Boundaries: Genre and the Consumption of War”

This talk focuses on *Richard III* 1.2, the notorious encounter in which the Duke of Gloucester isolates the war widow and orphan Lady Anne, emphasizing its critical legacies and performance possibilities in the #MeToo era. The presence of two types of war cause contemporary discomfort: the physical evidence of war's murderous violence on the stage, with even the ability to grieve for the dead being perverted; juxtaposed with Richard's rhetorical invocation of love-as-a-battlefield inherited from medieval romance and Petrarchan verse, which provides a staple for Shakespeare's erotic play. The episode raises further questions about the treatment of Shakespeare's more “ordinary” women (regarded in terms of behavior rather than social status), exposing structural problems in distinguishing wartime and peacetime.

Resisting the familiar strategy of explaining away the scene's disturbances by turning to its function within the overarching narrative, this talk remains focused on the scene itself. Through contrast with two other Shakespearean weapon-to-the-breast moments, it becomes clearer that it is precisely Anne's inability to kill that becomes a demonstration, not that peace has arrived nor that her hope to inspire contrition is justified, but of proof that she is a weak, expendable “relict.” To put this more strongly in contemporary terms: this is the culmination of the gaslighting of Anne Neville.

Looking not only at the contrast with the actual 15th-century history but also its representation cross-media (in Loncrine's film, *An Age of Kings*, Ostermeier's stage production, a multimedia dance performance, and the spinoff play *Teenage Dick*), the talk turns to contemporary forms of

shaming that further trouble the boundaries—and even the temporal sequencing—between war and peacetime. It concludes by turning to Virginia Woolf’s 1938 tract directly connecting antifascism with pacifist feminism, *Three Guineas*, noting how, in her hostile response, QD Leavis transformed Shakespearean allusions themselves into a weapon.

Ros King:

“‘Here we go again’: Shakespeare’s Wars and Modern Battles”

Patrick Gray:

“‘Unsocial Sociability’: Kant, Hegel, and Shakespeare’s Civil Wars”

To help explain how and why Shakespeare’s views on human nature, as well as war, might not be possible to reconcile with present-day secular progressivism, I draw on Thomas Sowell’s distinction between ‘constrained’ and ‘unconstrained’ ‘visions’ of the human condition, as well as the contrast William Bouwsma draws between ‘the two faces of humanism,’ ‘Augustinian’ and ‘Stoic.’ I argue that Bouwsma is more even-handed, and therefore reliable, than Jacob Burckhardt, even though his predecessor is better-known and more influential, because he does not limit himself to that side of the story of the Renaissance and Reformation that we today tend to find more congenial and exciting: the ‘early modern’ advent of our own more or less liberal credo. I then turn in closing to Hegel’s complex response to Kant’s concept of ‘unsocial sociability.’ Like Nietzsche, as well as Machiavelli and Gibbon, Kant rejects St. Augustine’s argument in his *City of God* that the Roman Empire was destroyed from within, hollowed-out by the same *libido dominandi* (‘desire to dominate’) that had brought it to its height. Instead, in his ‘Idea for a Universal History,’ Kant claims that ‘competitive vanity’ and ‘lust for power’ are the engine of civilization, praising ‘antagonism’ as ‘the cause of lawful order among men.’ This ‘unsocial sociability’ reappears in Hegel’s account of the progress of recognition (*Anerkennung*) as what he calls ‘the master-slave dialectic,’ a form of government which, by the light of an attentive reading of Shakespeare’s Roman plays, alongside Roman history itself, Hegel perceives is neither desirable, nor inevitable, nor even sustainable long-term, but instead prone to degenerate into civil war, unless replaced by more stable mixed government. To clarify this opposition, I explain that the influence of Alexandre Kojève has led Hegel to be misunderstood. Kant anticipates present-day liberalism. Hegel, by contrast, like Shakespeare, anticipates present-day critics of liberalism such as Alasdair MacIntyre and Patrick Deneen.

Summaries of Seminars at the 2018 Conference

Silvia Bigliuzzi and Jaq Bessell:

“Invad[ing] us to the skin’: Staging Territory and Invasion in King Lear”

The seminar focused on how *King Lear* stages and/or implies ideas of invasion, both literally and metaphorically. It explored the relations between territorial invasion and psycho-physical invasion and how they may be staged in performance. The former issue was examined through a discussion of the handy-dandy game serving as a powerful image of both war between England and France and foreign relations between Britain and France in the early years of James’s reign (Jonathan Baldo); the latter was instead explored through an analysis of proverbial speech and psycho-physical trauma, involving what Henri Bergson calls “habitual memory”, in the context of early modern pedagogy and Shakespeare’s portrayal of psychological trauma (Craig Dionne). Pascale Drouet investigated the connection between banishment and abuse of power and the character’s dissolution in the light of the Deleuzian concept of deterritorialization as part of a *lex talionis* dynamics and in relation to the function of the vertical metaphors of social downfall and human. The following three papers shifted the attention to the performance of *King Lear* on screen and on stage, discussing how the insulting lexicon delineating a world in which the margin invades the centre connects with the ‘vagrancy motif’ in Brooke’s 1971 film (Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin), and how the dissolution of Lear’s mind has recently been staged in France (Rivier-Arnaud) and in Bica’s 2018 one-man show in Craiova (Christie Carson). The seminar closed on Michael Corder’s close analysis of a brief initial passage of the play, advocating a rethinking of editorial practices and more expansive annotation.

Sarah Neville:

“Swords to Ploughshares”

Swords to Ploughshares: War and Nature in Shakespeare’s Works was a tiny but mighty seminar consisting of 2 delegates and a seminar leader. Over the two hours, Steven Mentz, Martin Prochazka, and Sarah Neville engaged with multiple questions about the relationship between texts and theories political, ecological, and anthropological, all raised by two insightful papers on War and Nature in the Henriad and the flood in *Antony and Cleopatra*. What we may have missed in numbers we ably made up for in thoroughness and camaraderie!

Laurie Johnson:

“Housing War in the Early Modern Playhouses”

This seminar began with a provocation to consider how warfare might be “housed” within the space and action of the early modern playhouses: how might different stages, repertories or companies have dealt with such inherent dangers without sacrificing the scale and spectacle that made plays about war marketable propositions? Four participants discussed three papers, each of which offered a particular interpretation of the seminar theme: Yan Brailowsky’s paper compared the “wooden O” speech in *Henry V* with Margaret of Anjou’s “paper crown” speech in *3 Henry VI* to examine the staging and performance implications of two competing reductions of battlefields to “molehill” scale, and it discussed these implications in relation to the Rose and Globe theatres; Sarah Dustagheer’s paper considered how access to specific sound effects and use of the Globe space shaped the treatment of military themes and stories in the repertory of the Lord Chamberlain’s and King’s Men; and Paula Baldwin Lind’s paper noted the relative paucity of props and stage effects of warfare in *Henry V*, such that the play instead relies on a rich semantic field of the language of war to fill the empty stage with the vasty field of Agincourt. The richness of the papers ensured that each received a thought-provoking range of discussion, and auditors were able to contribute to a free-ranging discussion on related themes, ensuring that the two hours’ traffic of our meeting room was gainfully used. Key topics raised in these discussions included how plays shifted register to cue military themes and action for audiences, the acoustics of

playhouse architecture, the close ties between staging war and staging love in plays of any type, and the use of different strategies for housing warfare offstage.

Tanya Pollard, Francesca Rayner and Janice Valls-Russell; Respondent: Naomi Liebler
“The Trojan War in Early Modern Imaginations”

This seminar brought together 14 scholars from 9 countries, with a wide array of topics. While the focus was on the Trojan War in keeping with the overall theme of the conference, ‘matters of Troy’ ranged broadly. For purposes of discussion, we divided them into three main areas. One cluster, on Troy’s cultural (and martial) associations in the period, included considerations on Anglo-French chronicles, the construction of national identities, the social costs of war, and ‘ruins of Troy’, all of which also drew attention to the classical and medieval-Tudor strands through which the story of Troy reached early modern England. Plays discussed included *Troilus and Cressida*, *King Edward III*, and the *Henry VI* plays. Another cluster explored the place of women in relation to Troy and the Trojan War, through women’s writings (such as Jane Lumley’s translation of Euripides’ *Iphigenia*), writings about Trojan women (George Peele’s *Arraignement of Paris, A Tale of Troy*), and invocations of figures like Hecuba to mediate the voicing of grief (*Hamlet, The Rape of Lucrece*). Another cluster explored diachronic perspectives especially through approaches to staging *Troilus and Cressida*. After opening with some framing remarks from the organizers, the discussion moved through these clusters in turn, asking questions about individual papers and about connections between papers within these clusters. We closed with reflections on links between the clusters, and further framing comments from the respondent. The quality of papers and discussion was high, and a number of the papers are being revised for a collection of essays that will be submitted for a special journal issue on Troy in the early modern imagination.

Tianhu Hao:

“Media Wars in Shakespearean Age and Our Time”

On 24 July 2018, Tuesday, at the Shakespeare Centre, a seminar entitled *Media Wars in Shakespearean Age and Our Time* was held during the ISC 2018. The seminar attracted six members from six countries on three continents: Carla Della Gatta (USA), Tianhu Hao (China, organizer and chair), Hyon-u Lee (Korea), Monica Matei-Chesnoiu (Romania), Reiko Oya (Japan), and Maddalena Pennacchia (Italy). The group photo taken soon after the seminar, with everyone smiling happily, testifies to the amiable atmosphere of the discussion. While film adaptations occupy the center of attention, print media and the Shakespeare Festival are also noticed. When the variety of media combines with the shifting stage of world history—from World War I to World War II to the 21st century—the theme of the Conference “Shakespeare and War” achieves a new meaning in the contests and conflicts between the later media such as film and television film and the Shakespearean media of manuscript, print, and the stage. Shakespeare’s resiliency ensures the constant success of the vastly different reinterpretations of the Bard.

Inspired by the stimulating seminar, Monica Matei-Chesnoiu and Tianhu Hao are co-editing a special issue of *Multicultural Shakespeare* on Shakespeare and intermedial/ cross-cultural contacts. Further research cooperation is on the way.

Jem Bloomfield:

“And there was war in heaven’: Connection, Canonicity and Clash between Shakespeare and the Bible”

Brett Greatley-Hirsch:

“Shake-speares and Can(n)ons”

Georgie Lucas:

“Shakespeare, Atrocity and War”

Kirilka Stavreva:

“Shakespeare and the ‘De-Cruits’”

Conference Participants

Zeno Ackermann

Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg

Iska Alter

Hofstra University

Ann Thompson

King's College London

Gerald Baker

Kingston University

Jonathan Baldo

University of Rochester - Eastman School of Music

Paula Baldwin

Universidad de los Andes

Simon Barker

University of Chichester

Alexey Bartoshevich

Russian Institute of Theatre Art

Jacquelyn Bessell

Guildford School of Acting

Silvia Bigliuzzi

University of Verona

Jem Bloomfield

University of Nottingham

Yan Brailowsky

Université Paris Nanterre / Société Française Shakespeare

Elizabeth Bronfen

University of Zurich

Werner Brönnimann

University of St. Gallen

Douglas Bruster

The University of Texas at Austin

James Bulman

Allegheny College

Dympna Callaghan

Syracuse University

Clara Calvo

Universidad de Murcia

William Carroll

Boston University

Christie Carson

Royal Holloway, University of London

Tom Cartelli

Shakespeare Association of America

Deborah Cartmell

De Montfort University

Warren Chernaik

University of London

Monica Chesnoiu-Matei

Ovidius University of Constanta

Nicoleta Cinpoes

University of Worcester

Janet Clare

University of Hull

Tom Clayton

University of Minnesota

Michael Cordner

University of York

Melissa Croteau

California Baptist University

Peter Davidhazi

Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Maria Del Sapio Garbero

Roma Tre University

Carla Della Gatta

University of Southern California

Carla Dente

Pisa University

Emma Depledge

University of Fribourg

Craig Dionne

Eastern Michigan University

Tobias Döring

LMU München

Michael Dobson

The Shakespeare Institute

John Drakakis

University of Stirling

Manfred Draudt

University of Vienna

Pascale Drouet

University of Poitiers

Jennifer Drouin

McGill University

Sarah Dustagheer

University of Kent

Paul Edmondson

Shakespeare Birthplace Trust

Gabriel Egan

De Montfort University

Balz Engler

University of Basel

Ewan Fernie

The Shakespeare Institute

Alison Findlay

Lancaster University

Joan Fitzpatrick

Loughborough University

Paul Franssen

Utrecht University

Evelyn Gajowski

UNLV

Suzanne Gossett

Loyola University Chicago

Dominique Goy-Blanquet

Université de Picardie

Hugh Grady

Arcadia University

Teresa Grant

University of Warwick

Patrick Gray

Durham University

Brett Greatley-Hirsch

University of Leeds

Keith Gregor

University of Murcia

Ina Habermann

University of Basel

Jay Halio

University of Delaware

Stuart Hampton-Reeves

University of Central Lancashire

Tianhu Hao

Zhejiang University

Christopher Hardman

Andrew Hartley

UNC Charlotte

Michael Hattaway

New York University in London

Diana Henderson

MIT

Atsuhiko Hirota

Kyoto University

Andrew Hiscock

Bangor University/Université Paul-Valéry-
Montpellier III

Andreas Hoefele

Munich University

Peter Holbrook

University of Queensland

Peter Holland

University of Notre Dame

Rui Carvalho Homen

Universidade do Porto

Adam Hooks

University of Iowa

Lisa Hopkins

Sheffield Hallam University

Paul Innes

University of Gloucestershire

Kenneth Jackson

Wayne State University

Laurence Johnson

University of Southern Queensland

Christa Jansohn

University of Bamberg

Eric Johnson

Folger Shakespeare Library

John Jowett

The Shakespeare Institute

Alexa Joubin

George Washington University

Mitsuru Kamachi

Rikkyo University

Farah Karim-Cooper

Shakespeare's Globe

Siobhan Keenan

De Montfort University

Ros King

University of Southampton

Andras Kisery

The City College of New York

Urszula Kizelbach

Adam Mickiewicz University

Krystyna Kujawinska Courtney

University of Lodz

Agnès Lafont

Université Paul Valéry - Montpellier 3

Jesse Lander

University of Notre Dame

Douglas Lanier

University of New Hampshire

Chris Laoutaris

The Shakespeare Institute

Liana Leao

Universidade Federal do Paraná

Hyon-u Lee

Soon Chun Hyang University

Rebecca Lemon

University of Southern California

Jill Levenson

University of Toronto

Naomi Liebler

Montclair State University

William Long

Rory Loughnane

University of Kent

Ellen MacKay

University of Chicago

Irena Makaryk

University of Ottawa

Georgina Lucas

The Shakespeare Institute

Lynne Magnusson

University of Toronto

José Manuel González

University of Alicante

James Mardock

University of Nevada

Vassiliki Markidou

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Zoltan Markus

Vassar College

Markus Marti
 Basel University
Randall Martin
 University of New Brunswick
Jean-Christophe Mayer
 CNRS and University of Montpellier
Gordon McMullan
 King's College London
Steve Mentz
 St. John's University
Paul Menzer
 Mary Baldwin University
Alfredo Michel Modenessi
 Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Joanna Montgomery-Byles
Ruth Morse
 Université-Paris-Diderot
John Mucciolo
Marga Munkelt
 University of Muenster- Germany
Sarah Neville
 Ohio State University
Madalina Nicolaescu
 University of Bucharest
Marion O'Connor
 University of Kent
Sharon O'Dair
Claudia Oik
 Freie Universität Berlin
Lena Cowen Orlin
 Georgetown University
Robert Ormsby
 Memorial University of Newfoundland
Reiko Oya
Hiroshi Ozawa
 Kwansai Gakuin University
Patricia Parker
 Stanford University
Maddalena Pennacchia
 Roma Tre University
Yves Peyré
 IRCL- Université Paul Valéry Montpellier
Natália Pikli
 Eötvös Loránd University
Tanya Pollard
 Brooklyn College - CUNY
Lois Potter
 University of Delaware
Eoin Price
 Swansea University
Roger Pringle
 Emeritus Shakespeare Birthplace Trust
Martin Prochazka
 Charles University

Ángel-Luis Pujante
 University of Murcia
Björn Quiring
 University of Dublin
Miguel Ramalheite Gomes
 Universidade do Porto
Francesca Rayner
 Universidade do Minho
Catherine Richardson
 University of Kent
Estelle Rivier
 Université Le Mans
Abigail Rokison-Woodall
 The Shakespeare Institute
Kate Rumbold
 University of Birmingham
Claudia Oik
 Freie Universität Berlin
José Roberto O'Shea
 Federal University of Santa Catarina
Liz Schafer
 Royal Holloway - University of London
Katherine Scheil
 University of Minnesota
Sabine Schülting
 Freie Universität Berlin
Isabelle Schwartz-Gastine
 University of Caen-Normandie
Charlotte Scott
 Goldsmiths College - University of London
James Siemon
Laurie Shannon
 Northwestern University
James Shapiro
 Columbia University
Erica Sheen
 University of York
James Siemon
 Boston University
Joystna Singh
 Michigan State University
Emil Sirbulescu
 University of Craiova
Simon Smith
 University of Birmingham
Emma Smith
 Hertford College - Oxford
Marlene Soares dos Santos
 Federal University of Rio de Janeiro
Steve Sohmer
 UCLA
BJ Sokol
 Goldsmith University

Kay Stanton
California State University - Fullerton

Kirilka Stavreva
Cornell College

Tiffany Stern
The Shakespeare Institute

James Stredder
Independent Scholar

Michiko Suematsu
Gunma University

Viv Thomas
Independent Scholar

Ann Thompson
King's College London

Jesús Tronch Pérez
Universitat de València

Janice Valls-Russell
IRCL- Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3/
CNRS

Virginia Vaughan
Clark University

Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin
IRCL- Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3/
CNRS

Christina Wald
University of Konstanz

Nick Walton
Shakespeare Birthplace Trust

Roland Weidle
Ruhr University Bochum

Herbert Weil
University of Manitoba

Judith Weil
University of Manitoba

Stanley Wells
Shakespeare Birthplace Trust

Sarah Werner
University of Pennsylvania

Charles Whitney
University of Nevada - Las Vegas

Michelle Willems
University of Rouen

Martin Wiggins
The Shakespeare Institute

Richard Wilson
Kingston University

Marion Wynne-Davies
University of Surrey

Li Lan Yong
National University of Singapore

Jennifer Young
University of Greenwich

Masahide Yuuki
Japan Theatre Association