Reproducing Shakespeare marks the turn in adaptation studies toward recontextualization, reformatting, and media convergence. It builds on two decades of growing interest in the "afterlife" of Shakespeare, showcasing some of the best new work of this kind currently being produced. The series addresses the repurposing of Shakespeare in different technical, cultural, and performance formats, emphasizing the uses and effects of Shakespearean texts in both national and global networks of reference and communication. Studies in this series pursue a deeper understanding of how and why cultures recycle their classic works, and of the media involved in negotiating these transactions.

More information about this series at
http://www.springer.com/series/14505

Valerie M. Fazel · Louise Geddes
Editors

The Shakespeare User

Critical and Creative Appropriations in a Networked Culture

palgrave macmillan

2017

Editors
Valerie M. Fazel
Department of English
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ, USA

Louise Geddes
English Department
Adelphi University
Garden City, NY, USA

Reproducing Shakespeare
ISBN 978-3-319-61014-6 ISBN 978-3-319-61015-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-61015-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017944589

Cover credit: Getty Images/DigitalVision

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Contents

CHAPTER 9

Shakespeare and Disciplinarity

Laura Estill

From early readers copying quotations into commonplace books to modern film and graphic novel adaptations, the ways Shakespeare's text has been and is used can tell us about why Shakespeare's plays are important and about how people receive and understand them.[1] Indeed, it is the job of Shakespeareans to care about Shakespeare's text and its circulation. So, what about all the other academics who use Shakespeare? This chapter focuses on non-Shakespearean yet academic use of Shakespeare—a surprisingly large purview that has yet to be considered critically.

Even in its most traditional forms, the study of Shakespeare is inherently interdisciplinary, combining literary studies, performance studies, translation/adaptation studies, book history, and theatre history, to name a few. Despite having multiple disciplinary homes, the professional academic Shakespearean is fairly easy to identify. James Q. Wilson defines a professional as "someone who receives important occupational rewards from a reference group whose membership is limited to people who have undergone specialized formal education and have accepted a group-defined code of proper conduct."[2] Clay Shirky elaborates: "A profession becomes, for its members, a way of understanding their world.

L. Estill (✉)
Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

V.M. Fazel and L. Geddes (eds.), *The Shakespeare User*, Reproducing Shakespeare, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-61015-3_9

Professionals see the world through a lens created by other members of their profession."[3] Professional academic Shakespeareans are generally terminal-degree-holding or -pursuing scholars who seek to publish in peer-reviewed journals and with reputable presses; they review work both before and after publication; and they cite and interact with each other's ideas. Professional academic Shakespeareans are, to use Pierre Bourdieu's term, bound by social capital,

> the aggregate or potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition—in other words, to membership in a group—which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word.[4]

The 'credential' for academic Shakespeareans need not even appear in quotation marks: the credentials are as tangible as memberships in societies, degrees, and publications. As this chapter shows, however, there are distinctly academic and professional approaches to Shakespeare that fall beyond the bounds of traditional Shakespearean scholarship.

As the contributions in this volume discuss, Yann Moulier-Boutang's theory of cognitive capitalism positions "information goods" at the center of exchange—and Shakespeare's works or knowledge thereof can be positioned as information goods.[5] However, the majority of academic Shakespeare quotations by non-Shakespeareans, as this chapter demonstrates, position these textual snippets not as cognitive capital but as a Bourdieusian cultural capital.[6] Moulier-Boutang rejects Bourdieusian social and cultural capital in his understanding of economic and political systems. And while academic publishing is, of course, an economic (and often political) system, it trades in cultural capital as well as cognitive capital in order to make, well, capital (cash).

It cannot be denied that Shakespeare has cachet, that is, cultural capital.[7] Shakespeare's cultural capital could, perhaps, be linked to the "Shakespeare brand" or the "Shakespeare-Industrial Complex" as it is sometimes termed. Kate Rumbold reminds us, however, that there is not a single corporation or agent that creates the image of Shakespeare on the market.[8] The "Shakespeare brand" is not, as Moulier-Boutang describes branding, the "result of hours of labour undertaken not only by designers, but also by stylists and by lawyers in big firms."[9]

The quotations discussed in this chapter are not the objects of trade of Moulier-Boutang's conceptual economy: they are its vehicle.[10] That is to say, when non-Shakespearean academics deploy Shakespearean quotations, they often seek to impart information that has nothing to do with Shakespeare or his works.

I argue that non-Shakespearean academic use of Shakespeareana functions in four ways: (1) referencing and citing Shakespeare as a lingua franca that is accessible to readers across disciplines; (2) quoting Shakespeare as a way to perform cultural capital; (3) engaging Shakespeare's text as a means to offer insight into concepts beyond Shakespeare; and (4) analyzing Shakespearean texts from different disciplinary lenses as a form of scholarly criticism.

Of the four ways I identify non-Shakespeareans deploying Shakespearean quotations, the first three rely on cultural capital. The importance of these uses (and abuses) of Shakespeare, to Shakespearean scholars, is that they reveal one way Shakespearean text circulates in our contemporary culture; meanwhile, their value to their author and readers is entirely different. And while some of these quotations might do little to improve our understanding of Shakespeare's texts, they are important because offer insight into a particular type of scholarly Shakespeare user—one that is not a Shakespeare scholar.

"Brush up Your Shakespeare": Shakespeare as Lingua Franca

References to Shakespeare can effectively draw in a non-Shakespearean audience (to consider a non-Shakespearean topic) when they refer to well-known phrases, situations, or characters, or when they are well-explicated for a broad readership. In many fields of academic study, it is not uncommon to see Shakespearean references in titles and abstracts of journal articles. For these scholars, Shakespeare is not their subject matter but, instead, a hook to capture the audience's attention.

"To be or not to be" is the most popular line adapted by scientists, social scientists, and academics of all stripes. "To Stage or not to Stage?" "To sound or not to sound?" "To Plant or not to Plant?": these are the questions that appear in titles of editorials and articles in scholarly periodicals as varied as the *International Journal of Gynecological Cancer*, *Pediatric Radiology*, and *Current Farm Economics*.[11] Google Scholar lists

fifty-nine scholarly sources with "To e or not to e" in the title alone.[12] The majority of the scholars who adapt Hamlet's famous line for their titles do not relate their content to Shakespeare at all: they are simply using a familiar turn of phrase to express a conundrum. For many, "To be or not to be" is not a metaphysical question about suicide. Rather, it is a formula that presents any binary choice. The authors of many articles that borrow Hamlet's phrasing often use it to set up the importance of their thesis: unlike Hamlet, they are not in a quandary. They know the answer to their question, but they pose it using Shakespearean language to engage their audience and to set up the exigence for their writing. This rhetorical strategy draws on shared knowledge: the writer and reader both acknowledge that the other can recognize a Shakespearean quotation.

The abstractness of being in "to be or not to be," along with the phrase's formulaic nature, is what allows writers to project their subject matter onto Hamlet's words. The meaning of to be is both simple (to live) and as complicated as life itself. It is this openness that allows writers to appropriate Shakespeare's line. Scholars from all disciplines recycle Shakespeare's words because "to be or not to be" is catchy, familiar, and open to being imbued with new meanings, all of which can help them express their ideas in a shorthand familiar to readers.

The popularity of the "to x or not to x" formula is not surprising, given that "to be or not to be" is the most discussed line in scholarship of Shakespeare's works, in traditionally Shakespearean fields such as English and theatre studies and beyond. *Hamlet* is the most popular Shakespeare play;[13] "to be or not to be" is the most popular line from the play.[14] JSTOR Labs' *Understanding Shakespeare* offers 889 scholarly articles in the JSTOR database alone that cite Hamlet's line. While many of these citations appear in expected venues, such as *Shakespeare Quarterly*, *Criticism*, and *PMLA*, others appear in *The Columbia Law Review*, *Psychological Science*, and *Dance Research Journal*. While some of the articles highlighted by *Understanding Shakespeare* engage with Hamlet's words fleetingly (as an example of blank verse, for instance, or as an archetypal example of indecisiveness),[15] others delve into the speech with close reading and analysis.

Although the majority of scholars who rewrite Hamlet's line for their title or abstract touch on Shakespeare's text only briefly (in the title, introductory paragraph, and sometimes the concluding paragraph), others offer extended Shakespearean appropriations without actually

discussing his works. Often, these Shakespearean moments challenge simple binaries of amateur and professional: while the writers may not be professional Shakespeareans, they are professional academics in other fields using Shakespeare to communicate discipline-specific ideas with their colleagues. George W. Kaplan, for instance, opens his editorial in the *Journal of Urology* with:

> To treat or not to treat? Whether 'tis nobler in the eyes of men to suffer the slings and arrows of the activist and capitulate to the temptation to do something in the face of adverse urodynamic findings or resist and spare the parent of the child with myelomeningocele the added burden of intermittent catheterization.[16]

While this question is Hamletian in phrasing, it is not Hamletian in concept: it is about as far removed from Shakespeare's play as possible. Presumably Kaplan is using Shakespearean phrasing to engage his audience. Kaplan, like many other scientists who appropriate Shakespeare's words, is not, however, reaching out to a public audience. Kaplan's editorial, and many in its vein, use Shakespeare for an audience of specialists—but an audience of non-Shakespearean specialists. While Kaplan can perhaps safely assume that the readership of the *Journal of Urology* is familiar with *Hamlet* and recognize this allusion to a difficult question with two possible responses, the reverse is not true: readers of *Shakespeare Quarterly* would not be expected to understand the meaning of "myelomeningocele" (a form of spinal bifida) without looking it up. A familiarity with *Hamlet*, however, is not the same as field expertise: Shakespearean scholars expect their readers to know a variety of field specific terms and ideas, from topics ranging from theatrical practices to theoretical frameworks to historical and cultural contexts.

In medical, science, and social science journals, Hamlet's phrase is rivaled in popularity only by "What's in a name?"[17] Juliet's question, like Hamlet's, is both particular to her circumstances and easily abstracted. In her soliloquy, Juliet wonders what her life would be like if Romeo was not a Montague. Yet by itself, "What's in a name?" asks about the nature of language and the power of words (gesturing to the relation between the Saussurean signifier and signified). Experts, across fields, recognize the power of nomenclature and importance of precise terminology; Juliet's words nicely encapsulate this notion.

Literary phrases, including Shakespeare's, can stand in for epistemological approaches. As Stanley A. Plotkin explains in a commentary in the *Journal of the International AIDS Society*, the scholarly position of those who believe an AIDS vaccine is imminent is displayed by their literary and cultural referents: "optimistic quotations have been liberally used, from Shakespeare's *Henry V*'s 'Once more unto the breach, dear friends' to Winston Churchill's definition of success as 'going from one failure to another with no loss of enthusiasm.'"[18] Henry's battle cry represents optimism in the face of a seemingly undefeatable enemy or following multiple losses. Small wonder, then, that his words have been appropriated by medical researchers: "Once more unto the breach" appears in titles of pieces of, for instance, *The American Journal of Bioethics*, the *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, and *Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy*, to list just a few.[19] In these cases, a single Shakespeare line is intended to evoke a community between author and reader, not just based on their shared knowledge of Shakespeare but also on their shared confrontation of a challenge, like Henry V and his men at Harfleur.

Non-Shakespearean scholars borrow Shakespeare's phrases to serve as a shorthand for situations and characters that they expect their audience to know. In the early modern period, playwrights, including Shakespeare, leveraged familiar proverbs or commonplaces to catch their audience's attention and to draw them into the story by pointing to shared values expressed in the phrases.[20] Today, Shakespearean references function similarly to early modern commonplaces and proverbs: scholars, across disciplines, expect readers to be fluent in Shakespeare, that is, aware of the major themes, ideas, and moments in his works. When used effectively, literary references can function as invitations to readers: drawing on a shared knowledge in order to create community, draw attention, or impart information.

"Apologies to Shakespeare": Shakespeare as Cultural Capital

Easily recognizable Shakespearean quotations in non-Shakespearean journals function not only to impart information or reference ideas but also as a form of cultural capital, as described by Bourdieu.[21] John Guillory applies Bourdieu's theories to the literary canon, demonstrating

that the literary canon (to which Shakespeare is central) offers "*linguistic* capital" and "*symbolic* capital." Guillory explains that "*symbolic* capital" is "a kind of knowledge-capital whose possession can be displayed upon request and which thereby entitles its possessor to the cultural and material rewards of the well-educated person."[22] In many of these cases, the use of Shakespearean quotations signals the writer's education as much as it may elucidate an idea for the reader, or bring a particular moment or image to mind. Although Shakespeare is clearly a global cultural commodity, as his works are frequently translated, internationally performed, and often adapted, Shakespearean references in non-Shakespearean journals could be lost on non-English speakers or on those with differing educational backgrounds. The appearance of Shakespearean quotations in medical journals and other specialized journals suggests that authors who quote the Bard, and editors who allow or encourage that practice, take for granted that their readers will know Shakespeare, regardless of their specializations. The idea that all academics can know or understand Shakespeare can be problematic when it devalues the work of professional Shakespeareans—the editors, literary scholars, cultural historians, actors, directors, and others who strive to further our understanding of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Shakespeareans rarely assume that their readers will know, for instance, complex medical terminology; although the reverse can be true, which leads to misappropriations of Shakespeare's words.

Non-Shakespearean academics who appropriate "To be or not to be" and other Shakespearean quotations are showcasing their academic chops: they are drawing on cultural capital. In Bourdieu's formulation, money can buy you education, which you parlay into cultural capital. Displaying a knowledge of Shakespeare, then, can be an elitist move that authors use to signal their education, social class, and intelligence. While many authors who refer to Shakespeare in specialized journals expect their audience to have a basic understanding of Shakespeare's works or to recognize canonical phrases, other academics deploy more obscure Shakespearean lines.

The use of less-recognizable Shakespearean quotations does not necessarily lead readers to think of a particular play. If the Shakespearean quotation is not immediately recognizable, it is sometimes, but not always, explicated by the academic writer, with varying degrees of success. These 'deep cut' references often appear in the first line of abstract

and are then abandoned for the rest of the paper. For instance, the following are all opening sentences from scientific abstracts:

- The adage from Shakespeare, "troubles, not as single spies, but in battalions come," holds true for *Nicotiana attenuata*, which is commonly attacked by both pathogens (*Pseudomonas* spp.) and herbivores (*Manduca sexta*) in its native habitats.
- According to William Shakespeare "the purest treasure mortal times afford, is spotless reputation; that away, men are but gilded loam or painted clay." Well, if hospitals used to be proud of their "spotless reputation," those days are over if we look at the growing number of complaints and cases related to medical mistakes.
- "The daintiest last, to make the end most sweet," comes to us from Shakespeare's *Richard II*, but in the most recent edition of *Blood*, the paper from Martinez-Lopez et al. suggests that by using minimal residual disease (MRD) testing by sequencing, we may be nearing the "end most sweet" or, in twenty first century vernacular, the cure of myeloma.[23]

These three openings represent the trend of quoting Shakespeare as an introductory strategy in a way that highlights the author(s)'s erudition. These quotations are not easily recognizable; they do not evoke particular moments or ideas. Even the plays referenced, such as *Richard II*, are not among the Bard's most popular. Rather, readers must parse Shakespeare's words and determine meaning from them, often without explications from the authors. Undergraduate literature students would not be expected to understand "gilded loam" without a gloss; will hospital administrators? Presumably, the opening of an article or abstract should not send readers to a dictionary but should invite them into a shared space for communicating knowledge. The anticipated audience for these articles is one who can read and understand Shakespeare's English without glosses; or, perhaps more cynically, the anticipated audience are readers who will be impressed by a Shakespearean quotation.

These one-off references by non-Shakespeareans sometimes use Shakespeare's words in a way that would be considered inappropriate and ineffectual by literary scholars or theatrical practitioners. In the above examples, the quotation, "The daintiest last, to make the end most sweet" is taken entirely out of its original context in *Richard II*. The idea is grammatically incomplete: by omitting the opening part of

the sentence, "Lo, as at English feasts, so I regret/The daintiest last ..." (1.3.67–8), Bullingbrook's meaning is made unclear. The "daintiest" items Bullingbrook is discussing is dessert. Rather than quoting a half-idea, "The daintiest last, to make the end most sweet," narrowing Shakespeare's phrase to "end most sweet" would actually make this quotation more universally applicable and less confusing. A metaphoric "end most sweet" would certainly apply to the "end of myeloma," a kind of blood cancer. While, at times, quoting Shakespeare's language can serve as a cultural touchstone to bring readers into an understanding of an article's topic, at other times it serves to separate readers (and, perhaps, to single out writers) who cannot understand Shakespeare.

When academic writers use 'deep cut' Shakespearean phrases, as the examples above demonstrate, they might not have any understanding of the broader play from which they are quoting. Today, you can find Shakespeare quotations easily with a simple Google search. Indeed, Google suspects that what you are after is actually quotations: in the United States, when you type "Shakespeare" into a search engine, it suggests "Shakespeare quotes" as an autocomplete option, one more popular even than "Shakespeare plays."[24] Specialist Shakespeareans know to turn to a concordance in order to find instances of a particular word in Shakespeare's plays, such as the one available on Eric Johnson's *Open Source Shakespeare* (discussed in Chap. 10) —but you do not need to be a Shakespearean to find quotations on websites such as BrainyQuote, BuzzFeed, and GoodReads, all of which Google suggests.[25] Google itself now offers a selection of quotes, rent from their plays and disconnected from their original contexts. With internet search engines, it is now easier than ever to fake an understanding of Shakespeare's works: the meme-filled internet, unsurprisingly, fosters decontextualized Shakespearean snippets. A number of non-Shakespearean academics who quote from Shakespeare have, indeed, likely not read the plays from which they quote—or, if they have, they might not understand what they are quoting. They are performing a knowledge of Shakespeare as a means of gaining cultural capital. Indeed, this kind of calculated performance would not have been unknown in Shakespeare's day. Academics who draw on Shakespeare plays they have not read perform a modern kind of *sprezzatura*.

Even coming from a culture of literary and linguistic borrowing and adaptation, Shakespeare could not have anticipated the disparate and far-ranging afterlives of his words. He was not writing about nicotiana,

hospital reputations, or myeloma. Many authors acknowledge that their appropriations of Shakespeare remove his words from their original context and reframe them in ways that would be foreign to their author by adding the formula "apologies to Shakespeare" in their title or abstract.[26] The caveat "apologies to Shakespeare," furthermore, can signal how far afield his words have been taken: in some cases, "apologies to Shakespeare" is the only reference back to Shakespeare's works, beyond the initial (often heavily altered) quotation. It is not Shakespeare's words that are the priority here: it is that the author is quoting them, and sometimes willfully misusing them. "Apologies to Shakespeare" can signal the author's use of cultural capital: this writer, the phrase indicates, knows and can alter or borrow Shakespeare's words.

"Gruliet and Pomeo": Reading Through Shakespeare

Some academic authors use Shakespeare as a touchstone beyond their introduction and make Shakespeare foundational to their writing about non-Shakespearean disciplines. In these cases, extended discussion of Shakespeare's works is used to cast light on non-Shakespearean topics. Both quotations from and extended discussion of Shakespearean works can serve as a heuristic for understanding myriad topics.

While, in most cases, referencing Shakespeare can bolster the author's authority (ethos), Shakespearean references can also bolster claims with emotional appeals (pathos). In making his case for the European Herbal Medicines Directive, Philip A. Routledge draws extensively on *Romeo and Juliet*, arguing that the star-crossed lovers might have lived had they had access to correct information about draughts, potions, and liquors.[27] Routledge's use of *Romeo and Juliet* is designed to show the exigence of the European Herbal Medicines Directive: he assumes that his readers know and care about Romeo's and Juliet's deaths and would be interested in an initiative that could have saved them. Shakespeare's works offer a way to make an emotional appeal to readers by referring to known characters and situations. This goes beyond simply drawing readers in with well-known quotations or impressing an audience with lesser-known lines: these writers use Shakespeare to elicit a particular emotional response.

Romeo and Juliet are invoked across disciplines as archetypal star-crossed lovers, a broad concept that is accessible to many readers. Meaghan King offers an extended adaptation of the prologue to *Romeo and Juliet* as an epigraph her article on interspecies bear mating:

> Two species, both alike in dignity
> In warming Arctic, where we lay our scene
> From dwindling ice to heated land
> Where carbon theft makes habitat unclean
> A pair of star-crossed lovers test their life
> And misadventures come perilous to each
> Do make a child…
> A glooming peace in morning?
> Uncertain future at noon?
> Go hence and talk of warming days,
> And the union of two sad bears in a climate of woe
> For there never was a tale as this—
> Of Gruliet and her Pomeo.
> – with apologies to Shakespeare[28]

King directly links Shakespeare's lovers to bears and adds elements that do not appear in Shakespeare's play: a child and racial difference between the houses. Her article opens, "It's a familiar story: two star-crossed lovers battle distance, race and disapproving families to be together. Defying the odds, they are driven to produce the ultimate expression of love—a child."[29] From the opening that conjures a version of *Romeo and Juliet*, King then rejects the comparison: "But this is no modern-day version of Shakespeare's famous tragedy.... These 'lovers' came from the esteemed and noble houses of Grizzly and Polar." King admits that interspecies bear mating "is more likely due to desperation than love."[30]

By comparing grizzlies and polar bears to the Capulets and Montagues, King reframes an article about the dangers of climate change by anthropomorphizing animals in order to make them more sympathetic figures. As she explains, it is the ever-dwindling ecosystem of the polar bears and the expanding range of the grizzlies, caused by climate change, that leads to this interspecies breeding. Her argument, that humans must act to mitigate climate change, is made more accessible because she presents it to the readers through Shakespeare. Similarly, the TV documentary *Romeo and Juliet: A Monkey's Tale* presents an

argument for the importance of non-human life by relating the story of two Macaque monkeys to Shakespeare's star-crossed lovers.[31]

As these examples show, Shakespeare's works can be used as a heuristic through which we approach utterly non-Shakespearean topics. Positing Shakespeare as a heuristic makes Shakespeare universal in a way that previous studies of Shakespeare's universality have not. While Shakespeareans have argued whether Shakespeare is, to use Ben Jonson's phrases, "of an age" or "for all time," or debated his global applicability and appreciation, these discussions still focus on the human.[32] When Shakespeare is not the object of study but rather the lens through which another object of study is approached, his works can be turned to illuminate almost any topic.

Reading *through* Shakespeare effectively, however, requires familiarity with Shakespeare's works on the parts of both the author and reader, which is quite different from the display of cultural capital discussed earlier wherein an academic decontextualizes a line from Shakespeare. The assumption that underlies the use of Shakespeare as a heuristic is that those who can read academic publications in English will also know Shakespeare, and, perhaps with prompting, will be able to remember the salient features of his more popular plays. The success of these emotional appeals lies in the audience's knowledge of Shakespeare, but writers aiming to invoke particular responses can gloss the Shakespearean references to make them understandable by audiences who might not know Shakespeare's works. Using Shakespeare as a lens through which we access other information only works if the lens is clear: that is, the reader either has to have a pre-existing understanding of the texts, plot, and/or characters referenced, or the writer has to make it evident.

"First, Let's Kill All the Lawyers": Non-Shakespeareans Analyze Shakespeare

It is Shakespeare's enduring status as both center of the English literary canon and as pop culture icon that makes him eminently quotable (and referenceable) across disciplines. His works appear prominently, for instance, in interdisciplinary fields such as medical humanities, populated by some Shakespeareans as well as experts who would not identify as Shakespeare scholars. Further afield from the humanities, however, Shakespeare is also deployed by unexpected professionals, like, for instance, dentists. My focus here is not on all professional discourse but that published in academic journals.

This last category of academic use, non-Shakespeareans analyzing Shakespeare, functions differently from the three others (drawing in an audience, performing cultural capital, and using Shakespeare as a heuristic) in that these academics and professionals engage with the Shakespearean network in a way a simple quotation from Shakespeare does not. Bruno Latour's "critical sociology" suggests that "social ties" can bring together disparate domains of knowledge.[33] Moulier-Boutang describes the "library effect": "the greater the number of networked persons qualified in a given subject, the greater the probability you will find the right answer to a question."[34] I suggest that these ideas need to be considered together and in relation to Bourdieu's social capital. As Bourdieu explains, social capital relies on the capital of a person's network (which, in academia, is often cultural capital):

> The volume of the social capital possessed by a given agent thus depends on the size of the network of connections he can effectively mobilize and on the volume of the capital (economic, cultural, or symbolic) possessed in his own right by each of those to whom he is connected.[35]

For professional Shakespearean academics, this network can be traced in a variety of ways: including citations, graduate supervisions, invitations to speak, and publications, for instance, in edited collections such as this one. Extended analyses by non-Shakespeareans function, unlike short Shakespearean quotations, as cognitive capital in a way that extends the Shakespeare network.[36]

Although I have focused on writing about Shakespeare and the use of Shakespearean references in non-Shakespearean venues for publication, many scholarly publications call into question this simple binary of Shakespearean discipline (such as theatre, literature, or history) versus non-Shakespearean discipline (such as physical sciences, life sciences, or medicine). Articles that discuss the themes and meaning of Shakespeare's work are not limited to journals in the humanities, liberal arts, arts, or social sciences. *The Lancet* has a longstanding history of publishing articles on Shakespeare: the inaugural issue in 1823 included a review of *Much Ado About Nothing* and one of their 2016 issues included a review of *Hamlet* at the Royal Shakespeare Company by Niall Boyce (a psychiatrist and academic), an article by Jonathan Bate (a Shakespearean) about *King Lear*, and an editorial about "The Bard at the Bedside."[37]

David W. Chambers, a trained dentist and university professor, published his article on ethics, game theory, and Shakespeare's tragedies in *The Journal of the American College of Dentists*.[38] This article would be at home in a journal of literary criticism, and yet is presumably aimed at an audience of dentists. Malvin E. Ring's "Shakespeare and Dentistry: Teeth and Oral Care in the Writings of the Bard," which appeared in the *Journal of the California Dental Association*, would not be out of place as an undergraduate essay submitted in an English class.[39] Of these two articles, written by dentists for dentists, only one makes any explicit mention of dentistry in Shakespeare's work, and both point to themes and ideas in Shakespeare's plays.

Can only a dentist explicate the references to oral hygiene in Shakespeare's works? That is, are there topics in Shakespeare's plays that only non-Shakespeareans can truly understand? This is the debate that lingered on the primary Shakespearean listserv, SHAKSPER: The Global Electronic Shakespeare Conference, throughout months of 2015.[40] In a discussion that began about textual variance and *The Merchant of Venice*, William Blanton, himself a lawyer, suggested that only a lawyer could understand Shylock's trial scene. Professional Shakespearean scholars disagreed, some more politely than others: Blanton's expertise in law (and his research on historical law) did not make up for his lack of understanding of early orthography and printing practices, not to mention the rest of the Shakespeare canon. When Shakespeareans began providing examples of scholarship about the trial scene undertaken by legal and Shakespearean experts, Blanton set up three criteria for scholarship he would consider: it must be "(1) by experienced trial attorneys who have (2) familiarized themselves with sixteenth century English law and trial procedure and (3) who have analyzed the Trial Scene as though it were a trial." Laurie Johnson astutely questioned why these criteria would be necessary. Does having experience as a litigator offer any new understanding of a dramatized trial scene written hundreds of years ago and set in a fictionalized locale? The resounding conclusion of the listserv discussion (with Blanton as a dissenting voice) was no. Although new critical insights can be generated by a particular specialist scholar's experiences, they are not necessary or intrinsic to valid and useful textual interpretations.

The upshot of the SHAKSPER discussion about Shakespeareans and lawyers is that there are, indeed, Shakespearean lawyers. Larry Weiss pointed out that there are "a number of lawyers who are well-regarded Shakespeare scholars, notwithstanding that they are 'amateurs,' *i.e.*, it is not what they do for a living." Shakespeareans shared numerous

examples of lawyers or experts in early modern law who write about Shakespeare's works. As demonstrated by the outpouring of examples on the listserv, well-respected research into the law can be undertaken by both professional lawyers and professional Shakespeareans, both of whom might be considered amateurs (or, by Weiss's definition, go unpaid) in the other's field.

Professionals such as lawyers and dentists can write academic Shakespeare publications and still not be professional academic Shakespeareans. Their knowledge could add to the information network that is Shakespeare studies—yet it often goes unread, undiscussed, and uncited by Shakespeareans. As Latour explains, "To provide a piece of information is the action of putting something into a form."[41] For better or worse, professional academic Shakespeareans expect contributions to their knowledge network to come in specific forms: journal articles, books and chapters, and, increasingly, particular kinds of digital contributions. When an explication of Shakespeare's work appears in the *Journal of the California Dental Association*, it is unlikely to reach a wide audience of Shakespeareans (regardless of whether it is indexed in the *World Shakespeare Bibliography*—which, in this case, it is). Shakespeareans as a Latourian "collective"[42] rely on cultural and social capital—publication venue, as a marker of both, matters. "Amateur" Shakespeareans, such as those discussed on the SHAKSPER list, may be able to contribute insights into Shakespeare's life and works, but the importance of their contributions is not guaranteed *because* of their different viewpoints. Rather, amateur scholarship (and scholarship it is, despite not being professional academic Shakespeare) must surmount the obstacle of access, that is, getting the attention of professional Shakespeare scholars.

*

Academic Shakespeare by non-Shakespeareans is closely tied to pop Shakespeare: as a pop culture icon, Shakespeare belongs to a broad community. Shakespeare is a cottage industry, literally: people pay money to visit Anne Hathaway's cottage because she was married to the Bard. It is unsurprising that Shakespeare quotations pepper academic writing, because his works are already oft-quoted in popular culture.[43] It would be more surprising if, given the ubiquity of Shakespeare in pop culture (from insult generators to keychains to young adult novels), Shakespearean references failed to appear across disciplines in academic writing.

As this chapter has shown, academic use of Shakespeare by non-Shakespeareans can run the gamut from a single quotation to an extensive analysis. Non-Shakespeareans can deploy Shakespeare in their published academic research in order to capture readers' attention, to show off their knowledge, to provide a new way to approach a particular topic, or to offer insight into Shakespeare's works. Shakespearean scholars can turn to this evidence to see which plays, which characters, which scenes, and which ideas are at the forefront of a cultural imagination.

The ubiquity of Shakespearean references across disciplines both reflects and bolsters Shakespeare's cultural capital; however, it also reinforces English and Western hegemony, despite the prevalence of translations, adaptations, and global Shakespeare studies. The academic Shakespearean references discussed here are those deployed by English-speakers with knowledge of the Western literary canon. As English became the de facto language of science, among other disciplines,[44] Shakespeare became central to the English literary canon, which is how Shakespeare's ideas and phrases came to permeate English-language academic writing. As this chapter has demonstrated, how Shakespeare is deployed is important to Shakespeareans, but also, ultimately, that it is Shakespeare being deployed with such regularity is what makes us Shakespeareans and not, say, Mundavians or Shirleians.

Shakespeare affects the way we think, regardless of our discipline. Shakespeare's works can be deployed both as a heuristic (a way to access other knowledge) and an epistemology (an underpinning framework that shapes the knowledge itself) in modern academic discourse. So long as academics are writing in English—and perhaps beyond—Shakespearean references will continue to illuminate varied and far-reaching topics, just as non-Shakespeareans will continue to bring their insights to Shakespeare's works. Shakespeare and his works are a cultural touchstone that helps us to communicate.

Notes

1. I should like to thank Valerie Fazel and Louise Geddes for their thoughtful feedback. All line numbers from Shakespeare's plays are taken from *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 2nd ed., ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al. (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1997).
2. James Q. Wilson, *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It* ([New York]: Basic Books, 1989), 60.

3. Clay Shirky, *Here Comes Everybody* (London and New York: Penguin—Allen Lane, 2008), 58.
4. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," trans. Richard Nice, in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. John G. Richardson (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 241–258; reprinted in *Education: Culture, Economy, and Society*, ed. A.H. Halsey, Hugh Laudern, Phillip Brown, and Amy Stuart Wells (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997): 46–58, 51.
5. Yann Moulier-Boutang, *Cognitive Capital*, trans. Ed Emery (Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2011).
6. For an outline of the forms of cultural capital, see Pierre Bourdieu's "The Forms of Capital." Tracing a history of Shakespeare's cultural capital and market value is beyond the bounds of this chapter, though many scholars have fruitfully explored this topic from a variety of perspectives as it relates to Shakespeare's day, our time, and the intervening centuries. See, for instance, Adam Hooks, *Selling Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Kate McLuskie and Kate Rumbold, *Cultural Value in Twenty-First Century England: The Case of Shakespeare* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014); Sarah Olive, *Shakespeare Valued: Education Policy and Pedagogy 1989–2009* (Bristol: Intellect, 2015); Barbara Hodgdon, *The Shakespeare Trade* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998).
7. For how Shakespeare's cultural capital evolved from his day to our own and some of the ways it is currently deployed, see Dominic Shellard and Siobhan Keenan's eds., *Shakespeare's Cultural Capital: His Economic Impact from the Sixteenth to the Twenty-first Century* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). See also Judy Atkins and Alan Finlayson, "'As Shakespeare so Memorably Said…': Quotation, Rhetoric, and the Performance of Politics," *Political Studies* 64.1 (2016): 164–181.
8. Kate Rumbold, "Brand Shakespeare?" *Shakespeare Survey* 64 (2011): 25–37.
9. Moulier-Boutang, *Cognitive Capital*, 32.
10. On the immaterialization of the economy and the move from physical to conceptual, see Moulier-Boutang, especially 58–59.
11. Henry C. Kitchener, "To Stage or not to Stage?: That is the Question (with apologies to Shakespeare)" *International Journal of Gynecological Cancer* 20.11 (2010): S55–S56; W.E. Berdon, "To sound or not to sound, that is the question (with apologies to Shakespeare)," *Pediatric radiology* 15.6 (1985): 391; J.A. Larson, H.P. Mapp, and L.M. Verhalen, "With apologies to Shakespeare, 'to plant or not to plant, that is the question'" *Current Farm Economics—Agricultural Experiment Station, Division Of Agriculture, Oklahoma State University (USA)* 1 (1993): 27.
12. *Google Scholar*, scholar.google.com. Searched December 8, 2015.

13. Laura Estill, Dominic Klyve, and Kate Bridal, "'Spare Your Arithmetic, Never Count the Turns': A Statistical Analysis of Writing about Shakespeare, 1960–2010," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 66.1 (2015): 1–28.
14. This figure comes from JSTOR labs *Understanding Shakespeare*, which associates all material in JSTOR that quotes Shakespeare to the line from the play. http://labs.jstor.org/shakespeare/.
15. James Brooks Kuykendall, "Recitative in the Savoy Operas," *The Musical Quarterly* 95.4 (2012): 549–612; Roy D. Carlson, "Don Giovanni on Eccles Street," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 51.4 (2009): 383–399.
16. George W. Kaplan, "Editorial: With Apologies to Shakespeare," *The Journal of Urology* 161.3 (1999): 933.
17. Neville W. Goodman asserts that of the Shakespearean allusions in article titles indexed by the Medline database, a third are to *Hamlet* and a third are to "What's in a name?" See "From Shakespeare to Star Trek and beyond: A Medline Search for Literary and Other Allusions in Biomedical Titles," *BMJ* 331.7531 (December 22, 2005): 1540–1542.
18. Stanley Plotkin, "Sang Froid in a Time of Trouble: Is a Vaccine against HIV Possible?," *Journal of the International AIDS Society* 12.1 (2009): 2.
19. Insoo Hyun, "The Embryo Potentiality Argument Revisited: 'Once More Unto the Breach, Dear Friends,'" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 13.1 (January 1, 2013): 28–29; Stephen B. Manuck, "Cardiovascular Reactivity in Cardiovascular Disease: 'Once More unto the Breach,'" *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 1.1 (March 1, 1994): 4–31; A.B. Alexandroff, "Once More unto the Breach," *Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy* 43.4 (1996): 254–255.
20. See, for instance, Robert William Dent, *Proverbial Language in English Drama Exclusive of Shakespeare, 1495–1616: An Index* (University of California Press, 1984); and Dent, *Shakespeare's Proverbial Language: An Index* (University of California Press, 1981). Both of Dent's books are available in their entirety from Google Books.
21. For a discussion of Shakespearean cinema in relation to cultural capital, see Douglas Lanier, "Recent Shakespeare Adaptation and the Mutations of Cultural Capital," *Shakespeare Studies* 38 (2010): 104–113.
22. John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2013), ix.
23. Cbgowda Rayapuram and Ian Baldwin, "Host-Plant-Mediated Effects of Nadefensin on Herbivore and Pathogen Resistance in Nicotiana Attenuata," *BMC Plant Biology* 8.1 (2008): 109; C. Lussiez, "Informing the patient on medical liability: what can we do?" *World Hospitals and Health Services* 45.1 (2009): 15–16; Sagar Lonial and Charise Gleason, "Down to the Bitter End," *Blood* 123.20 (2014): 3061–3062.

24. Google results from around the world similarly put "Shakespeare quotes," "Shakespeare quotations," or a translation of this (such as "Shakespeare zitate") in the top three: including Google.ae, Google.ca, Google.de, Google.dk, Google.es, Google.nl, and Google.pl (United Arab Emirates, Canada, Germany, Denmark, Spain, the Netherlands, and Poland). Note that not all Google sites privilege "quotes" as an autocomplete.
25. The URLs for the sites mentioned are as follows: opensourceshakespeare.org, brainyquote.com, buzzfeed.com, and goodreads.com.
26. Google Scholar lists over 300 articles that employ the formula "apologies to [Shakespeare/W. Shakespeare/William Shakespeare]" with titles such as "All's Well that Ends Well (with apologies to W. Shakespeare)," "O Patterns! Wherefore art thou patterns! (with apologies to Shakespeare)," and "What's in a Name? (with apologies to William Shakespeare): The Serials Section's Name Change and other ALCTS Trends and Initiatives." See also note 15 for further examples.
27. Philip A. Routledge, "The European Herbal Medicines Directive: Could It Have Saved the Lives of Romeo and Juliet?" *Drug Safety* 31.5 (March 2008): 416–418.
28. Meaghan King, "Pomeo & Gruliet," *Alternatives Journal* 36.1 (2010): 30–33.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Karina Holden, *Romeo and Juliet: A Monkey's Tale* (DVD: Animal Planet, 2008).
32. Ben Jonson, "To the memory of my beloued, the AUTHOR Mr. William Shakespeare," printed the 1623 first folio. Facsimile in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, pp. 97–98. For a history of the universal-particular debate in Shakespeare studies, see Kiernan Ryan, *Shakespeare's Universality: Here's Fine Revolution* (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2015).
33. Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), esp. 5–6.
34. Moulier-Boutang, *Cognitive Capitalism*, 29.
35. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 51.
36. See Moulier-Boutang, *Cognitive Capitalism*, esp. 62.
37. *The Lancet* 387.10029 (2016).
38. David W. Chambers, "Evil Games," *The Journal of the American College of Dentists* 77.1 (2010): 35–43.
39. Malvin E. Ring, "Shakespeare and Dentistry: Teeth and Oral Care in the Writings of the Bard," *Journal of the California Dental Association* 24.4 (1996): 17–22.
40. Hardy Cook, ed., SHAKSPER: The Global Electronic Shakespeare Conference, www.shaksper.net. The subject headings for this discussion

are "Adventures in Original Punctuation," "Gobbo name," and "MV Dialogue": these ran from March to October 2015 and can be accessed on the website's archive.

41. Latour, *Reassembling the Social*, 223.
42. Latour, *Reassembling the Social*, 247.
43. See Lanier, *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), esp. "According to Shakespeare: Allusion and Citation," 50–81. See also *Shakespeare and Popular Culture*, ed. Robert Shaughnessy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
44. Boer Deng, "English Is the Language of Science," *Slate*, January 6, 2015, http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2015/01/english_is_the_language_of_science_u_s_dominance_means_other_scientists.html; Adam Huttner-Kords, "The Hidden Bias of Science's Universal Language," *The Atlantic*, August 21, 2015, http://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2015/08/english-universal-language-science-research/400919/.

CHAPTER 10

Opening Shakespeare from the Margins

Eric M. Johnson

The Shakespeare user ought to be at the center of Shakespeare studies. The term 'user' here encompasses readers, playgoers, media consumers, researchers, and instructors: anyone who has an affinity for Shakespeare, and a desire to understand his works and the four centuries of artistic expression they have inspired. The field should be focused outward, concerned with bringing the largest possible number of people into the universe of committed Shakespeare lovers, and not with simply fostering a dialogue between experts.

Shakespeareans should embrace this strategy for multiple reasons, but the most immediate is survival. The hand-wringing commentaries about "The Death of the Humanities" might be somewhat excessive, but an increasing proportion of university students in the United States are opting for other majors. Undergraduate enrollment in humanities majors dropped 8.7% in just the two-year period from 2012 to 2014. The humanities now represent only a tenth of all bachelor's degrees conferred every year.[1] Several state governors have questioned the economic value of a humanities degree, and how much they should be subsidized by the public.[2]

E.M. Johnson (✉)
Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, DC, USA

V.M. Fazel and L. Geddes (eds.), *The Shakespeare User*, Reproducing Shakespeare, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-61015-3_10