Shakespearean drama is never, and indeed may never have been, encountered as a whole. Like all play texts, it occurs in parts, is presented in scenes, takes place in performance, at various different locations, under a particular direction, and is usually cut and arranged for this purpose, often fundamentally reworked, revised or rewritten to speak to new places and various audiences across space and time. Sometimes only fragmentary figures, phrases, gestures, motifs, props or things – like Macbeth’s dagger, Yorick’s skull, Shylock’s bond or Juliet’s balcony and Prospero’s books – are cut out and inserted into a new dramatic context or quite a different medial frame. And yet they are recognized and keep operating as signposts towards larger meanings – meanings which are renegotiated in relation to the given interests, views or projects that these Shakespearean legacies, at any given time and place, are called upon to serve. For this reason, Shakespearean transections and translocations should not be seen as detrimental but as constitutive for the productivity of ongoing engagements with Shakespearean material, across the different media and cultural domains of contemporary worlds, whether in TV series, films, stage adaptations, literary rewritings, public discourse or political campaigns. All these make Shakespeare matter, and matter anew, in acknowledging and realizing his remarkable power to anatomize also present-day culture. Shakespearean transections therefore may cut either way, making Shakespeare both the object and the subject of theatrical anatomies and continuously provoking both new texts and new views of old texts. It is in this sense that we use the term translocation to keep the tension strong in all such projects and to explore them as productive constellations for all kinds of unexpected meanings to emerge. With our workshop, then, we hope to trace the lines, directions, strategies and ways which such transections and/or translocations take, and discuss their poetic as well as political functions.
PROGRAMME (preliminary)

Friday, 14 June

09.30 – 09.45  CHRISTINA WALD & TOBIAS DÖRING: Introduction
09.45 – 10.45  DYMPNA CALLAGHAN: Outing Tarquin:
              Speaking Up in Shakespeare’s Lucrece
11.15 – 12.15  SABINE SCHÜLTING: Various Pounds of Flesh
12.15 – 13.15  CHRISTINA WALD: The Crisis of Inheritance:
              King Lear and Succession
15.00 – 16.00  STEFAN WILLER: Composite Archaics:
              Shakespeare, according to Botho Strauß
16.30 – 17.30  SANDRA FLUHRER: War of the Landscapes:
              Heiner Müller and the ‘Elizabethan Metaphor’
17.30 – 18.30  TOBIAS DÖRING: The Rape of Lavinia:
              Transections and Transactions between Ovid, Shakespeare, Müller, Strauß

Saturday, 15 June

09.15 – 10.15  INA HABERMANN: The Bard Explaining the 2016 US election:
              Stephen Greenblatt’s Tyrant and the Political Uses of Shakespeare
10.15 – 11.15  EWAN FERNIE: Back to the Future:
              Shakespeare, Bildung and Burgeoning Democracy
11.45 – 12.45  Responses / Roundup Discussion

ABSTRACTS

Dympna Callaghan (Syracuse)

Outing Tarquin: Speaking Up in Shakespeare’s Lucrece

It is hardly fortuitous that our present moment provides us with a wealth of up-to-the minute examples of some of the most long-standing and contentious issues surrounding female speech in relation to male sexual violence. The hashtags “Me too” and “balance ton porc” have led to open accusations of sexual assault and misconduct from Rose McGowan and Ashley Judd in Hollywood to Terry Reintke in the European Parliament and everywhere in between. That there have also been vigorous ripostes from Catherine Deneuve, among others, suggests that, despite the urgent need to give language to the unspeakable, naming sexual violation is no straightforward matter. This paper will explore the history of these dynamics in relation to The Rape of Lucrece and do so especially in the context of the constraints—both aesthetic and political—on Shakespeare’s own poetic freedom of expression.
Tobias Döring (Konstanz/München)

**The Rape of Lavinia: transactions and transactions between Ovid, Shakespeare, Müller, Strauß**

The figure of Lavinia in Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* is not just so remarkable because she suffers one of the most violent and shocking crimes ever committed – and physically displayed – on the Shakespearean stage, but also because her suffering uncomfortably suggests the willful act of self-serving appropriation by which a playwright turns to given literary models so as to transect and use them for his purpose. When Marcus sees her mutilated body and decides to speak on her behalf – “Shall I speak for thee? Shall I say ‘tis so?” (2.3.33) – his verbal power makes the mute female into an allegory of the cultural violence involved, on Shakespeare’s part, in rearticulating, replaying and indeed outplaying the Ovidian example. His ekphrasis, a turning point for the entire plot, becomes a mode of overpowering. The point recurs in the dramatic adaptations of the play, which therefore emphasize this reading. Both Heiner Müller’s *Anatomie Titus* (1984) and Botho Strauß’ *Schändung* (2005) turn the rape of Lavinia into powerfully self-reflexive moments, full of ekphrastic, metatheatrical and meta-adaptive implications. My paper will thus explore these scenes of rape and raise the question whether their allegorical reading may also be resisted.

Ewan Fernie (Stratford)

**Back to the Future: Shakespeare, Bildung and Burgeoning Democracy**

Emerson said Shakespeare wrote the text for modern life, and that he was the horizon we had yet to go beyond. Carlyle suggested Shakespearean drama had prefigured the true universal church of the future: a church which transcended confessional difference, even Christianity itself. For George Dawson, the Bard was the fulcrum for a new ‘civic gospel’, which Dawson pioneered in industrial Birmingham as a model of collective individualism. Shakespeare had the same progressive function – as the avatar of a better world – for Frederick Furnivall, founder of the New Shakspeare Society; and Eleanor Marx, who was a member of it. This trailblazing potential has been underestimated by critics of ‘Victorian Shakespeare’. But then so too has its specifically German colouring. Sir Walter Scott’s Shakespearean inheritance and purport were much remarked by contemporaries, but his first literary works were translations from German. As were Carlyle’s, and Dawson lectured on German literature, religion, philosophy and criticism, even as he did on the Bard. Eleanor Marx, we might say, was German; her heredity – and her all but consanguineous relation to Engels, which stretched for twelve years beyond her father’s death – combined with the influence of Furnivall, who held an honorary Ph.D. from the Humboldt University of Berlin. I will argue that these conjunctions between German literature and Shakespeare blend *Bildung* with burgeoning democracy into a unique and valuable legacy, one which we have forgotten but which could lend some ethical substance and insurance to democracy in the era of Brexit and Donald Trump.

Sandra Fluhrer (Erlangen)

**War of the Landscapes. Heiner Müller and the ‘Elizabethan Metaphor’**

In his poetological remarks, Heiner Müller speaks about *Erfahrungsdruck* (pressure of experience) as an impulse for aesthetic processes. While intense experience may affect individuals in ways that involve a loss of physical or psychological form – trauma, illness, a lack of orientation –, literature or historiography, by contrast, have the capacity to turn distress into dense aesthetic forms which accommodate the danger of a dissolution of body and soul. Müller’s examples are the laconic verses of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, the crystalline style of Tacitus’s *Annals* and a form of image in Shakespeare Müller calls ‘The Metaphor of the Elizabethan Age’, which my paper seeks to explore. Müller’s brief
remarks suggest that such metaphors – an example of his own is “The [Berlin] wall as Stalin’s monument for Rosa Luxemburg” – entail wide-ranging rhetorical workings of matter and ideas and often juxtapose images of nature with historical and mythological imagery. In contrast to concepts of aesthetic sublimation like those of the Weimar classicists, but also of Freud – this sense of imagery does not aim at transforming psycho-physical afflictions into clean ideas but seeks to retain the disturbing character of experience through strategies of extreme aesthetic tension. Taking Müller’s famous image of the “War of the Landscapes” from his 1988 Weimar speech “Shakespeare a Difference” as a starting point, my paper seeks to outline the poetological, political and anthropological dimensions of this concept of metaphor through readings of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, of Müller’s adaptation, and of the concurrence of historical and mythological material in both plays.

Ina Habermann (Basel)

**The Bard Explaining the 2016 US election: Stephen Greenblatt’s *Tyrant* and the Political Uses of Shakespeare**

In October 2016, Stephen Greenblatt published a highly influential article in *The New York Times* about Shakespeare’s take on how “a great country” could “wind up being governed by a sociopath”. Applying the lessons of Shakespeare’s Richard III to the present, he sets Shakespeare up as the author to whom people turn in their hour of need, desperate to understand what is happening around them. As Robert McCrum puts it in *The Guardian* of July 1, 2018, “Shakespearean’ became a consoling shorthand for bewildered American democrats.” With his book *Tyrant: Shakespeare on Power* (published by Bodley Head in 2018), Greenblatt followed up his initial intervention with an extended inquiry, offering a “grammar of tyranny”, or “anatomy of power”, as McCrum calls it. My talk will explore the uses Greenblatt makes of Shakespeare, pointing out some problems of making Shakespeare our contemporary in this way.

Sabine Schülting (Berlin)

**Various pounds of flesh**

In November 2017, Cher twittered: “trump will have his pound of flesh from us, so he can give trillions 2 Wall st.”. In political debates, Shylock’s pound of flesh is frequently invoked as a synonym for ruthless capitalism and questionable economic deals. Like “Shylock”, “a pound of flesh” has long since entered the dictionary, meaning “something strictly or legally due, but which it is ruthless or inhuman to demand” (OED). My paper will take its departure from references to the pound of flesh in contemporary public discourse, a phrase that has literally been ‘cut out’ from Shakespeare’s play and translated to other contexts. As a polemic attack, the phrase gains its force from its unacknowledged Shakespearean source, and the connection it draws between anti-Semitic myths and early-modern money capitalism, as well as the conversion “between the original, literal flesh and the monetary sign” (Derrida/Venuti 2001: 184). Moving on to recent Shakespeare adaptations and productions – including Albert Ostermaier’s rewriting, *Ein Pfund Fleisch* (2012) – I will explore the “unexpected meanings” emerging from these translocations: the tensions between economic and anti-Semitic discourses and their intersection with the sexual and material connotations of the “pound of flesh”.

Christina Wald (Konstanz)
The Crisis of Inheritance: King Lear and Succession

I will look at how the recent TV series Succession (2018), takes up King Lear to explore the transition crises of inheritance and succession. Transferring Shakespeare’s medieval kingdom to a current media conglomerate with enormous political influence, run by a family with the telling name Roy, Succession depicts a series of failing succession plans. The series takes up central motifs of Lear, such as the crisis of sovereignty in moments of succession, the return of the predecessor, and the interlinking of marriage and succession. Written during the transition of governments in the US, and aired during Donald Trump’s presidency, Succession’s interest in the pathologies of a family-run business catering to right-wing ideologies and in the nexus of media and politics also speaks to the political state in the US.

This thematic interest is pertinent for every adaptation which itself is meant to succeed as an inheritor of King Lear. Like Lear’s daughters, every adaptation takes a particular stance towards its ‘parent’, which may be characterized by devotion or opposition, love or hatred, deep-seated engagement or superficial attachment. Succession also shows that adaptation is a bi-directional process, offering meta-adaptational comment on how later versions have transformed the ‘origin’, making Lear the play a “child-changed father” (4.7.17).

Stefan Willer (Berlin)

Composite Archaics: Shakespeare, According to Botho Strauß

In a newspaper article on the occasion of Shakespeare’s 400th obit in April 2016, German author and playwright Botho Strauß related Shakespeare’s work to “scenic primeval times” (“szenische Urzeit”), by contrast with the modern temporalities of progress and present. However, Strauß stated, Shakespeare today can only be experienced in a “composite” way, combining readings, films, and “recollections of serious acting.” This contradiction between composition, fragmentation, and reception on the one hand, and primeval authenticity on the other is characteristic for Strauß’ ways of transecting and translocating Shakespeare. In my talk I will deal with his two major adaptations—one might also speak of appropriations or overpaintings—: Der Park from 1983, in which Strauß uses A Midsummer Night’s Dream, and the Titus Andronicus version Schändung (“Rape”) from 2005.