

Shakespeare Seminar

William Shakespeare



Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft

Ausgabe 17 (2020)

Shakespeare and Dance

Shakespeare Seminar 17 (2020)

EDITORS

The *Shakespeare Seminar* is published under the auspices of the Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, Weimar, and edited by:

Dr. Kirsten Sandrock, Georg-August Universität Göttingen, Seminar für Englische Philologie, Käte-Hamburger Weg 3, D-37073 Göttingen (ksandro@uni-goettingen.de)

Dr. Lukas Lammers, Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Englische Philologie, Habelschwerdter Allee 45, 14195 Berlin (l.lammers@fu-berlin.de)

PUBLICATIONS FREQUENCY

Shakespeare Seminar is a free annual online journal. It documents papers presented at the Shakespeare Seminar panel of the spring conferences of the Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. It is intended as a publication platform especially for the younger generation of scholars. For the current Call for Papers, please see our website: www.shakespeare-gesellschaft.de

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER

ISSN1612-8362

CONTENTS

Introduction Lukas Lammers and Kirsten Sandrock	1
Not Moving a Foot: The Dancefloor as an Amorous Battleground in <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> Valentina Finger	3
Gender and the Dancing Fairy Body in Frederic Ashton's <i>The Dream</i> Steven Ha	17
Visual Culture and Gendered Histories: Dancing Fairies and Ballet Adaptations of <i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i> Julia Hoydis	30
Missing Words, Polydirectional Adaptation and Metareference as Choreographic Strategy in Shakespearean Dance Adaptations Maria Marcsek-Fuchs	45
"For other than for dancing measures": Jigs at Shakespeare's Globe and the Politics of Shakespearean Performance Marlena Tronicke	59
Call for Statements Shakespeare Seminar 2021.....	72

**“FOR OTHER THAN FOR DANCING MEASURES”:
JIGS AT SHAKESPEARE’S GLOBE AND THE POLITICS OF SHAKESPEAREAN
PERFORMANCE**

BY

MARLENA TRONICKE

Introduction

Anyone coming to see a performance at the reconstructed Shakespeare’s Globe will likely encounter a substantial amount of onstage dancing – during the play itself, but also in the form of a concluding jig. This should not surprise, given that Shakespeare’s works provide ample opportunity for dancing. As Alan Brissenden’s *Shakespeare and the Dance* (1981) and, more recently, *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Dance* (2019), have shown in great detail, the concept of dance is woven into the fabric of individual scenes as well as entire plays across the dramatic canon.¹ Notably, several comedies conclude with an explicit call for song and dance. To name but a few examples, prior to Puck’s epilogue, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1595) features a song sung by Titania and Oberon, with Oberon inviting the other characters to dance along (5.1.385-390).² *As You Like It* (1599/1600) concludes with music and dance to celebrate the weddings of Rosalind/Orlando and Celia/Oliver. When Jacques announces that he will not participate in the imminent festivities indicating that his melancholic disposition makes him “for other than for dancing measures” (5.4.191), this is a political gesture that has the potential to subvert the play’s otherwise conservative tendency to smooth all previous discord and redirect its characters onto the path of order and stability. And in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (1594/95), wedding festivities and dancing are even postponed entirely, an ending which may appear unexpected within the generic framework of comedy but which echoes the play’s preoccupation with “the unfinished, the broken and the incomplete” (Brissenden 35). At Shakespeare’s Globe, however, concluding company dances are not restricted to the staging of comedies; rather, the jig has become a trademark of Globe performance style and practice more generally.

Evidence suggests that from the fifteenth century onwards, plays on the London stage – Shakespearean or other – concluded with some form of dancing loosely referred to as ‘jig,’ even though the term was used with reference to various forms of musical conclusions to a play (Clegg 83–84). Robert Clegg discusses how Shakespeare’s Globe re-instigated the jig as part of their experimentation with what they termed original

¹ For an overview of extant scholarship on both dance *in* Shakespeare and Shakespeare *as* dance (the latter of which, as McCulloch suggests, has long remained understudied [70]) see McCulloch 2016. *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Dance* has significantly advanced scholarship in both these areas.

² All references to Shakespeare’s plays are to the *Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*.

practice, and how they eventually established the final company dance as a new “‘Globe tradition’ in the 21st Century” (van Kampen qtd. in Clegg 98). Since then, Clegg suggests, the jig’s “guiding aesthetic has been that of consistency: the conclusion has been in keeping with the play, the choreography driven by harmonization” (101). Whilst this sounds commercial above all, more recent jigs at the theatre point in another direction, which raises the question of what and whom exactly this “harmonization” relates to. In recent years, performances at Shakespeare’s Globe have become more overtly political, as indicated by so-called colour- and gender-blind casting as standard practice. In this article, I explore the ways in which the jigs, even more so than the productions they are attached to, have the capacity to intervene in normative discourses concerning, for instance, able-bodiedness or Whiteness. Drawing on a number of selected Globe performances from 2014–2019, and understanding dance as a distinctly political form of embodied expression and knowledge, I discuss to what extent the jig may not only function as commentary on the specific production it succeeds but also challenge ideologically charged assumptions concerning Shakespearean drama more generally, particularly when presented in period costume.

Early Modern Jigs and the Embodied Politics of Dance

The theatrical convention of finishing a play with a dance precedes the early modern stage and can be traced back as far as the medieval mystery cycles. Whereas dancing had always been a major feature of English country life, by the end of the sixteenth century dance became increasingly characteristic of courtly culture, where it found its prime expression in the courtly masque (Clegg 88–89; see also Brissenden 2–3). The term ‘jig’ itself originated in the context of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century drama, where dancing was equally common. There, it referred to the dramatic jig, “a short, sometimes bawdy, often comic musical-drama that included elements of dance, stage-fighting, and disguise” (Clegg 89) – in other words, a proper dramatic piece in its own right rather than a choreographed accessory to the play it succeeds. In its looser connotation of ‘a type of dance,’ the term first occurred around the year 1560 (Clegg and Skeaping 4). Whilst comparatively little is known about the exact nature of jigs in original Shakespearean performance, it is safe to assume they featured jigs in some shape or form (see Clegg 87–96). Such dances at the end of a play, Clegg proposes, served various purposes:

Dancing that concluded the plot might symbolize harmony, restore character roles or hierarchy, and offer closure to the dramatic plot; however, the type of dance may lay challenge to collective order. Dancing that occurred after the play might bridge the liminal space between player and character, between the world of the drama and the reality of the spectator, and foster a sense of community—the energy and symbolism of which may, however, spill into the streets beyond the theater, making those responsible for civil, moral and religious order nervous. (Clegg 84)

The jig’s function as a “bridge” between what Clegg identifies as “the world of the drama and the reality of the spectator” is especially important, because it suggests the jig has the capacity to involve the audience much more effectively than a play, however much immersive. The jig forges a bond between actors and audiences. In doing so, it

subtly flattens hierarchies between observer and observed, and reminds the audience of their complicity with the events on stage.

Even though primarily associated with the stage, jigs also existed outside the theatre and were frequently presented in communal settings such as private houses or marketplaces. Performed by household servants as well as professional actors, so-called libellous jigs called attention to transgressions and failings, both private and public, by members of the community. Albeit in comical form, they sought to sanction what was perceived as immoral conduct. Importantly, these critical voices developed out of the respective communities themselves; they were mostly written by amateur rather than professional writers and hence proved a powerful subversive tool that was difficult to censure or contain (Clegg and Skeaping 3).³ Libellous jigs thus opened up “sites of conflict that brought into sharp focus opposition between literary ambition and sub-literary popular culture, civic order and public disorder, controlled and uncontrolled behaviour, lawfulness and lawlessness, morality and immorality” (Clegg and Skeaping 3). As can be taken from this overview, the jig has always been politically charged.

Conceiving of the jig as a distinctly political form of expression begs questions regarding the relationship between dance and politics more generally. As Rebekah Kowal, Gerald Siegmund, and Randy Martin argue via the philosopher and political theorist Jacques Rancière, “art and politics do not reside in separate spheres. Rather, one needs to think of their primary connection as being embedded or enfolded in the raw material of our sensible world” (4). Dance, therefore, is political per se, regardless of its context. They further differentiate between “political dance,” i.e., dance that seeks to communicate a specific political message, and “‘the politics of dance’ (Kowal, Siegmund and Martin 3). The latter, “in a self-reflexive manner, questions its own modes of production, its relation to the institutions in which it takes place, and the power relations among the different players (dancers, choreographers, audiences) in the game” (Kowal, Siegmund and Martin 3). In the following, I discuss the selected jigs at Shakespeare’s Globe with regard to both their politics and as political dance. In particular, I probe the ways in which they self-reflexively engage with the status of Shakespeare’s Globe as a powerful cultural space for negotiations of Shakespearean drama, and with twenty-first century debates on historical theatre and representation more generally.

Before proceeding with the question of where the politics and political impetus of the jig extend beyond that of a given play itself, it is worth taking a closer look at the concept of corporeality. It is a truism that bodies on stage matter. According to Nadine George-Graves, both “[d]ance and theatre serve as correctives to the Cartesian emphasis on ‘cogito’ experience, advancing embodied knowledge” instead (6). Both art forms “remind us that the human body is not just another physical object but [...] the mechanism by which the world is made manifest and, indeed, existent” (George-Graves 6). Arguing in a similar direction, Ann Cooper Albright proposes thinking through the concept of corporeality in order to “reflect on the very slippery way that bodies carry

³ For a more comprehensive overview of the history of the dramatic jig, see Clegg and Lucie Skeaping’s eponymous chapter in *Singing Simpkin and other Bawdy Jigs* (1-65). They not only distinguish between various forms of jigs but also compare the performance traditions of England and mainland Europe.

meaning in contemporary performance” (19). As she makes clear, audiences do not solely respond to a performance on a psychological or physical level, and neither is their role in watching a play or dance a passive one. Rather, she suggests, audiences bring to a performance their body *and* mind, both of which are actively implicated in the process of watching a performance and also in constant dialogue with other bodies in the performance space (Albright 20). Albright therefore understands “corporeality here as an intertwining of sensation and perception where the body remains anchored as the central scope of awareness. [...] Within the context of performance, corporeality circulates between the bodies onstage and those in the audience” (20). For its aforementioned function of bridging the space between audience and actors, this is particularly true of the jig. It encourages the audience to follow the beat they feel in their bodies, and join in the dialogue that has unfolded in the previous hours. It thus conditions an embodied form of perception that develops in a corporeally articulated discourse with all the other bodies that are co-present in the same space.

Political Jigs at Shakespeare's Globe

Since its opening in 1997, Shakespeare's Globe has been a theatre as much as a space for research and education on early modern theatre practice. To begin with, during Mark Rylance's artistic directorship (1997–2005), researchers and theatre practitioners made use of ‘original practice’ wherever possible. Seeking to achieve close approximation of original Shakespearean performance practices in order to find out what insights such experimentation might yield, they tested the potential of single-gender casting, Renaissance costume, stage design, as well as dance in a setting that is concomitantly early modern and twenty-first-century.⁴ Such deliberations also included pondering possible ways to end a play, whether with a dramatic jig in a narrower sense, or a looser, more communal dance of the cast. As Claire van Kampen indicates, the former appeared too obstructive because “[t]he notion of a ‘curtain call’ is too engrained in modern audiences to cope with the idea of appreciatively but silently watching four actors dance a pavane at the end of a long play” (86; see also Clegg 97–99). Since there is limited documentation of Shakespearean jigs, Clegg remarks, “historical precedence became secondary to establishing the new Globe's new tradition” (Clegg 97–98), and so the result was a company dance that mixed early modern performance tradition with more contemporary flavours. Whereas strict adherence to original practice performances was

⁴ In their introduction to *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, an overview of the insights gained from the first ten years of ‘original practice’ at Shakespeare's Globe, Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper emphasise the project's claim to experimentation rather than authenticity. As they explain, “[t]he Globe Theatre has been a disappointment to many scholars. It has not told them what they wanted it to and it has not involved them as they had hoped. But some of the initial visions of recreating a historical moment through the harmonious collaboration of practitioner and scholar must be seen to be a romantic ideal. Instead, what this theatre has offered up to the scholarly community is a real understanding of the possibilities of practical experiments that are *historically and critically informed*” (Carson and Karim-Cooper 9; emphasis added). For further reading on the individual areas of performance that were informed by ‘original practice’ see the edited collection in its entirety.

discontinued after Dominic Dromgoole's appointment as artistic director (2005–2016), the jig – by now a favourite with audiences – stayed in place.

As in-house choreographer who is responsible for all kinds of musical onstage movement at Shakespeare's Globe, Sian Williams has shaped the jig into a product with a distinctive design. And yet, as Veronica Howell points out, "this isn't choreography in a conventional sense" (n.p.). Always developing the jigs in dialogue with the actors, Williams goes beyond "a re-creation of a formal dance of the period. Her ideas are always more of an action replay of the play, all the important themes restated in motion" (Horwell n.p.). Akin to the libellous jigs, the jigs at the Globe are communal creations that all the actors involved can agree on. One of their foremost functions, Williams indicates, is to provide a welcome moment of release after a potentially strenuous, often three-hours long performance. "'The jigs have rhythm, rhythm first' and as to the audience clapping along, 'you try and stop them'" (qtd. in Horwell n.p.). Referring to Williams's quote, Evelyn Tribble aptly describes the jigs as "one of the most powerful forms of synchronized experience" through which "[a]ctors and audience are engaged in constant affective negotiation" (161). This "synchronized experience" of the jig activates the audiences' bodies in a visceral manner and thus achieves a pulling effect.

As indicated by these descriptions, the jig seems a part of an evening's (or afternoon's) entertainment that audiences await eagerly. This becomes especially palpable when such anticipation is frustrated: for his 2014 staging of *Anthony and Cleopatra*, director Jonathan Munby initially decided to finish without a jig. The production was saturated with numerous, extended Egyptian dance scenes, and so he felt the final dance was not needed and might furthermore distract from the powerful concluding image of Cleopatra's statue-like, dead body (Munby qtd. in Horwell n.p.). This directorial choice sparked discontent among many audience members, though. As Horwell puts it, "[i]t didn't feel right to Globe-trotters. This is not how death and life in the wooden O goes, there is no end of history. Get up, woman!" (n.p.). Since reviewers, too, commented on the jig's notable absence (Taylor n.p.), Munby felt compelled to reconsider his decision and reinsert a jig in later performances (Munby and Neill n.p.). It thus seems the concluding jig has become a commercial feature of the Globe experience, something that audiences expect to get delivered with the purchase of a ticket. At the same time, however, recent jigs (or the absence thereof) have struck decidedly political notes, in terms of both 'political dance' and 'the politics of dance.'

To begin with another of Munby's productions, his 2015 *The Merchant of Venice* had no concluding jig at all, an absence that many reviewers addressed. Rather than ending on the resolution of the comic plot – a resolution which is rather uncomfortable in itself –, the production concluded with a coda staging Shylock's forced baptism. For Alexander Coghlan, this frustration of audience expectations proved particularly effective. As he wrote,

[t]here's a certainty, a reassurance that comes with attending a Globe show. You know that however bad things get, however bloodied the stage at final curtain, however bruised the relationships on stage, everyone – corpses and all – will rise and come together for a spirited closing jig. [...] How much more striking, then, is Munby's *Merchant of Venice* – not a tragedy turned on its head with a lively dance, but a "comedy" ending with the sudden shock of pain and cruelty. (Coghlan n.p.)

After Gratiano's final "I'll fear no other thing / So sore, as keeping safe Nerissa's ring" (5.1.306–7), the scene merged into a tableau of Shylock's daughter Jessica (Phoebe Pryce) receiving a letter, erupting into a mournful Hebrew lament, and getting down on her knees. Her song was then layered with the beating of drums and Latin chants of Priests who were leading Shylock (Phoebe Pryce's real-life father Jonathan Pryce) onto the stage for his forced conversion to Christianity. Shylock's tearful "Amen" concluded the performance. This concomitantly disturbing and compelling image would have been especially effective for those expecting a jig as per Globe convention; instead, Munby offered a punch in the gut. Surely, adding a jig onto this alternative ending would have provided closure and harmony where neither is called for. The performance thus refrains from offering a sense of emotional and physical relief that might paint over the play's antisemitic overtones. In this particular case, therefore, the decision to withhold the jig was a political statement in itself.

Since Emma Rice's brief time at the helm (2016–2018), performances at Shakespeare's Globe have become more overtly political. Rice's iconoclastic productions, and those staged by some of the guest directors she contracted, certainly upended traditional notions of Shakespearean drama. Even though not subscribing to the terms herself (Rice n.p.), she practiced colour- and gender-blind casting,⁵ and cast a drag performer, Le Gateau Chocolat, in the role of Feste in her 2017 production of *Twelfth Night*. Her 2016 staging of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* fused Renaissance and contemporary aesthetics on the levels of setting, costume, and sound. Much of this production's storytelling relied on the usage of music which, next to modern pop and punk songs, boasted Elizabethan tunes mixed with Indian styles. The concluding jig amplified this cultural mash-up as it had the actors dance to Bollywood tunes that were at least to some degree played on Renaissance instruments in a Bollywood-inspired choreography. This was political dance in the sense that it countered the dominant image of Shakespeare as a cultural icon of White excellence by relating it to a (post)colonial setting; in clapping and moving along with the actors, the audience celebrated and literally applauded this message of a re-appropriated, decolonised Shakespeare. In addition, through highlighting the production's ambiguous approach to historical accuracy, the politics of dance here called attention to both the constructed nature of authenticity associated with historical drama and the ideological implications of furthering such orthodoxies – for an institution like the Globe especially, whose productions had been considerably more reverential so far.

Rice's split with the Globe gained a lot of attention in the media.⁶ Michelle Terry's arrival in 2018, and with that, the question of where the Globe would be heading

⁵ On the inconsistent terminology and potentially problematic ideology behind gender-blind casting, as well as the crucial question of who is considered to be blind to gender in the first place, see Bachrach n.p.; on related questions in the context of colour-blind casting, see Thompson 2006.

⁶ It would be trivialising to reduce reasons for Rice's departure to what is often presented as a fallout over her decision to rely more strongly on enhanced lighting and sound (Furness n.p.); rather, it seems her overall artistic vision sat uncomfortably with ideas on what kind of cultural space the Globe should be, and what kind of Shakespearean performance it should house. Furthermore, Rice repeatedly admitted to finding Shakespeare "hard to understand" (Gardner n.p.), a phrasing that – whilst intended

politically and aesthetically, was therefore anxiously anticipated. Terry appeased critics and audiences alike by productions that looked and sounded less jarringly modern, but her approach proved just as radical in other ways. Terry's main innovation was a consistently democratised rehearsal room: first, she decided to loosen the concept of one director in charge of the production and handed over the authority to the ensemble instead – a decision that was widely criticised (Billington n.p.; Wolf n.p.). Second, based on the view that “what the Globe can offer is Shakespeare for all, by all” (Terry qtd. in Hemming n.p.), she introduced gender-, colour-, and disability-blind casting as consistent Globe practice. Ayanna Thompson draws attention to the gatekeeping function Shakespeare has, and to how, even in the twenty-first century, people of colour are still often excluded from discourses on Shakespearean drama, scholarship, and performance (n.p.); surely, similar barriers operate along the lines of class and normative able-bodiedness. Onstage representation of actors therefore needs to be more diverse, as Terry points out: “If our job is to hold a mirror up to nature, [we should ask] who is holding the mirror and who is being reflected” (qtd. in Hemming n.p.). The metaphor of the mirror is a poignant one in the context of the jig, especially where audiences are invited to join in the dance. In such cases, the positions of those who hold the mirror and those who see their image being projected back begin to blur, so that actors find themselves as much reflected in the audience as vice versa.

The 2018 double bill of *Hamlet* and *As You Like it* (both co-directed by ensemble directors Federay Holmes and Elle While) marked the beginning of Terry's artistic directorship. The same company of twelve actors, equally balanced between male and female, performed in both plays, and so several male characters (e.g., Hamlet, Orlando) were cast with female actors, and vice versa (e.g., Ophelia, Rosalind). Even though the cross-gender casting received a lot of critical attention, the most innovative aspect of both productions, according to many critics, was that the roles of Guildenstern and Celia were played by Deaf actor Nadia Nadarajah.⁷ As Guildenstern, she signed her lines in British Sign Language (BSL) with Rosencrantz acting as an interpreter. Other characters at least partly communicated with her in BSL, often simultaneously speaking their lines to facilitate understanding among the predominantly non-Deaf audience. Andrzej Lukowski considered Nadarajah's performance “the most important thing about the production” and “surely the night's most progressive flourish” (n.p.). As Celia, Nadarajah used BSL not only as a secret language between her and Rosalind but also to communicate her “frustrated voicelessness” (Andrews 687) as a bystander in Rosalind and Orlando's courtship. For Meghan Andrews, Nadarajah was “[t]he highlight of the production” (687). These enthusiastic responses to Nadarajah's performances relate the

to reduce potential anxieties regarding the ‘high culture’ label that is often attached to Shakespeare – raised a number of eyebrows.

⁷ It should be noted that Nadarajah is not the first Deaf performer on the Shakespearean stage in the UK. In 2018, Gregory Doran directed a 50/50 gender balanced production of *Troilus and Cressida* at the Royal Shakespeare Company in which the prophet Cassandra was played by Deaf actor Charlotte Arrowsmith, who also communicated in BSL. Arrowsmith furthermore played the role of Curtis, a servant, in Doran's 2019 production of *The Taming of The Shrew*. During its run, she also understudied the role of Vincentia and thus became the first Deaf performer to understudy for a non-Deaf actor (RSC n.p.).

politics of the two individual plays to larger debates on how Deaf and other non-ablebodied actors can be better involved in theatre practices, and what more participatory interchanges between Deaf and Hearing communities could look like (Shakespeare's Globe, "Michelle Terry & Nadia Nadarajah," n.p.).

Most forcefully, however, the production of *Hamlet* positioned itself within such debates by taking up BSL as a joint communicative language between characters/actors on stage and the audience during the concluding jig. Following the final scene, the dead characters slowly came to life again, regrouped with the others, and then started signing in BSL along to a rhythmic beat. On one level, and in line with Williams's understanding of the jig as a condensation of a production's most important themes, questions of power and communication, of who has the capacity to speak, and who listens, thus re-emerged as a key concern of this *Hamlet*. On another level, the usage of BSL in the jig was not accompanied by spoken words for non-Deaf audience members to make sense of, which caused a certain amount of (productive) frustration amongst audience members. Whilst Peter Kirwan, for instance, praised "[t]hat the signing was such an organic and unremarkable part of the production" he also indicated that he "would have loved to know what was being said during the final jig" ("*Hamlet*," n.p.). For non-speakers of BSL, their own able-bodiedness in this respect did not enable them to read the bodies onstage, a dynamic which turned traditional power- and knowledge-relations upside down. The politics of dance thus exploited the embodied nature of both communication and knowledge as dramatised in this production by enlisting the audience in a dialogue most of them could partake in to a limited extent only. This awareness of their own Hearing bodies manifested in tacit communication with the bodies of other non-Deaf audience members who were cast in the same, rather passive position. Resounding the libellous jig's function of calling out social grievances, the politics of the *Hamlet*-jig foregrounded the communicative power relations at play in normative Hearing culture. What is more, it took to task theatre culture's tendency to exacerbate such formations of able-bodiedness as the norm.

Another memorable use of the jig could be witnessed in the 2019 production of *Henry V, or Harry England* (co-directed by ensemble directors Federay Holmes and Sarah Bedi), this time shifting the focus to preconceived notions of Shakespeare as an icon of (White) Englishness. Through stagings of *Richard II*, *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*, and *Henry V* – all of which could be watched as a trilogy on selected dates – the 2019 summer season "explored the past, present and future of our 'scepter'd isle'" (Shakespeare's Globe, "Summer 2019," n.p.). As the mission statement on the Globe's website continues, the season "scrutinised our national myths and the stories that we tell about ourselves" (Shakespeare's Globe, "Summer 2019," n.p.). This cycle of history plays was staged at a time when debates on whether at all, and on what terms, Britain should leave the European Union were in full swing. Prior to, and in the aftermath of, the referendum, notions of Britishness (or indeed Englishness) became contested. Neo-imperialist and nationalist speech at various political levels, strikingly made visible by the Windrush scandal, threw into relief that, in the eyes of many Brexiteers, Britishness was perceived as conterminous with Whiteness. Against this backdrop, the 2019 summer season at the Globe opened up a forum to interrogate the ways in which Shakespeare, and particularly the history plays, reinforce understandings of who and what is perceived as part of

English history, and how much these dominant formations of Englishness resonate to the present day. Arguably, *Henry V* is Shakespeare's most patriotic play, as also indicated by the slightly revised title for this Globe production. The Globe confronted this issue head-on by casting a Black female actor, Sarah Amankwah, in the title role, thus creating a friction arising from the discrepancy between the role, "the eponymous king's place in the myths of English nationalism" (Ludmon n.p.), and the actor's Black, female body. As another major change to the playtext, the lines of the Chorus were allocated to a number of characters, thus "fragmenting the jingoistic message and highlighting how the words often have little to do with the action they commentate on" (Ludmon n.p.).

Rather than obliterating Amankwah's race and ethnicity in a manner that the term 'colour-blind' might suggest, the production drew attention to her being non-White, most forcefully via the use of music and dance. Of course, this *Henry V* also featured a concluding jig which "brought all of the musicians as well as the cast onstage carrying drums, offering a loud and rousing percussive rhythm to close off the trilogy day" (Kirwan, "Henry V," n.p.). More importantly, however, it deployed a variation of the jig within the play itself through the rendition of "Non Nobis" after the victory at Agincourt in act 4, scene 8. Kirwan describes this interlude as follows:

Accompanied by the BSL interpreter (doing a fantastic job translating both Latin and French as well as early modern English), the ensemble knelt and sang Tayo Akinbode's setting, which drew on American Roots melodies that evoked anything from deep South spiritual to the second lines of New Orleans jazz funerals. (Kirwan, "Henry V," n.p.)

In making use of a number of languages, this jig within the play presented a version of English history that was multicultural and multilingual, inclusive and accessible. Moreover, through drawing on various historical and cultural contexts simultaneously, none of them properly aligning with what are considered realist depictions of medieval England, it playfully called into question history's (and the history plays') claim to narrative authority. Even though historical evidence attests to a significant Black presence in early modern England even outside forms of enslavement (see Kaufmann 2017; Nubia 2019), English history is still predominantly imagined as White. Explicitly linking the origins of twenty-first-century England/Britain to African American culture and, implicitly, transatlantic slavery, the politics of dance here offered an image of Britain at odds with constructions of Britishness as White – constructions not only perpetuated in pro-Brexit discourse but also enshrined in the history plays' critical reception and performance history. These alternative imaginings of 'England' strove on the signifying power of corporeality, calling attention to what Albright names the "slippery way that bodies carry meaning" (Cooper Albright 19); they were negotiated through a joint awareness of a range of 'different' bodies and cultures, on and offstage, that communicated with each other in the same space.

Conclusion: Jigging Shakespeare for Everyone?

In February 2020, in an article for *The Telegraph*, the paper's theatre critic Dominic Cavendish bemoaned the decline of 'traditional' Shakespeare vis-à-vis the rise of what he called the "woke Brigade" (n.p.). He claimed that in recent years, "Shakespeare

performance has increasingly marched to a 'woke' drum. [...] We've seen greater diversity in casting and much gender-flipping. Fine, OK. A traditionally cast production is now a rarity, ever more unthinkable. That's less fine" (Cavendish n.p.). A continuation of such performance practices – i.e., gender-, colour-, and disability-blind casting – he predicted, "will render our national playwright as much taboo as totemic" (Cavendish n.p.). Cavendish's argument warrants some commentary. First, what he calls "traditionally cast" productions are certainly not rare these days, and in the context of Shakespearean drama and its early modern tradition of all-male casting this is also an unfortunate phrase to use. Second, his argument ignores that casting processes are not just a matter of identity politics but that they, above all, endeavour to arrive at new, perhaps surprising, readings of well-known texts.

Cavendish's article sparked considerable outrage in various quarters. Gregory Doran, artistic director of the RSC, responded with a fierce rebuttal, indicating that any director working on a Shakespeare play should "want to reveal what is most urgent, most resonant and sometimes most challenging in his work, and address those issues head on" (n.p.). He reminded readers that, rather than a form of censorship, finding new ways into a play through casting choices or making changes to the text is part and parcel of every successful production, and invoking – like Terry in the above quotation – the metaphor of the performance as mirror, concluded: Shakespeare "held a mirror up to nature, and whatever gender you are, whatever your racial heritage, your social background, whatever your physical or mental differences, you should be able to look into that mirror and recognise yourself reflected back. That is our purpose and our responsibility" (Doran n.p.). Representation, in other words, does matter, and identity politics understood in this way always operate in dialogue with, rather than in opposition to, the plays' content and cultural signification.

Arguments such as Cavendish's raise the question of who can lay claim to Shakespeare and his works in what ways. As I have argued, the twenty-first-century jig as a more open form of expression than historical drama (even when staged today), is ideally designed to negotiate such anxieties. For their historical associations with bawdiness (via the libellous jigs) and their reputation as a commercial feature of Globe entertainment, the jigs discussed above lack the hefty cultural capital and, hence, ideological baggage of 'high art' usually associated with Shakespearean drama. Their liminal status as neither play nor dance, as neither part of, nor mere attachment to, a given play renders them model sites to perform frictions that may arise in between the conflicting positionalities of roles and actors, on- and offstage bodies; frictions that, as I have suggested, may pertain to constructions of historical accuracy, dominant formations of (White) Englishness in both diachronic and synchronic perspective, or normative able-bodiedness. Also, the jigs' reliance on the body "as the central scope of awareness" in Albright's sense (20) complicates, if not negates, the idea of a passive, apolitical spectatorship. In an essay on Globe audiences more generally, Penelope Woods (2015) has proposed thinking about spectatorship at this particular theatre as a form of doing rather than being. The jig here proves a case in point, because its political impetus extends beyond mere "dancing measures," as Jacques would have it. Rather, it presents a pertinent vehicle to spark debates on what Shakespearean drama in the twenty-first century is, looks like, and should be.

Works Cited

- Albright, Ann Cooper. "Split Intimacies: Corporeality in Contemporary Theater and Dance." *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Theater*. Ed. Nadine George-Graves. New York: Oxford UP, 2015. 19–34.
- Andrews, Meghan C. Rev. of *As You Like It*, by Shakespeare's Globe. *Shakespeare Bulletin* 36.4 (2018): 687–91.
- Bachrach, Hailey. "'Gender blind' casting, who and what goes unseen?" *King's English*, King's College London, 23 May 2018, <https://blogs.kcl.ac.uk/english/2018/05/23/shakespeare-and-gender/>. Accessed 4 Aug. 2020.
- Billington, Michael. "Michelle Terry's plan for Shakespeare's Globe is democratic – but is it doable?" *The Guardian*, 4 January 2018, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2018/jan/04/michelle-terry-shakespeares-globe>. Accessed 4 Aug. 2020.
- Brissenden, Alan. *Shakespeare and the Dance*. London: Macmillan, 1981.
- Carson, Christie, and Farah Karim-Cooper. "Introduction." *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*. Eds. Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 2008. 1–12.
- Cavendish, Dominic. "The woke brigade are close to 'cancelling' Shakespeare." *The Telegraph*, 9 February 2020, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/theatre/what-to-see/woke-brigade-close-cancelling-shakespeare/>. Accessed 4 Aug. 2020.
- Clegg, Robert, and Lucie Skeaping. *Singing Simpkin and other Bawdy Jigs*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2014.
- Clegg, Robert. "'When the Play is Done, You Shall Have a Jig or Dance of All Treads': Danced Endings on Shakespeare's Stage." *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Dance*. Eds. Lynsey McCulloch and Brandon Shaw. New York: Oxford UP, 2019. 83–106.
- Coghlan, Alexander. "The Merchant of Venice, Shakespeare's Globe: Jonathan Munby's Merchant is quiet, but delivers a deadly final blow." *The Arts Desk*, 01 May 2015, <https://theartsdesk.com/node/75242/view>. Accessed 3 Aug. 2020.
- Doran, Gregory. "Why Shakespeare was 'woke' to begin with." *The Telegraph*, 23 February 2020, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/theatre/what-to-see/shakespeare-woke-begin/>. Accessed 3 Aug. 2020.
- Furness, Hannah. "Emma Rice leaves Shakespeare's Globe after row over modern lighting." *The Telegraph*, 25 October 2016, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/10/25/emma-rice-leaves-shakespeares-globe-after-row-over-modern-lighti/>. Accessed 3 Aug. 2020.
- Gardner, Lyn. "It's time for a big adventure': Emma Rice on her opening Globe production." *The Guardian*, 11 April 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2016/apr/11/emma-rice-interview-shakespeares-globe-theatre-wonder-season-midsummer-nights-dream>. Accessed 3 Aug. 2020.
- George-Graves, Nadine. "Magnetic Fields: Too Dance for Theater, Too Theater for Dance." *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Theater*. Ed. Nadine George-Graves. New York: Oxford UP, 2015. 1–16.

- Hemming, Sarah. "Globe director Michelle Terry on untapped potential in Shakespeare's great plays." *Financial Times*, 11 January 2019, <https://www.ft.com/content/6d193852-1369-11e9-a168-d45595ad076d>. Accessed 4 Aug. 2020.
- Horwell, Veronica. "The jig is up – Shakespeare's Globe sends them out dancing." *The Guardian*, 1 October 2014, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2014/oct/01/shakespeare-jig-music-choreography-globe-theatre>. Accessed 5 Aug. 2020.
- Kaufmann, Miranda. *Black Tudors: The Untold Story*. London: Oneworld Publications, 2017.
- Kirwan, Peter. "Hamlet @ Shakespeare's Globe." *The Bardathon*, 30 June 2018, <https://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/bardathon/2018/06/30/hamlet-shakespeares-globe/>. Accessed 6 Aug. 2020.
- Kirwan, Peter. "Henry V, or Harry England @ Shakespeare's Globe." *The Bardathon*, 10 June 2019, <https://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/bardathon/2019/06/10/henry-v-or-harry-england-shakespeares-globe/>. Accessed 6 Aug. 2020.
- Kowal, Rebekah J., Gerald Siegmund, and Randy Martin. "Introduction." *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Politics*. Eds. Rebekah J. Kowal, Gerald Siegmund and Randy Martin. New York: Oxford UP, 2017. 1–24.
- Ludmon, Mark. Rev. of *Henry V or Harry England*, Shakespeare's Globe. *British Theatre.com*, 21 May 2019, <https://britishtheatre.com/review-henry-v-or-harry-england-shakespeares-globe/>. Accessed 10 Aug. 2020.
- Lukowski, Andrzej. Rev. of *Hamlet*, by Shakespeare's Globe. *Time Out*, 17 May 2018, <https://www.timeout.com/london/theatre/hamlet-review-3>. Accessed 2 Aug. 2020.
- McCulloch, Lynsey. "Shakespeare and Dance." *Literature Compass* 13.2 (2016): 69–78.
- McCulloch, Lynsey, and Brandon Shaw, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Dance*. New York: Oxford UP, 2019.
- Munby, Jonathan, and Heather Neill. "Director Jonathan Munby Cats Eve Best in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Theatre Voice*, 16 June 2014, <http://www.theatrevoice.com/audio/director-jonathan-munby-cats-eve-best-in-shakespeares-antony-and-cleopatra/>. Accessed 10 Aug. 2020.
- Nubia, Onyeka. *England's Other Countrymen: Black Tudor Society*. London: Zed Books, 2019.
- Rice, Emma. "Eyes wide open." *The Old Vic*, 20 September 2018, <https://www.oldvictheatre.com/news/2018/09/eyes-wide-open>. Accessed 6 Aug. 2020.
- Royal Shakespeare Company. "Deaf Actor Makes History." *Royal Shakespeare Company*, n.d., 25 Apr. 2021, <https://www.rsc.org.uk/news/archive/deaf-actor-makes-history>.
- Shakespeare's Globe. "Summer 2019." *Shakespeare's Globe*, n.d., 5 Aug. 2020, <https://www.shakespearesglobe.com/seasons/summer-season-2019/>.
- Shakespeare's Globe. "Michelle Terry & Nadia Nadarajah in conversation." *Medium*, 28 June 2018, <https://medium.com/@shakespearesglobe/michelle-terry-nadia-nadarajah-in-conversation-64d97562e84>. Accessed 5 Aug. 2020.

- Shakespeare, William. *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*. Rev. ed. Ed. Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Kastan. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002.
- Taylor, Paul. “‘Exquisitely understated.’” Rev. of *Antony and Cleopatra*, by Shakespeare’s Globe. *The Independent*, 30 May 2014, <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre-dance/reviews/antony-and-cleopatra-shakespeares-globe-theatre-review-exquisitely-understated-9460457.html>. Accessed 10 Aug. 2020.
- Thompson, Ayanna. “Introduction.” *Red Velvet*, by Lolita Chakrabarti. 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. N.p.
- . “Practicing a Theory/Theorizing a Practice: An Introduction to Shakespearean Colorblind Casting.” *Colourblind Shakespeare: New Perspectives on Race and Performance*. Ed. Ayanna Thompson. London: Routledge, 2006. 1–24.
- Tribble, Evelyn. *Early Modern Actors and Shakespearean Theatre: Thinking with the Body*. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2017.
- Van Kampen, Claire. “Music and Aural Texture at Shakespeare’s Globe.” *Shakespeare’s Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*. Eds. Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 2008. 79–89.
- Wolf, Matt. “Blind to Race, Gender and Disability, Shakespeare’s Globe Goes a New Way.” *The New York Times*, 31 May 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/31/theater/shakespeares-globe-gender-race-disability-blind-casting.html>. Accessed 5 Aug. 2020.
- Woods, Penelope. “Skilful Spectatorship? Doing (or Being) Audience at Shakespeare’s Globe Theatre.” *Shakespeare Studies: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Review* 43 (2015): 99–123.

Zusammenfassung

Obwohl nicht hinreichend belegt ist, wie genau diese im frühneuenglischen Kontext ausgesehen haben könnten, ist doch anzunehmen, dass Theaterstücke auf Londoner Bühnen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts mit einem sog. Jig endeten. Neben einer rein ästhetischen oder unterhaltenden Rolle kam dem Jig dabei auch eine sozialkritische Kommentarfunktion zu. Mit seiner Eröffnung im Jahr 1997 hat das rekonstruierte Shakespeares Globe den Jig als Teil einer größeren Annäherung an zeitgenössische Theaterpraxis wieder aufgenommen und als festen Bestandteil der ‚Globe-Erfahrung‘ im 21. Jahrhundert etabliert. Während dieses Alleinstellungsmerkmal zunächst kommerziellen Zwecken zu dienen scheint, deuten jüngere Jigs des Globes in eine andere Richtung und ordnen sich in die zunehmend explizit politische Ausrichtung des Theaters ein, die etwa durch inklusive Castingprozesse unterstützt wird. Der vorliegende Artikel diskutiert am Beispiel ausgewählter Produktionen aus den Jahren 2014–2019, inwieweit zeitgenössische Jigs in normative Diskurse zu Themen wie Gender, *Whiteness* oder *able-bodiedness* intervenieren können. Basierend auf einem Verständnis von Tanz als einer dezidiert politischen Form des künstlerischen Ausdrucks wird untersucht, in welchem Maße diese Jigs nicht nur die ihnen vorangehenden Produktionen kommentieren, sondern zugleich ideologisch besetzte Konzeptionen von Shakespeare und seinen Dramen gemeinhin zur Disposition stellen.