

# ASIAN QUARTERLY

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

A Peer-reviewed, International Journal, approved by the University Grants Commission of India

Estd: May 2003 ISSN 2229-581 X

Volume 20

Issue No. 1 & 2

May-Aug 2022

Academics need to catch up with what has been happening in their subject and to acquaint themselves with different perspectives of the experts who really have a grasp of their subject. They also need an instrument that readily serves their own need of expression. Asian Quarterly (AQ) has been carefully planned to suit the needs of its readers.

Published by the charitable trust named Forum for Culture Studies, the quality and relevance of the journal are maintained by the Institute of Advanced Studies in English (IASE), Pune. Over the years, AQ has emerged into one of the most reputed journals published in the field of humanities. It is published quarterly, in the months of February, May, August, and November every year.

## Subscription & Contact Details

Subscription rates are given below. The payment can be made by Demand Draft drawn in favor of **Forum for Culture Studies, Pune** and posted at 10, Usha Manor, Ganeshkhind Road, Aundh, Pune 411007, India or by bank transfer using the following details:

Beneficiary: Forum for Culture Studies, Bank: Bank of Maharashtra, Branch: Aundh (0118), Account No: 20104448616, IFSC: MAHB0000118, Swift Code: MAHBINBOCP.

All correspondence can be made on the same address or at [iasepune@gmail.com](mailto:iasepune@gmail.com) or telephonically at +91-8308908349. More details are uploaded on [www.iasepune.in](http://www.iasepune.in)

## CHIEF EDITOR

**Ashok Thorat**

Founder-Director, Institute of Advanced Studies in English, Pune

## EXECUTIVE EDITOR

**Munira Lokhandwala**  
S P Pune University, Pune

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

**Rama Gautam**

Institute of Advanced Studies in English, Pune

**Dhanashree Thorat**

University of Kansas, USA

## SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

**Nirmala Menon**

Indian Institute of Technology, Indore

**Martina Pahr**

Creative Writer, Munich, Germany

**Shilpa Choudhary**

Delhi University, India

**Paroo Nihalani**

Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

**Bushra Ni'ma Rashed**

University of Baghdad, Iraq

**Dawood Mahdi**

King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia

**Maya David**

University of Malay, Malaysia

**Virat Potheklang**

Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, Thailand

**Vibha Bhoot**

Jodhpur University, India

**Eak Duwadi**

Kathmandu University, Nepal

**Mojgan Yarahmadi**

Islamic Azad University, Iran

© Forum for Culture Studies, Pune

# Asian Quarterly An International Journal of Contemporary Issues



Subscription Period	Indian		International	
	Individual	Institution	Individual	Institution
One year	Rs. 3000	Rs. 4000	\$ 90	\$ 100
Three years	Rs. 7500	Rs. 10000	\$220	\$ 260
Five years	Rs. 12000	Rs. 17000	\$ 390	\$ 450
			+Postal Charges	+Postal Charges

## CONTENTS

Digging the Roots of Submerged Subaltern Self through Autobiographies: A Peek into The Inner World of Bama Faustina and Sally Morgan <b>Somali Saha</b>	..... 4
Critical Discourse Analysis of Narendra Modi's Address to US Congress <b>Muckta Karmarkar</b>	..... 16
Depiction of Women Characters in Select Sooraj Barjatya's Films <b>Eera Aniket Khedkar</b>	..... 35
The Threats of Upcoming Social Media Language: A Cross-Sectional Study of Indian Social Media Posts <b>Sawani Vinita</b>	..... 47
Multi-Media Application Tools in English Language Learning and Teaching <b>Jyothi Katari</b>	..... 56
A Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis of Selected British and Iraqi Lullabies <b>Hakim K. Al-Abadi, Khalid Sh. Sharhan, Zahraa J. Qasim</b>	..... 66
Shakespearean Literature <b>Snober Sataravala</b>	..... 88
Decoding Alienation In <i>Temporary People</i> by Deepak Unnikrishnan <b>Tasnima Yasmin</b>	..... 102

Paranoia In Arab and Indian Diasporic Characters: A Comparative Study of Ibrahim Nasrallah's <i>Prairies of Fever</i> and Deepak Unnikrishnan's <i>Temporary People</i> <b>Tasnima Yasmin</b>	..... 125
Similarities in Shakespeare's <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> and <i>The Tempest</i> <b>Wallace Jacob</b>	..... 141



## SHAKESQUEERING LITERATURE

Snober Sataravala\*

*Perhaps what makes Shakespeare truly global across space and time is the universal need to be subversive, to queer things up, in fact, as Jonathan Dollimore says—to be ‘radically subversive’ which he defines ‘as not merely the attempt to seize existing authority, but as a challenge to the principles upon which authority is based’ (13). Thus it involves not just a dissident politics of class, race, gender and sexual orientation but a fluidity, contradiction and indeterminacy of the text. This paper views Shakespeare’s forte and legacy as literary subversiveness in the transgression of form, structure, genre and themes which become a projection of the collective unconsciousness of a people. It examines these qualities in the form of the Sonnets, queer characters, drag or cross-dressing, costumes and surveillance.*

*Keywords: Queer, radical subversiveness, Dollimore, drag, surveillance*

What is ‘queer’ and what does it mean to ‘queer’ things up? What does Tony Purvis, in the chapter ‘Sexuality’ from *Literary Theory and Criticism: An Oxford Guide* (2006) edited by Patricia Waugh, mean when he says terms like heterosexuality and homosexuality are inventions of the 19<sup>th</sup> C and the last twenty years of theory and criticism have experienced a ‘queering’ of all these terms?

No doubt Oscar Wilde<sup>1</sup> and the more visible upheavals he brought in his wake led to those labels but the act of subversion is as ancient as time

\* Snober Sataravala is the Head, Department of English, St Mira’s College for Girls, Pune.

*Jayash*  
Principal Incharge  
St. Mira’s College for Girls, Pune.

along with its inescapable coupling with containment. Aristotle describes man as a *zoon politikon*, a social animal wanting to belong and the consequence of that is to contain. However, if one considers all ancient myths informing much of human narrative, whether it be Draupadi in the *Mahabharata* or Gaia in Hesiod’s *Theogony*, there is a strong subversive undercurrent that sutures the bedrock of all human unconsciousness—the collective unconscious.

Interestingly, in a way, the entire Elizabethan Age was queer, beginning with a female queen whose legitimacy was debatable as was her virginity despite her title ‘The Virgin Queen’. ‘Queer’ was the normative at the theatre and that’s what Shakespeare’s forte was, he ‘queered’ things up. Thus what makes Shakespeare global like the name of his theatre, ‘The Globe’, is the universal need to be subversive, to queer things up, in fact, as Jonathan Dollimore says—to be ‘radically subversive’.

The traces of the word ‘queer’ available on *Dictionary.com* vary from the adjective meaning strange, odd, unusual, to suspicious, shady, to unwell, to mentally unstable. The verb means to spoil or jeopardize and the noun signifies someone who falls outside the heterosexual mainstream or gender binary. Purvis comments, ‘The noun ‘queer’ in the recent past interpellated the subject on the basis of violence and exclusion’ (447). Thus to be ‘queer’ is in a way to be a victim or a subaltern who is trapped by unconventionality and perhaps can only break out of the master/slave<sup>4</sup> dialectics by inflicting violence, coloured by Eros/Thanatos<sup>5</sup>, which at a metaphorical level demands an act of violence against existing norms resulting in a destruction of all established systems. The master is culture which constitutes heteronormative society whilst the slave is the Other.

<sup>4</sup> Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831), a post-Kantian idealist, in *The Phenomenology of Spirit*

<sup>5</sup> According to Freud, Eros is the love instinct and Thanatos, the death one.



Currently for Purvis in queer theory 'sexualities are conceptualized in terms of fluidity, contradiction and indeterminacy' (442) which is also linguistic and discursive thus texts, practices and methodologies are 'queered'; 'queer readings', 'queering' of literary movements and genres 'displaces practices which seek to preserve an uncontaminated literary past' (444). Thus to 'queer' things up means all identity categories must be disrupted, questioned and queered into radical subversiveness. Theoretical terms like 'queer' and 'radical subversiveness' may have been unknown to Shakespeare but the practice certainly was not. However, whether it be technique, performance, identity, form, or life; he portrayed it in all its varieties allowing for the Other to come.

Eve Sedgwick in *Tendencies* (1994) refers to 'the open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, dissonances and resonances, lapses and excesses of meaning when the constituent elements of anyone's gender, of anyone's sexuality aren't made (or can't be made) to signify monolithically' (8). In a sense to counter the instinct to conform is an equally powerful and opposite one to resist fixing of any sort whether it be meaning, form or identity. This paper expands the scope of that definition beyond sexuality to textuality and performance.

Purvis adds 'Theorizations of performativity and speech act theory, drag, camp, the carnivalesque and masquerade point in the direction of reconceptualization of sexuality and identity' (444) which is something Shakespeare was enacting long before there was a theory on it. For Mikhail Bakhtin, the carnivalesque was desirable as it fuelled that subversive instinct. It becomes a space where rules are broken and orders are inverted, a fool is crowned, class borders becomes permeable and identities fluid behind masks and costumes. It is the grand theatre of the streets.

Jonathan Dollimore in his essay 'Shakespeare understudies: the sodomite, the prostitute, the transvestite and their critics' from the book *Political Shakespeare: Essays in cultural materialism* (1994), is

concerned with 'how is social change achieved, and how it is defeated, resisted, pre-empted and co-opted- in one word contained?' (130). 'Shakespeare Literature' is concerned with how it persisted because of the tendency to queer. For Dollimore one of the objectives of cultural materialism is 'to discern the scope of dissident politics of class, race, gender and sexual orientation both within texts as well as their roles in culture' (130) something which although Shakespeare engaged with he also inadvertently contained.

In the essay, 'Shakespeare, cultural materialism and the new historicism,' Dollimore defines radical subversiveness 'as not merely the attempt to seize existing authority, but as a challenge to the principles upon which authority is based' (13). He asserts subversiveness cannot be 'independent of articulation, context and reception'. He gives the example of the Machiavellian demystification of religion which existed before Machiavelli. According to Dollimore what made Machiavellianism subversive in the Renaissance was that it was taken up by more than the initiated few. Thus the potential to acquire power expanded its scope and became more inclusive. Shakespeare in his own way made that possible through his dramas like *Measure for Measure* with the Duke disguising himself as a Friar surrendering his power as head of state to that of religion which is a realm readily available to the audience whilst that of the head of state is not. The player acting as Duke, acting as Friar in a sense results in the demystification of religion as well as royalty whilst the audience in the 'Pit' participates in its performance and engages with it.

The entire motive behind the Duke's masquerade is surveillance. In this performance his understudy, Lord Angelo, subverts the normative function of restoring law and order by indulging in the criminal himself. The victim is Claudio who through consensual premarital intercourse impregnates his lover Juliet for which he is to be arrested. His virtuous sister Isabelle on the verge of becoming a nun pleads on his behalf only to become an object of Angelo's desire. The diabolical plot is pre-

empted by the Duke-as-Friar who forms an even more subversive plot. Isabella must agree to Angelo's demands but instead of a play-within-a play there is a character-within-a character. Mariana, Angelo's former lover will go in her stead to ensnare him. The plan is Claudio will be pardoned and the masquerade will be protected. However Angelo deceives them and does not pardon Claudio. Once again there is a character-within-a character for the head of a pirate is sent to masquerade as Claudio's. The Duke then reverts to his original guise and listens to Isabella's complaint. The denouement results due to Angelo's confession, Claudio's pardon and of course a proposal. The Duke proposes to the chaste Isabella, God's order is subverted as the church loses a nun and the social order is contained.

Thus literary subversiveness is viewed in the transgression of form, structure, genre and themes which become a projection of the collective unconsciousness of a people. Shakespeare's queering satisfies a deep rooted need in the audience for the same. His plays are not for all time but feed a timeless urge to be dissident. However, ironically, Dollimore warns that 'even as it [transgression] offers a challenge to authority, transgression ever runs the risk of re-enacting elsewhere the very exploitation which it is resisting immediately' (85) and hence often Shakespeare reverts to the status quo just as people tend to do more often than not. Gay people often marry straight ones living a charade of a character-within-a character and those who live with their gay partners often live the normative family life adhering to stereotypical gendered roles even though they are of the same sex. However, despite the pull to conform there is an equal and opposite pull against it.

To chart out the areas where Shakespeare challenges the normative during his age in term of forms and genres would require a full length book and considering the formidable scholarship as well as popular engagement with Shakespeare this paper can only glide briefly on the surface. However, it will attempt to address the subversive or queer in the *Sonnets*, some of the structural issues in his plays and to try and see

how it resonates through to the works and ideas of some contemporary key thinkers.

The father of the sonnet, Petrarch, originally wrote sonnets as a sequence dealing with love for a cold and cruel mistress, which Wyatt structured as an octave turned by the following sestet. The supplicant lover would importune the beloved praising her external beauty and then progress towards her inner qualities. At the most superficial level, Shakespeare 'queered' Petrarch, changing the form of the sonnet to three quatrains followed by an epigrammatic couplet. In sonnet 130 in his description of his mistress, Shakespeare does the diametric opposite:

My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun;  
Coral is far more red than her lips' red;  
If snow be white, why then her breasts are dun;  
If hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head. (Vendler 556)

He uses Petrarchan conceits like coral and the Sun but subverts and negates them replacing the archetypal beauty of the latter desired by all with a physical monstrosity, inadvertently elevating her, the lover and their love.

Helen Vendler in her remarkable book *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (2007) distinguishes between a lyric which is 'solitary speech' and the dramatic monologue. If one is to read the *Sonnets* as a lyric then unlike a dramatic monologue there is no implied listener and hence it strips away any social specification of age, regional location, sex, class and even race allowing it to be voicable by anyone reading it, thus allowing the reader to perform it and become it.

However, on the other hand, Shakespeare's 'reality-effect' tempts and misleads the reader to perceive the *Sonnets* as a documentary of a lived life. Vendler cites Eve Sedgwick who says "Shakespeare's Sonnets seem to offer a single discursive, deeply felt narrative of the dangers and vicissitudes of one male homosocial adventure" (2). Thus already a 'queering' of experience sets in for the reader who is torn between being



the speaker and listening for Shakespeare. To add to the complication of experience, Vendler acknowledges that Shakespeare was 'unusually rich in his borrowing of diction and formulas from patronage, from religion, from law, from courtship, from diplomacy, from astronomy and so on, but he tends to blaspheme in all of these realms. He was a master subverter of the language he borrowed' (2). This adds to the instability of the experience making the reader never quite sure, never fixed in the engagement with meaning.

Inescapably, deep down Shakespeare was a dramatist and hence '...for Shakespeare the Dark Lady sequence is...a proto-sketch for a drama like Othello, with its jealousy, its sexuality, its ambiguous "darkness", its betrayals...' (3) now making the reader yet another player rather than a solitary speaker.

However, on the other hand for Vendler, the true 'actors' in the lyrics are words. She views a new stylistic arrangement or a new linguistic strategy as 'interruptive and interesting as the entrance of a new character' (4). Thus, even if the sonnet is read as a lyric, it is still dramatic but in a different way; as the words are the actors and not the reader. To avoid misinterpretation of the *Sonnets* she stresses that one must make a distinction between Shakespeare, the author, and his fictive self she names as the speaker of the *Sonnets*. Already the reader has gone from speaker-to-player-to-reader of words allowing for multiple meanings to be released from the text.

Vendler divides the *Sonnets* into two cycles wherein the first 126 sonnets concern a young man and the rest a dark-haired, dark-eyed woman or mistress who is the tormenting betrayer of the second cycle. This in itself is radically subversive at multiple levels for according to her:

The *Sonnets* raise powerful sexual anxieties not only by representing a sexual triangle (as other sequences, European and English did not) but by making the speaker's erotic relationship's unusual ones. (15)

In the first cycle concerning the young man the eye seems to be the chief sexual organ and desire is consummated through the gaze. This is a common trope with Shakespeare and even Bassanio in *The Merchant of Venice* casket scene is warned that fancy is bred in the eyes. However, throughout the *Sonnets*, 'The speaker is a rebel against received ideas...No received idea of sexuality goes uninvestigated; and the thoroughly unconventional sexual attachments represented in both parts of the sequence stand as profound (if sometimes unwilling) critiques of the ideals of heterosexual desire, chastity, continence, marital fidelity, and respect for the character of one's sexual partner' (20). In short, everything is 'queer'. In addition, he violates sonnet conventions when he politicizes love as in sonnet 73 with his veiled allusion to the plundered catholic churches as 'Bare ruined choirs' (333).

The dramatic quality of the *Sonnets* signifies not just love but gender as performance which resonates to Judith Butler. Dollimore comments that 'the central premise of both postmodern and Renaissance sonnets is that identity can never be firmly solidified as a quantifiable phenomenon' (137). It is something that is performed, fluid and changing, constantly challenging, never fixed but an interminable play.

More than the *Sonnets*, it is drama that got Shakespeare not just fame but wealth and yet he was a minority writer for he was not part of the court or of the universities. He was the outsider. His drama was primarily for the plebeians, the groundlings and the 'penny stinkards'. Perhaps this writing from the margin gave him the license to queer the very form of drama. Dryden in 'An Essay of Dramatic Poesie' (1668) comments on Shakespeare's violation of the unities and tragic comedy as a uniquely English genre. Dr Samuel Johnson takes up the refrain in his preface to *Shakespeare* (1765). In short, Shakespeare did the unthinkable, he queered Aristotle and was forgiven and then commended for doing so.

Apart from form, Shakespeare explored a variety of themes be it colonization in *The Tempest*, Anti-Semitism in *The Merchant of Venice*,





sexual promiscuity in *Measure for Measure* and *Troilus and Cressida*, betrayal in *Hamlet*, tyranny in *Lear* which are just the tip of the iceberg. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* according to Leonard Tennenhouse's 'Strategies of state and political plays: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Henry IV*, *Henry V*, *Henry VIII*' deals with themes like the complex relationship between authority and the figure of misrule, carnival and festival captured by the exchanging of partners, roles and the costumes. A queen is paired with a poor player by a trickster inverting a hierarchical order, feeding the collective unconscious and hope of the audience further demystifying the unattainable and bringing it within their ken.

Another theme that Jonathan Dollimore addresses in the essay 'Shakespeare, cultural materialism and the new historicism' is the construction of the Other in the form of a sexual deviant. Deviancy in that period was regarded as radically subversive—meaning that which threatens authority. Dollimore acknowledges the paradox of the Elizabethan Age is that although it had laid down some of the worst punishments for homosexual behaviour it was accepting of homoerotic art. He elaborates that the theatre discloses what is behind the demonising even as it exploits it and thus what one has in the theatre is not so much a vision of political freedom but rather an awareness of political domination.

Briefly some of the characters addressed as being representative precursors to the 'queering' endeavour are Hamlet, Antonio & Bassanio, Portia, Cleopatra and Duke Vincentio. Ernest Jones' *Hamlet and Oedipus* (1954) and in particular in the essay 'Hamlet: The Psychoanalytical Solution' (1947), states in a nutshell that Hamlet has no doubt about his duty which is he must act against his uncle. The reason for his much debated delay, according to Jones, is a special repugnance towards the act, itself. This is rooted deeply in his childhood and when Claudius externalizes the desire Hamlet repressed as a child, being to kill his father and marry his mother, it results in the resurrection of that memory. The desire is so unbearable that Hamlet goes mad.

Shakespeare's brilliance allows him to portray symptoms of the Oedipus complex however he cannot and nor can the audience articulate it as they suffer the same repression. What Jones does not discuss is Hamlet's cruel treatment of Ophelia, his love/hate relationship with his mother and the brutal sacrificing of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.

Freud in *Civilization and its Discontents* (1961) explains that the dialectics of love/hate or Eros/Thanatos<sup>6</sup> define most human relations. People cope with the ravages of guilt either through physical aids like drugs or they turn to art, religion and myth. Hamlet the character is made to cope with his guilt through his play-within-the play. Perhaps the origin of his self loathing, his Thanatos towards Ophelia, his sacrificing of friends due to an assumption of betrayal and his suicidal duel with Laertes is because of his repressed homosexual desires. He must die because he does not have the courage to live 'queer' and that is the battle he loses.

Similarly, Antonio in the opening scene of *The Merchant of Venice* is gripped by a depression of which he knows not the cause. He refutes all of Salarino and Salanio's suggestions but his mood lifts when Bassanio enters. One can almost hear Antonio recite to Bassanio 'That time of year thou mayst in me behold' for he is the older man to be replaced by the younger rich Portia and the Thanatos tension between the two remains till the end hinting at the triangle that informs the narrative underscoring the *Sonnets*.

The terms 'drag' and 'queen' have many traces. 'Queen' apart from royalty is slang for an effeminate homosexual whilst one of the traces of the sign 'drag' is to wear the clothes of the opposite sex in a sense to appropriate their gender. In *Gender Trouble*, Butler plays upon the difference between the anatomical body of the performer and the gender being performed. Thus for her drag or cross-dressing is not to be understood as a secondary imitation or enactment of a prior original gender. It is a performance or entering into the role of that gender.

<sup>6</sup> Eros-love instinct, Thanatos- death instinct

In Elizabethan theatre the convention was for young boys to play the part of women. Butler explains, 'The performative is not an act which brings into being the subject it names. Rather the performative is to be understood in terms of the "reiterative power" of discourse to produce the object that it names.' (Purvis 442). Hence a particular way of dressing or walking over time produces that character. Perhaps Butler was not thinking of Shakespeare and he definitely was not aware of her but just as the actor performs his dialogues, each performance is ever so subtly different and each actor will enact the same role in a different way, this will be reiterated infinitely. Each performance is 'queer' due to the fixity of the text and yet its instability — 'the very excitability of discourse — can open up a space for an alternative model of agency which is alert to, and at the same time acknowledges its relation to the structure of constraint' (442).

The Shakespearean players without theorizing were pragmatically living and performing the 'queer' each time they dressed in drag and performed the role of a woman as in the case of Portia, re-cross dressed as Balthazar, the young male lawyer. This is not a simple case of reverting to the player's original gender but the cross dressing of an already cross dressed player which opens up a rupture and instability allowing for the 'queer' which not only the actor performs but the audience inadvertently empathises with whilst engaging with and entering into the performance.

Dollimore mentions that dress code violation in the Elizabethan Age was believed to be very serious and to cause a disturbance which resulted in chaos in God's order. It is only in the realm of the theatre that 'drag' was legitimately possible. Shakespeare and theatre of that time was able to constantly subvert and get away with dress code and gender violation by it through Portia or Rosalind, another girl who pretends to be a boy, in *As You Like It*. In his view the theatre had a particular investment in dress violation as not only did boys play female parts but actors also violated dress code of class when they wore the clothes and played the part of a superior rank.



Dympa Callaghan views Renaissance drama as a site of gender instability. According to Dollimore when Cleopatra recalls the night she cross dressed with Antony and took his sword (ii, v, 22-23) sexuality is seen to be rooted in the transfer of power. He goes on to view Cleopatra as 'camp' and a 'queen' and cites Leslie Fiedler's opinion that Mick Jagger was most suited to play her. Dollimore expands the concept of cross dressing to go beyond sexual categories like drag and include social, political and religious one. Shakespeare mastered the genre of the disguised ruler and religious disguises as in *Measure for Measure*.

During the Elizabethan Age diatribes against promiscuity, female self-assertion, cross-dressing and homosexuality were quite common and many viewed this behaviour as symptomatic of an impending dissolution of social hierarchy and consequently civilization. They believed that individual transgressive acts sent reverberations through the macrocosms and even brought down God's vengeance on all. Therefore laying down order and establishing an authoritarian state paralleled by persecution of deviants and dissidents was both enforced by the state and internalised by the authoritarian family. Thus sexuality being subjected to surveillance in *Measure for Measure* captures a complex social moment in a complex play which resonates to a modern world where surveillance has become part of every ordinary citizen's life. Along with that is the inadvertent shrinking of the freedom the subject has in the public sphere which is something Habermas is concerned with.

Michel Foucault in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977) outlines a prison known as the Panopticon that can be read as an allegory for society. The prison is designed to give the illusion that every single prisoner, at all points in time and space, is under the surveillance of a central tower. This resonates to George Orwell's 1984 where Big brother is always watching or Tolkien's 'eye of Sauron' in *Lord of the Rings* to the contemporary Snowden whistle blower controversy. We live in a world of CCTV cameras and the internet, a



digital world where we have nowhere to hide. This is a world that Shakespeare anticipates in *Measure for Measure*, when Duke Vincentio disguises himself as a friar to spy on his subjects in the name of greater good. Similarly, Shakespeare's fool particularly in *King Lear* resonates to Foucault's lunatic who is precious to society because he will say what the normalized have been disciplined into forgetting.

The purpose of this paper is not to gossip whether memorable characters are fairies<sup>7</sup> or dykes<sup>8</sup> but with great sensitivity and respect to recognize that what resonates or in a sense inspires us with wonder is their courage consciously or unconsciously to be 'queer'. The Globe theatre was not just global in its characters, plots and themes, encompassing different countries and issues but what is global is the queer legacy—the anti normative. This tendency once again gains momentum in the Age of Modernism with writers like Pound and Eliot 'queering' form and Auden anticipating the Beat Generation. The legacy Shakespeare leaves us is that the literariness of a text or art by nature is 'queer'. One must queer the forms, themes and along the way reality as well. Shakespeare's legacy is to queer the unqueer which today has resulted in the queer being unqueered. Hopefully what we inherit is a world less shocked by alternate lifestyles and a world that celebrates difference without fear.

## References

- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, Print.
- Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield. Ed. 1994. *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Second Edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press, Print.

<sup>7</sup> A disparaging term for an effeminate homosexual

<sup>8</sup> A disparaging term for a masculine lesbian

- Foucault, Michel. 1991. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 1975. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Penguin Books, Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1961. *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. 1905. Trans. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1961. *Civilization and its Discontents*. Trans and Ed. James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.; *Internet Archive: Community Books*. Ebook. Web. 12 Nov. 2013.
- Jones, Ernest. 1919. *Hamlet and Oedipus*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1976. Print.
- Purvis, Tony. 2006 'Sexualities'. *Literary Theory and Criticism: An Oxford Guide*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. Oxford: OUP, Print.
- Shakespeare, William. 2006. *Antony and Cleopatra*. John Wilders. Ed. London: Arden, Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. *Hamlet*. Ann Thompson and Neill Taylor. Ed. London: Arden, Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967. *Measure for Measure*. J.W. Lever. Ed. London: Arden, Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. *The Merchant of Venice*. John Drakakis. Ed. London: Arden, Print.
- Sedgwick, Eve. 1994. *Tendencies*. New York: Routledge, Print.
- Vendler, Helen. 2007. *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, Print.

