Introduction

During the dark days of World War Two, British actors, politicians, writers and cultural commentators turned to Shakespeare in order to articulate both their national identity and the values for which their country was fighting.[1] According to the literary critic G. Wilson Knight, Shakespeare is "the authentic voice of England";[2] to the actor Donald Wolfit, "[he] represents more than everything else the fighting spirit of our country";[3] and for the statesman and future prime minister Anthony Eden, "our history is enacted, our philosophy as a people is given expression, in plays which are the greatest gift of English genius to mankind."[4] In these formulations, Shakespeare and his works capture essential qualities of the nation; they serve as a principle of unity, a marker of what binds its people together. It is against this cultural backdrop that we can place Laurence Olivier's *Henry V* (1944). As Jennifer Barnes has noted, Shakespeare "could be made to function as a trope for the imagined community of the nation in wartime Britain," and Olivier's film, with its

---

[1] This phenomenon, as well as its association with wartime British cinema, is gently mocked in Lone Scherfig's *Their Finest* (2016), which features Jeremy Irons, as the unnamed Secretary of War, enthusiastically declaiming a portion of the St. Crispin's Day speech to a team working on a propaganda film about Dunkirk. All quotations from Shakespeare come from Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Suzanne Gossett, Jean E. Howard, Katharine Eisamaun Maus and Gordon McMullan (eds.), *The Norton Shakespeare: Essential Plays and The Sonnets*, 3rd ed. (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Co., 2016).

[2] G. Wilson Knight, *This Sceptred Isle: Shakespeare's Message for England at War* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1940), 36.

[3] Quoted in Laurence Raw, *Theatre of the People: Donald Wolfit's Shakespearean Productions, 1937–1953* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2016), 28.

[4] The quote is from the then-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs when he visited Stratford's Shakespeare Memorial Theatre in early 1940. See Simon Barker, "Shakespeare, Stratford, and the Second World War," in Irena R. Makaryk and Marissa McHugh (eds.), *Shakespeare and the Second World War: Memory, Culture, Identity* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 199–217, esp. 209. In a recent significant discussion of Olivier's film, Kent Puckett makes this point differently, arguing that the film is "just one part of a large and unsystematic wartime effort to use Shakespeare to connect the violence of the present with the experience of the past" (*War Pictures: Cinema, Violence, and Style in Britain, 1939–1945* [New York: Fordham University Press, 2017], 87).

I

depiction of English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh soldiers coming together to form a "band of brothers," represents an important cinematic articulation of that trope, which I term the wartime Shakespeare topos (WST).[5]

The association of Shakespeare with national unity is ironized by the fact that when Eden and Knight allude to the playwright, they do so in the name of England, not Britain.[6] While such rhetorical slippages were common, their problematically Anglocentric nature did not go unnoticed during the war. For example, the BBC received complaints about radio programs that "typically celebrated 'England' rather than 'Britain', to the increasing resentment of Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. The [Ministry of Information, or MOI] was sensitive to this problem, and warned the BBC as early as October 1939 to avoid using 'England' as a synonym for 'Britain' ('it causes irritation among the minorities')."[7] And while numerous critics have discussed how Olivier cut from his film material that raised questions about Henry's leadership or "explored ambivalences within the play's principal ideological motifs,"[8] they have neglected his removal of a significant portion of the text centering on a possible Scottish assault should Henry leave England unprotected when he invades France (1.2.136–220).[9] One can imagine that Olivier expunged references to "the weasel Scot" (1.2.170) for practical reasons; the lengthy discussion of the potential threat diverges from the scene's larger emphasis on Anglo-French antagonism. There is also an ideological dimension to his

[5] Jennifer Barnes, *Shakespearean Star: Laurence Olivier and National Cinema* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 23. It is also relevant here that, as Barnes demonstrates, Olivier himself was widely seen at this time as the incarnation of Shakespeare's cultural authority (24). For discussion of "a World War II image of Shakespeare that is at odds with the propaganda purposes to which *Henry V* was put by Olivier or G. Wilson Knight," see Ton Hoenselaars, "Recycling the Renaissance in World War II: E. W. & M. M. Robson Review Laurence Olivier's *Henry V*," in Hoenselaars and Arthur F. Kinney (eds.), *Challenging Humanism: Essays in Honor of Dominic Baker-Smith* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), 269–289, esp. 286.

[6] In this study, I endeavor not to use "England" as a shorthand or a synonym for "Britain," but I do not draw attention to every instance in which the two are conflated. It should be noted that, during the war, "British" feature films were produced to a great extent in and around London, which was both the heart of the national film industry and home to the Ministry of Information, about which I shall soon have more to say.

[7] Siân Nicholas, *The Echo of War: Home Front Propaganda and the Wartime BBC, 1939–1945* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 231.

[8] Ian Aitken, "Formalism and Realism: *Henry V* (Laurence Olivier, 1944; Kenneth Branagh, 1989)," *Critical Survey* 3 (1991): 260–268, esp. 262.

[9] Barnes talks more generally about the slippage between "Britain" and "England" in Olivier's film (*Shakespearean Star*, 23–24). On the nature and significance of the Scottish threat in both Shakespeare's play and its sources, see Lorna Hutson, "Forensic History: *Henry V* and Scotland," in Lorna Hutson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of English Law and Literature, 1500–1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 687–708, esp. 692–699.

decision, however: he seeks to efface potential tensions between England and Scotland in a way that enables the viewer to identify in the monarch's cry, "God for Harry, *England*, and St. George," an appeal to *British* unity (3.1.34, my emphasis).[10] Olivier's excisions show that the WST needs to be actively maintained; cuts have to be made for Olivier's film to do the kind of nationalist work that he wants it to do. (I return to that work in the Coda, by way of Olivier's handling of consecutive scenes in the French and English camps.) Importantly, by reading the film against the play text, we get a sense of one of the tensions within Olivier's version of the WST. That Scotland is understood to be in need of appeasement tells us that the inclusive wartime vision of Britain to which Olivier subscribes is under historical pressure.

I have taken up Olivier's omission of the Scottish threat in order to bring into focus the interplay between three things: Shakespeare's play; a cinematic adaptation of that play; and the WST. While the WST has a broad cultural currency, it takes on distinct forms; in Olivier's film, it emerges in part out of the deletion of material pertaining to Scotland that threatens to undermine the image of national unity with which it is associated. To put it another way, the WST is differently constituted in different adaptations and appropriations thanks to the specific intertextual relations at work in each of them. These relations encompass not only the hypotext (the literary source) and the hypertext (the adaptation or appropriation), but also the social and cultural milieu in which the adaptation or appropriation is created.[11]

The nexus of intertextual relations that I have just discussed can be productively described as an *ideologeme*. This concept is developed by Julia Kristeva, who defines it as follows:

> The ideologeme is that intertextual function read as "materialized" at the different structural levels of each text, and which stretches along the entire length of its trajectory, giving it its historical and social coordinates. This is not an interpretative step coming after analysis in order to explain "as ideological" what was first "perceived" as "linguistic." The concept of text as ideologeme determines the very procedure of a semiotics that, by studying the text as intertextuality, considers it as such within (the text of) society and history.[12]

---

[10] For more on Anglo-Scottish tensions during World War Two, see Chapter 2.

[11] Gérard Genette defines hypertextuality as "any relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the *hypertext*) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the *hypotext*), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary" (*Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky [Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997], 5).

[12] Julia Kristeva, "The Bounded Text," in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 36–63, esp. 36–37.

In theorizing the ideologeme, Kristeva is reacting against a structuralist view of language that approaches it as a self-contained system of significa-tion. An implication of Kristeva's theory is that, in the words of Graham Allen, "texts have no unity or unified meaning on their own, they are thoroughly connected to on-going cultural and social processes."[13] Rather than taking up a given text in a way that abstracts it from culture, Kristeva asserts that its "historical and social coordinates" are also objects of analysis; they are part of the text's ideologeme, which, if we are to examine it, requires that we consider that text in its social and historical dimensions.[14]

In discussing an example of an ideologeme, Allen refers to concepts such as nature or justice, concepts that "are the subject of immense social conflicts and tensions" whose presence "at the same time 'inside' and yet 'outside'" of the text will disrupt whatever unity that text might purport to have."[15] I would contend that the WST can be productively read along these lines. As we saw in the case of Olivier's *Henry V*, the slippage between "England" and "Britain" – a source of social friction occurring simultaneously "inside" and "outside" the film – has the potential to disturb Shakespeare's status as an emblem of national unity, a potential that Olivier seeks to neutralize through some judicious cutting of the play. That excision attests to both the constructedness and the uniqueness of his particular iteration of the WST, and the conceptual fissures within it come into focus when we interpret together the film, the play and the social and historical contexts (meaning, in this example, period attitudes toward the conflation of "England" and "Britain").

It is hardly shocking that, in making an explicitly propagandistic film designed to bolster morale, Olivier produces a celluloid version of *Henry V* that seeks to reinforce the idea that Shakespeare tropes nationhood. However, reading that trope as an ideologeme – as an intertextual relation between play, film, society and history – reveals some of the fault lines within it. Moreover, whereas Olivier approaches the WST with an eye to burnishing Shakespeare's credentials as an emblem of national unity, a

---

[13] Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2011), 36.

[14] Kristeva has been critiqued for approaching society and history semiotically, in a way that "erases the specific social situation" (Allen, *Intertextuality*, 56). In contradistinction to this view, Mary Orr seconds Allen in suggesting that "'intertextuality' as static, all-encompassing network, with no outside of the text, is not Kristevan" (*Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* [Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003], 28).

[15] Allen, *Intertextuality*, 36, 37. Frederic Jameson's Marxist conception of the ideologeme has it as "the smallest intelligible unit of the essentially antagonistic collective discourses of social classes" (*The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981], 76.)

number of wartime moviemakers construct the trope differently. If some intend simply to mobilize a vision of a unified nation, others – including the filmmakers most central to this study – seek to put pressure on that vision; to explore its nature and probe its contradictions (in one case, as we shall see, by gesturing toward the role of Scotland in the British war effort); or to test the vision's limits. But intention is obviously not all that is at issue here, as contradictions within or attendant upon a given instantiation of the WST necessarily emerge out of its status as an intertextual relation.

As I have shown, to read Olivier's *Henry V* through the lens of the ideologeme is to take up play, film, society and history. "Society" and "history" are, of course, capacious categories and, in the case of my very brief discussion of the film, I have only referred to specific sources of tension that are simultaneously registered and occluded in Olivier's particular deployment of the WST. When it comes to the films that are the central focus of this book, I take up a range of social issues that these films connect to Shakespeare's status as trope for nationhood: the race-based challenge posed to Britishness by colonial participation in the war effort, for example, or animosity between professional and volunteer firefighters that stands in for broader cultural threats to social cohesion. Additionally, I seek to demonstrate that cinematic iterations of the WST are more fully understood when we locate appropriations of Shakespeare within both cinematic and social history.

With that last point in mind, I turn now to a second British film released in 1944, Walter Forde's *Time Flies*. This little known time-travel musical comedy stars Tommy Handley, who was famous for his wildly popular comic radio program, *It's That Man Again* (*ITMA*). As BBC historian Asa Briggs put it, "*ITMA* was *vox mundi*, rich in all the sounds of war and with more invented characters than Walt Disney, and in 1942 and 1943 it had become as much of a national institution as the BBC itself."[16] In 1943, Gainsborough Studios released a film, also directed by Forde, that featured Handley and had the same title as his radio program;[17] *Time Flies* (also from Gainsborough) was his second, and final, cinematic starring role. Handley, who appears under his own name, plays a scheming opportunist who convinces Bill Barton (George Moon), behind the back of his wife, Susie (Evelyn Dall), to buy shares in Time Ferry

---

[16] Asa Briggs, *The BBC: The First Fifty Years* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 215.
[17] The film *It's That Man Again* contains a number of glancing references to Shakespeare. For instance, when Handley takes over a failed theater and drama school, one of the students asks him, "What can you teach us?" He replies, "Everything, from *Hamlet* down to paper tearing." Shortly thereafter, he addresses the students as "Friends, humans, pupils."

Services, an enterprise helmed by an inventor, Professor Stuart MacAndrew (Felix Aylmer). The Professor's invention is the Time Ball, which, thanks to a series of mishaps, unexpectedly carries the Professor, Tommy and the Bartons, who were performing on Broadway, from New York City in 1943 to late-Elizabethan England. Once there, they meet a series of historical figures including Walter Raleigh (Leslie Bradley), John Smith (Roy Emerton), Pocahontas (Iris Lang) and, perhaps inevitably, Queen Elizabeth (Olga Lindo). The Elizabethan portion of the film takes up about an hour of its running time, and a surprising amount of it is devoted to competing claims to the New World, the selling off of which initially provides Tommy with both loot and a title ("Sir Tommy Handley, Lord of the Americas"). For this study, however, the most significant encounter is between the Bartons and William Shakespeare (John Salew). Fleeing a group of sixteenth-century Londoners who are alarmed by their "prophecies" about the future, the Bartons duck into a structure that turns out to be the Globe Theater. Backstage, they find costumes into which they change to disguise their appearances. Susie, having come upon a poster announcing a recent theatrical offering, announces to Bill, "They've been doing Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost*." Her husband replies, "I'll bet business was lousy."

When Susie explores the theater in search of food, she comes upon a bearded man sitting at a desk in the middle of the Globe stage. We work out long before she does that this is Shakespeare, who is struggling with the composition of *Romeo and Juliet*. From the balcony, she supplies the playwright, whom she mistakes for a fellow performer who can't remember his lines, with his own verse: "He jests at scars that never felt a wound"; "What's in a name?"[18] At one point, Shakespeare proleptically invokes the authorship controversy: "But another perfect line! Ah, it's not one of Francis Bacon's, is it?" When Shakespeare finally introduces himself to Susie, after thanking her for her help, she recognizes the situation and, startled, exclaims, "Gosh!" The encounter with Shakespeare concludes in a musical number – with the aid of Bill and Susie, a group of Elizabethan minstrels are all but transformed into a swing band – put on by the Bartons to distract their pursuers, who have made their way into the theater. Along with his fellow Elizabethans, Shakespeare dances contentedly to popular music of the 1940s.

For all of the obvious differences, tonal and otherwise, between *Henry V* and *Time Flies*, both films take as given that Shakespeare plays a privileged

---

[18] She also comically upbraids him for not ascending to the balcony as Romeo does – and Shakespeare steals the idea.

role within British national – or, indeed, world – culture. Whereas Forde's movie indulges in the mind-bending speculation typical of time-travel narratives – are lines from *Romeo and Juliet* really Shakespeare's if Susie Barton introduces them to him? – the very familiarity of the play to an American music hall performer attests to the Bard's reach. Not only is Shakespeare assumed to be recognizable to moviegoers; the reference to Francis Bacon also speaks to the pervasiveness of the "authorship question" (about which I will say more in Chapter 1). *Time Flies* also has some fun with the cultural standing of the playwright's works. If Shakespeare emblematizes highbrow literariness – an association implied by Bill's wager that "business was lousy" – by the end of the dance number, the Bard struts like a true man of the people. He is of an age *and* for all time.[19]

There is nothing in *Time Flies* that explicitly refutes the idea that Shakespeare emblematizes the nation; however, the film constitutes its own version of the WST in a way that puts pressure on that idea. Consider, first of all, Bill's comment about business being lousy. This is in part a quip about *Love's Labour's Lost*, not one of Shakespeare's greatest hits; it is also a jest about the popularity of classical theater relative to the musical entertainment he and Susie have made a career out of performing; and it is a metacinematic joke – one of several made during the film – about the failure of Shakespeare at the movie theater box office.[20] (Indeed, before Olivier's *Henry V*, which was released just months after *Time Flies*, no British or American film adaptation of Shakespeare produced during the sound area had been commercially successful during its initial run.) If Shakespeare embodies the best of national culture, he is at the same time neither an inevitable nor even a likely candidate to capture the screens of British cinemas.[21]

---

[19] *Time Flies* is not the first film to combine the popular and the highbrow in a representation of the playwright himself. See, for example, the Warner Brothers short *Shake, Mr. Shakespeare* (1934), which is discussed by Darlena Ciraulo ("Broadcasting Censorship: Hollywood's Production Code and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*," in Stephen O'Neill (ed.), *Broadcast Your Shakespeare: Continuity and Change across Media* [London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2018], 27–45, esp. 34).

[20] *Time Flies* is peppered with metacinematic references. When Tommy first encounters Elizabethan soldiers, he says, "They're making pictures. We've landed in Hollywood." Shortly thereafter, he asks one of them "Who's your director? Cecil B. DeMille?" Most notably, the time travelers' escape from prison is aided by cinematic technology: the Professor projects a moving image of the four of them onto the wall of their cell, thereby fooling the guards into believing they are still in captivity. And when the time travelers return to New York weeks earlier than they had originally left, causing the Bartons to slowly disappear, Bill refers to the couple, whose voices for unexplained reasons remain audible, as "a couple of soundtracks."

[21] A similar dynamic is at play when it comes to radio Shakespeare at this time. On the one hand, Shakespeare is central to the BBC's mission, and he regularly appears on the nation's wireless sets; on the other hand, the broadcasting network makes significant changes to its programming during the war that both marginalize Shakespeare and confirm the comparative unpopularity of the

It is also significant that *Time Flies* is, among other things, a parody of British heritage films that were produced both before the war and, for overt propaganda purposes, during it.[22] Olga Lindo's Elizabeth owes an obvious debt to Flora Robson's depiction of the querulous and aging queen in William K. Howard's *Fire over England* (1937), a film that featured Olivier in a starring role.[23] Moreover, an extended banquet scene, in which Tommy teaches Elizabeth how to cheat at the shell game, inevitably evokes an earlier cinematic banquet, featuring Charles Laughton as the monarch, in Alexander Korda's wildly successful *The Private Life of Henry VIII* (1933). As for movies made during the war itself, filmmakers repeatedly explored the potential propaganda value of both the early modern period specifically and Britain's illustrious past more generally. The first propaganda film of the war, *The Lion Has Wings* (1939, directed by Adrian Brunel, Brian Desmond Hurst and Michael Powell), literally lifts the Tilbury sequence from *Fire over England*, while David Macdonald's *This England* (1941) begins in 1940 and takes its viewer back through time to four key episodes in the history of a small village, one of which is the Spanish Armada.[24] The film's concluding sequence, which starts during peace celebrations at the end of World War One, boasts a recitation of John of Gaunt's "royal throne of kings" speech in *Richard II*, from which the film's title is derived. This recitation, moreover, literally bridges the past and present: Rookeby, a blinded veteran of the Great War, begins the address, but it is (presumably) his son, played by the same actor (John Clements), who completes it in 1940.[25] One could multiply examples, but

playwright's works. For more on this topic, see Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., "Shakespeare and World War II," in David Loewenstein and Paul Stevens (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 205–220.

[22] For a discussion of wartime heritage films, see James Chapman, *The British at War: Cinema, State and Propaganda, 1939–1945* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1998), 232–248. In Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger's *The Volunteer* (1944), made to bolster recruitment for the Fleet Air Arm, a costumed Ralph Richardson tells us via voiceover that "[w]e were making a propaganda film. At the outbreak of war, actors dived into historical costumes and declaimed powerful speeches about the wooden walls of England." Richardson refers to his own version of such an oration as his "beefeater speech." In comic contrast, Tommy refers in *Time Flies* to Elizabeth's "Spameaters."

[23] *Fire over England* clearly equates the late-sixteenth-century Spanish threat with the twentieth-century German one.

[24] James Chapman identifies *This England* as "the first [cinematic] attempt during the war to mobilise the past in order to address social divisions and to promote the need for national unity" (*Past and Present: National Identity and the British Historical Film* [London: I. B. Tauris, 2005], 91).

[25] This speech is also quoted in Harold Young's *The Scarlet Pimpernel* (1934), which I take up in Chapter 1, and it concludes the Hollywood film *Sherlock Holmes and the Secret Weapon* (directed by Roy William Neill and released in 1942). On the role of Shakespeare in Neill's movie, see Greg M. Colón Semenza and Bob Hasenfratz, *The History of British Literature on Film, 1895–2015* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015), 208–210.

the key point is that *Time Flies* is clearly spoofing movies that center on Britain's national heritage, as is made clear when Elizabeth secures ownership to the New World by way of the rigged shell game. So much for Britain's great and glorious history. It should be noted, moreover, that Olivier's *Henry V* has been identified as the culmination of the series of wartime heritage films that *Time Flies* sends up.[26]

In offering an irreverent take on the heritage film, *Time Flies* resembles the costume melodramas for which its studio, Gainsborough Pictures, is most famous.[27] I will have a good deal more to say about Gainsborough's melodramas, especially Leslie Arliss's *The Man in Grey* (1943), in Chapter 3. For now, it is enough to note that, by the time that Forde's film was released, and in the wake of *The Man in Grey*'s remarkable success, Gainsborough's production team largely turned its back on features that had a propagandistic dimension; instead, they devoted more of their resources to carefully budgeted, if often lavish-looking, entertainment that, in its turn to the past, sought to offer a respite from the war.[28] (In contrast, Olivier's *Henry V* was the most expensive film made in Britain during the conflict. Produced by Two Cities Films, a maker of prestige pictures, with the support of the MOI, it was also an extremely successful work of cinematic propaganda, the idea for which was inspired by Olivier's stirring declamations, on the radio and in person, of Henry's speeches at Harfleur and Agincourt.) With its status as a Gainsborough film in mind, we can better understand what is at issue in the depiction of Shakespeare in *Time Flies*. As I have suggested, the film does not contest Shakespeare's status as national icon, but it does take a gentle swipe at the uses to which the playwright, as well as his Elizabethan contemporaries, have been put in period cinema. Moreover, in directing our attention away from the verse of *Romeo and Juliet* and toward 1940s popular culture, the song-and-dance number that concludes the Shakespeare sequence in the film captures Gainsborough's dismissive attitude toward earnest historical propaganda features.

Another way to understand Forde's film is through the particular version of the WST that it constructs. On the one hand, Shakespeare is seen as emblematizing a shared societal inheritance and a common

[26] Charles Barr, "Introduction: Amnesia and Schizophrenia," in Barr (ed.), *All Our Yesterdays: 90 Years of British Cinema* (London: British Film Institute, 1986), 1–29, esp. 12.

[27] On connections between *Time Flies* and the costume melodramas, see Sue Harper, "'Nothing to Beat the Hay Diet': Comedy at Gaumont and Gainsborough," in Pam Cook (ed.), *Gainsborough Pictures* (London and Washington, DC: Cassell, 1997), 80–98, esp. 91–92.

[28] On Gainsborough's emphasis on controlling costs, see Sue Harper, *Picturing the Past: The Rise and Fall of the British Costume Film* (London: BFI Publishing, 1994), esp. 119–135.

national identity. Forget the chicken-and-egg problem posed by Susie's rendition of lines from *Romeo and Juliet*; it is the lines themselves that tether the past to the present, the sixteenth-century London playhouse to the twentieth-century British cinema. On the other hand, the film demonstrates some of the ways in which Shakespeare's status as national icon can be complicated: there is the relative unpopularity of his plays (or at least of *Love's Labour's Lost*), as well as the distinction drawn between his canonical verse and the crowd-pleasing dance music that the Bartons introduce both to Shakespeare and to a delighted Elizabethan audience. Additionally, there is the way in which *Time Flies*, like the studio that made it, explicitly opposes itself to heritage films like Olivier's. In a manner that is far more direct than in *Henry V*, Forde's film introduces us to a theme, intrinsic to the cinematic WST as an ideologeme, that I will return to throughout this book: the tension between a view of Shakespeare as a unifying force and one that sees him as a register of social and cultural difference. (Later chapters will also consider the role played by Shakespeare in articulating racial and national difference.) Moreover, the depiction of such division has a heightened significance during what was referred to even at the time as "the people's war." I will have more to say about this concept, which stresses that men and women of all backgrounds overcame their social dissimilarities and pulled together in the national interest, in subsequent chapters. If the WST was deployed in the service of the people's war, it could also disclose the fragility, if not the illusoriness, of that notion.

Time Flies differs from *Henry V* in another significant, if obvious, way: it is an appropriation and not an adaptation of Shakespeare. Julie Sanders usefully differentiates the latter kind of intertextual product from the former one: whereas "[a]n adaptation signals a relationship with an informing source text or original" and is recognizably "a specific version, albeit achieved in alternative temporal and generic modes, of that seminal cultural text," an appropriation

> frequently affects a more decisive journey away from the informing source into a wholly new cultural product and domain. This may or may not involve a generic shift, and it may still require the intellectual juxtaposition of (at least) one text against another. . . . But the appropriated text or texts are not always as clearly signalled or acknowledged as in the adaptive process.[29]

[29] Julie Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 26. Adaptation and appropriation have been fruitfully theorized in terms of process as well as product. See, most notably, Linda Hutcheon with Siobhan O'Flynn, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 15–22.