Sentimental States of the Nation

Remembering Diana, Princess of Wales (and Shakespeare's Richard II)

Christian Krug

A 'Moment in History'

The sixth and final season of *The Crown* (2016–2023), Netflix's popular streaming series which dramatized the reign of Queen Elizabeth II, deals in large part with the repercussions of the death of Diana, Princess of Wales in 1997. The first episode opens on a Parisian street at night with a pedestrian walking his dog. A car, pursued by motorcycles, drives by at high speed; it enters a tunnel, and the scene ends with an apparent car crash off-screen. At this point, the audience realizes what it is (not) witnessing: A 'moment in history,' the fatal crash that killed Diana and her companion Dodi Fayed in August 1997. The episode then cuts back to Diana and Fayed's first meeting, and the audience, which has made its own way back into its collective memory of the past, realizes that *The Crown* will work its way towards that crash—the audience's memory and the show's storytelling are on a collision course and will eventually converge during the season. *The Crown* works by anticipating a future that is already past—often in a self-reflexive fashion.

Diana's fatal car crash will remain off-screen. It serves as the season's fetishist anchor that organizes the libidinal investment with the show, its phantasmatic kernel that seems to defy representation. Contemporary representations of Diana work as much by inclusion as by exclusion, and in the case of *The Crown*, excluding the accident can double as an ethical decision and an attempt to raise the show's cultural prestige: Ostensibly, *The Crown* is not exploitative and too tasteful for such representations. This allows the show to disavow a fundamental aspect of current representations that revisit Diana's death and mourning, in which *The Crown* nevertheless participates: They

cater to a kind of 'trauma nostalgia,' where a "collective trauma" (Alexander) is repeatedly re-experienced in medialized form, and (other people's) grief can become an object of consumption.

Not showing the fatal car crash on screen is just one of several significant exclusions in *The Crown*. Another is Diana's funeral service in Westminster Abbey, an event televised across the globe. For U.K. audiences especially, these images are deeply ingrained in their collective memory; they 'know' and perhaps even expect them: Prime Minister Tony Blair's reading, Elton John revisiting his pop song about Marilyn Monroe, "Candle in the Wind," Earl Spencer, Diana's brother, holding an incendiary speech which draws applause first from the crowds outside the Abbey, then from the attendants in the church itself (including a twelve-year-old Prince Harry). *The Crown* shows the Royal Family making its way to the church, just as it showed Diana's car make its way into the tunnel in Paris—but then it also cuts away, omitting the actual ceremony. Representations of excessive mass media mourning seem to be just as problematic as the accident that triggered them.

This essay will consider such moments of inclusion and exclusion, remembering and forgetting as part of sentimental strategies—that is, ideological strategies that work by eliciting sympathy and fostering a sense of community by affectively tying ideological norms and values to (seemingly personal) feelings and (social) emotions, specifically sadness and grief, and then circulating them publicly. Diana continues to serve as a sentimental icon in the U.K., and representations of her death and mourning can be analyzed symptomatically, as a gauge to assess Britain's affective relationship with itself, at specific moments of time. This essay looks at three sentimental states of the nation: The first, in 1997, involves representations of Diana's funeral and of a 'nation in mourning' on television and in print (the mass media that dominated the news at the time). While these have already been extensively researched (e.g. Davies; Kear/Steinberg 1999b; Merck; Richards/Wilson/Woodhead; Seidler; Taylor 2000; Thomas), the second focus will be on representations that have not yet received the same critical attention—those of Diana at the 20th anniversary of her death in 2017. Several TV documentaries set out to re-evaluate her iconicity and the sentimental attachments to her. They frequently invite a second-order observation which may actualize a reflexive potential inherent in the sentimental itself. Such documentaries often also affectively re-sentimentalize their subject (effectively sentimentalizing an older sentimentality), which points towards the fact that 'the sentimental' should not so much be considered a code as a *coding*—a performative act whose hegemonic power needs

to be consistently re-established. Most importantly, however, reconsidering sentimental strategies twenty years later will allow us to speculate on the temporality of the sentimental and related concepts such as nostalgia. Finally, in a brief coda, this essay will take a detour and go back 400 years: 1597 saw the publication of the first Quarto of Shakespeare's *The Tragedie of King Richard the Second*, and I will briefly discuss Shakespeare's Richard II in relation to Diana, as a proto-sentimental hero(ine).

1997

Diana, Princess of Wales died in a car crash in Paris shortly after midnight on August 31, 1997. Her funeral service in Westminster Abbey took place one week later, on September 6. In the span of seven days, Diana was transformed from a media celebrity to a sentimental icon and a civil Saint in the symbolic economy of the U.K.'s popular politics. Even before her death, however, she had been the subject of sentimental (self-)fashionings—both as a willing participant and agent, but also as a sentimental 'subject' in quite another sense: she had been subjected to sentimental interpellations, including highly deceptive and manipulative ones.

Diana's sentimental fashionings took several forms. In the last few years before her death, media coverage increasingly framed her in the narrative mode of soap operas, which allowed for an open-ended narrative form, a set of staple characters, and an incessant talk about private feelings (cf. Geraghty). A melodramatic mode provided models of the victimized and persecuted heroine and an affective logic of excess. Diana herself strategically employed sentimental codes and repertoires, including the registers of psychotherapy and self-help literature, to help mold her public image after she separated from her husband, Prince Charles (cf. Hermes/Noordhuizen; Geraghty 78). She promoted talking about both public and private feelings—not just her compassion and sympathy for the suffering of others (e.g. with HIV patients or the victims of landmines), but also, most notably in a high-profile television interview for the BBC in 1995, her own suffering in an unhappy marriage, her struggles with eating disorders, and thoughts of suicide. By doing so, her intimate sphere supposedly became a legitimate subject of public discourse. And she also adopted pathos formulas and developed a physical repertoire of gestures with which she could communicate sympathy and suffering, including a Virgin-Mary-like lowering of her head and a downcast gaze which

became part of her unique iconography. Prime Minister Tony Blair referenced such gestures in his address to the nation on the day of her death:

> How many times shall we remember her, in how many different ways, with the sick, the dying, with children, with the needy, when, with just a look or a gesture that spoke so much more than words, she would reveal to all of us the depth of her compassion and humanity. (Blair 140)

In a thoughtful contribution to one of the earliest academic studies of her death, Mandy Merck's *After Diana: Irreverent Elegies* (1998), Homi Bhabha remarked that during the last years of her life, Diana turned herself into a figure of speech, a representation. This allowed her to serve as a screen onto which the public could project their own meanings of Diana (as the quote by Blair arguably also shows). Diana's own self-fashionings were hence both personal and deeply political: According to Bhabha, "[i]n defining a role for herself, Diana had to create a constituency and appeal to a sector of the nation's 'imagined community'—a people—who, like her, were struggling to find a representative and *representational* image for themselves, a 'sign' of public belonging, as well as an insignia of authority" (ibid. 106). For Diana, this came with a hefty price, as she was "symbolized and sentimentalized out of existence" (ibid.). And not all of her own sentimental self-fashionings were fully voluntary, as her now-infamous interview for BBC1's documentary series *Panorama* in 1995 demonstrates. An independent inquiry found in 2021 that the journalist who interviewed her, Martin Bashir, had deceived Diana by means of forged bank statements (Dyson), and in 2022 the BBC paid substantial damages to her nanny: In order to entice her to participate in the interview, Diana may have been presented with a false abortion notice meant to further isolate her from her then-husband, Prince Charles, now King Charles III (Landler). While the BBC has since permanently retracted the interview, it has by no means disappeared. It has merely suffered a generic sea-change and continues to live on in docu-fiction—on TV and in movies and streams.

After Diana's death, a popular myth of a nation united in mourning (Thomas 2, 7–44) helped turn her into a sentimental icon and worked towards her sacralization as a civil Saint ("Born a Lady, Became a Princess, Died a Saint," the *Mirror* titled on September 1, 1997; Thomas 45). Her apotheosis as 'Saint Diana' was helped by the fact that the media superimposed her death with that of Mother Teresa (now Saint Teresa of Calcutta) just a few days later. Systematic studies of newspaper coverage in the U.K. have shown how

immediately after her death, Diana's sentimentalization became a dominant model and almost completely replaced the previously ambivalent and critical reporting about her: In the U.K. press, key words to describe Diana were now "humanitarian", "real", "vulnerable", "nice", "sincere", "people's princess", "mother" (to all children), and "most hunted woman in history" (Hermes/ Noordhuizen). Diana became "the epitome of human kindness, warmth and caring"—and the only person who can suffer with everyone else *and* alleviate their suffering at the same time (ibid. 86). In death, however, she was mourned not just for who she was or what she did but for what she could not be or do any more—for a lost personal future and also a history unfulfilled. This, according to Lauren Berlant (160), links her to other icons of liberal democracy such as John F. Kennedy, Jr.

The days following Diana's death saw a blanket mass media coverage of seemingly unprecedented expressions of grief and mourning in London. Such scenes were not, in fact, unprecedented, as Esther Schor has shown in her analysis of the reaction to Princess Charlotte's death in 1817; Schor's distinction between individual grief and collective mourning, "the social diffusion of grief through sympathy" and "a force that constitutes communities and makes it possible to conceptualize history" (a fundamentally 'sentimental' definition in that it is grounded in moral sentimentalism) underlies this essay (Schor 4). The scenes were also less widespread and much more heterogeneous than reported on TV and in the press, as mass observation studies have shown (Thomas). Still, a popular myth of a 'nation united in mourning' quickly developed its own iconography: the sea of flowers in front of Buckingham Palace and Kensington Palace, Diana's residence; the flag pole on top of Buckingham Palace, first conspicuously empty and then flying the Union flag at half-mast; the young princes, William and Harry, walking behind the cortège of her mother at the funeral procession to Westminster Abbey; finally, the funeral service itself. These images (all, in fact, tied to the metropolis, London, rather than the country at large or a 'nation') also circulated globally, proving that the sentimental codes and registers surrounding her were easily translated and appropriated. They elevated Diana's status as an iconic figure with a transnational appeal that could be appropriated locally in very different ways (Taylor 2003). A white upper-class heterosexual English woman, Raka Shome has observed, through multiple mediations, was both "hypernationalized and transnationalized" and was able to secure affective attachments from people—"white and not white, Western and not Western" (Shome 1).

As a sentimental icon, Diana was an affective figure that allowed for a range of identifications, enabling communities to symbolically incorporate otherwise irreconcilable values, norms, or subjectivities. She was an establishment figure that could also be perceived to be anti-establishment, a champion of conservative gender roles and a progressive femininity, of heterofamilial norms and of sexual liberation, of heterosexual desire and desirability and of queer subject positions ("Diana was a gay man," Richard Coles memorably commented in 1998). As 'England's rose' (a frequent moniker of hers and also the first line of Bernie Taupin's rewritten lyrics for Elton John's "Candle in the Wind"), Diana embodied a traditional form of Englishness, but she simultaneously functioned as a global celebrity and icon of transethnic multiculturalism (Lomax). In this, sentimental codes and registers circulating in the media had the effect of simultaneously limiting and de-limiting national identity. They were also able to connect various public spheres and to bridge the metropolitan, the national, and the transnational.

In the U.K., Diana's sentimentalizations were also deeply political in a more specific sense. Diana's death came at a time of political upheaval, a few months after Tony Blair, the first Labour Prime Minister after 18 years of Conservative governments, took office. Blair's address to the nation, a few hours after her death, set an example of how Diana was to be remembered: As "the People's Princess"—a style which echoed one of Diana's self-representations; she had referred to herself as the "Queen of Hearts" in the *Panorama* interview in November 1995 ("I'd like to be a queen of people's hearts, in people's hearts," Bashir). Both styles position her in a new, informal relationship to the 'monarchy' and the 'nation.'

As an informal "People's Princess" and a "Queen of Hearts," Diana competed with the formal institution of the Royal Family—at least in some respects. This (equally iconic) institution has, since the 19th century, functioned as a media monarchy (Plunkett); while it retains some residual direct political influence and a lot of wealth, its main power continues to be symbolic. The Royal Family spotlights questions of belonging and exclusion. It does so intrinsically, by defining who is part of it and who is not (questions that arose not just with Diana but also with Camilla Parker Bowles, now Queen Camilla, and Prince Harry and Meghan Markle). It also does so vicariously, by allowing the British public to gauge its affective relationship with itself. Diana's relationship to the Royal Family was significant not just in terms of whether she personally was included or excluded. Diana became associated with individualistic identity positions which seemed to fundamentally threaten a dominant myth of the Royal

Family that had, since the reign of Queen Victoria in the 19th century, been constructed around middle-class, heterofamilial ideals of the domestic nuclear family (Homans). After her death, the Royal Family found itself on the front pages of the tabloid newspapers. The tabloids accused the Queen of not sharing the 'feelings of the nation': On September 4, for example, they prompted her to "Show us you care—Mourners call on the Queen to lead our grief" (*The Express*) and to "Speak to us, Ma'am—Your people are suffering" (*The Mirror*). The *Daily Mail* asked, "Has the House of Windsor got a heart?," while *The Sun* "[spoke] its mind: Where is our Queen? Where is her flag?" Elizabeth II was, symbolically as well as geographically, not currently in the 'heart' of the nation—that is, central London; she was in Balmoral, Scotland. It is interesting to note that performances of grief for the Queen of Hearts were, despite being broadcast to the whole of the U.K. and indeed the world, not just empirically a metropolitan affair, they were *expected* to occur in the metaphorical heart of the nation.

The tension between the expectations of the (tabloid's) public and the actions of the Royal Family has been interpreted as a symptom of competing emotional regimes, specifically 'private' and 'expressive' grief (Biddle/Walter; Thomas 88–91). An older regime called for grief to be experienced in private, and public displays of emotion had to be carefully controlled. This seemed to accord with stereotypical notions of an English 'national character' dominant in the mid-20th century (Dixon 2015), when controlled emotionality ('stiff upper lip') was, moreover, a marker of class. After Diana's fatal accident, the Royal Family may have adopted this model, as it had done in previous decades. However, a newer emotional regime of expressive mourning increasingly pathologized a 'bottling up' of emotions as unhealthy and demanded the therapeutic acting out of grief as public feeling. This had to be communicated and needed to be 'affirmed' or 'validated' as 'proper' grief. The Royal Family arguably navigated between such emotional regimes. On September 5, in what was sometimes referred to as "the floral revolution" (Greenhalgh), the Queen bowed to media pressure and returned to Buckingham Palace. She incorporated (albeit carefully selected) elements of expressive grief when she inspected the sea of flowers that had been placed in front of the palace, and, in an unprecedented concession, she also had the Union Flag on Buckingham Palace raised to half-mast: According to Richard Coles (171–2), the Union flag now symbolized "the identification of being British with having the correct feeling": It had become "the Standard of National Emotion."

This mass (media) phenomenon of widespread mourning for a sentimentalized civil Saint Diana was immediately understood—and politicized—as a

symptom of deeper changes to concepts of the nation, national identity, and a 'national character.' In life and in death, Diana became the object of negotiations about the values and the very identity of the nation. On the one hand, images of Britons finally 'embracing their feelings' were celebrated as evidence of a new British society, neatly coinciding with Labour's 'New Britain,' which now defined itself as a "nation of broken hearts" through a shared emotional experience (Tony Blair talked about Britain as a nation in "a state of shock, in mourning, in grief"). Writing in 1999, Valerie Hey argued that the intense reactions to Diana's death "occurred in part because 'Diana' was caught up in and positioned by some New-Labour/New-Britain political themes but also because she, literally and in fantasy, personified certain 'outlawed' emotions—of expressivity, compassion and caring" (60). Diana, in short, became the focal point for affective political movements pushing for a 'stakeholding' society in which, after eighteen years of Tory governments led by Margaret Thatcher and John Major, "margins would be rearticulated to the centre, wealth redistributed, services saved, rights (re)asserted, and society restored" (Kear/Steinberg 1999a, 4). She seemed to be able to forge sentimental networks and expand the boundaries of effective (and affective) citizenship: Her compassion for refugees and the poor, as well as her 'touching' concern for AIDS sufferers, had brought previously marginalized groups into the political discourse (Johnson 1999, 32–3). In death, they now seemed to be fully included via a shared sense of loss—most visibly when some 500 members of her charities walked after her funeral cortège.

On the other hand, however, an excessive mourning for Diana was rejected as a symptom of a progressive sentimentalization (now used in the pejorative sense) of Britain. In his column in *The Daily Telegraph* on September 3, 1997, future Prime Minister Boris Johnson, at that time still a political columnist, claimed that England was "undergoing a Latin American carnival of grief" (Johnson 1997, 22). He compared Diana to another self-proclaimed 'Queen of Hearts,' Eva Perón, and wondered: "Where is this—Argentina?" (ibid). In April 1998, public scenes of mourning for Diana served as a prominent example in *Faking It: The Sentimentalisation of Modern Society*, a widely circulated publication of a conservative think tank, the Social Affairs Unit. It warned against 'sentimentality' encroaching all aspects of social life (the book includes chapters on the sentimentalization of social policy, childcare, education, institutionalized religion, medicine, literature, music and media, even eating habits). Mourning for Diana seemed to bring such tendencies into sharp relief (cf. Anderson/Mullen 18), and quite appropriately, when it was reprinted as a Penguin paperback, the cover showed a tribute to Diana as "Queen of Hearts"

left amongst the flowers in front of one of the palaces. In his chapter on Diana, philosopher Anthony O'Hear pits Rousseau against Edmund Burke to describe Diana's own sentimentalization before her death with an improper indulgence of 'feeling' and the neglect of 'reason' and 'duty.' The public reaction towards her death (which he mainly accepts as genuine and unmediated) likewise stood for a national "elevation of feeling, image and spontaneity over reason, reality and restraint" (184). O'Hear's "New Britain" (which he frames against the Britain of World War II and the 1950s) is defined by a "modern sentimentality" where political correctness has taken the form of emotional correctness (188), 'shared feelings' are, first and foremost, an "emotional lowest common denominator" (186), victimhood has become indiscriminate and helps mask the nakedness of arbitrary power (186–7), well-meant 'caring,' if it focuses on symptoms and eschews addressing structural reasons, threatens to become a form of "intellectual or emotional imperialism" (188). (O'Hear discusses Diana's care for AIDS patients, and he himself only hints at what is supposedly eschewed by it, some "underlying activities which bring AIDS about," 188).

The Social Affairs Unit publication, as well as many other conservative positions, usually also attest to the affective pull of sentimentality, and they often interpret its mechanisms in similar ways to liberal-leaning academics. They mainly differ, however, in their political, moral, and ideological evaluation of it, and they place much more emphasis on sentimentality as a unilateral means of deception or control (a 'top down' model of communication), and far less in terms of any agency that the use of sentimental codes and registers may offer. This they share with 'republican' and 'leftist' positions. *Diana: The Mourning After*, Christopher Hitchens's television documentary broadcast one year after her death, is a good example. For Hitchens, the week after Diana's fatal accident represents a medialized "orgy of sentimentality [that] was nauseating to behold—a complete suspension of reality." Hitchens' documentary focuses on the role of television and the tabloids in crafting a representation which for him was essentially false but which proved highly successful in interpellating audiences. In one of the interviews featured in the documentary, the mass media coverage of Diana's death and her mourning is described in terms of a sentimental fascism; the interviewee, Mark Thomas, evokes Stalinism, Naziism, and Italian Fascism in short order: "It was almost like a Soviet leader had died, and they put on the martial music—except it was images of Diana and her children"; "It had the logic of a Disney production and the enforcement of a Nazi state"; if "Disney makes the Blackshirts" of Italian fascism, the result would likewise be a "sentimental: You *must cry*!". Both the contributors to *Faking It* and

Hitchens analyze many of the same aspects of Diana's iconicity and the public myth of a shared national mourning that liberal academia had also raised. In the hands of Hitchens, they now become instruments of vitriolic critique: When he revisits her cultural iconicity, 'Saint Diana' becomes 'Our Lady of the Versace.' As TV critics noted at the time, it is ironic that Hitchens's documentary, which advocates for rationalism to dispel the manipulative effect of sentimentality, tends to increasingly rely on emotional interpellation itself, swapping one "hysteria" for another (Barber). Released just one year after Diana's funeral, these examples already anticipate some of the revisions that occur at the 10th anniversary of her death in 2007, and the 20th in 2017.

2017

The plethora of films and documentaries released on the 20th anniversary of Diana's death enabled a U.K. audience to revisit, perhaps even to re-experience their personal and collective sentimental attachments. The 'affective documentaries' and TV movies I will discuss in this section present a variety of options to do so. These range from the vicarious consumption of (other people's) grief—the affective and emotional surplus attached to the sensational aspects of Diana's deaths—in what I have called 'trauma nostalgia' earlier, to a more reflexive engagement with (one's own) former affective investments—which is what most documentaries promise to facilitate. The documentaries also frequently re-sentimentalize Diana for new social, political, and cultural contexts. The two TV movies in turn illustrate (and explore) Diana's sentimental iconicity as a codified *cultural myth* which is often disavowed but continues to do cultural work. Diana remains a haunting presence in these movies. The first, a melodrama, has been chosen because it highlights the affective pull of that myth (*Diana and I*). In the second, the adaptation of a political play, its manipulative effect, and the political consequences take center stage (*King Charles III*).

Affective Documentaries

In late 2017, all major U.K. channels carried television documentaries on Diana which hovered uneasily between detachment and re-involvement. They offered historicized representations of a recent past *and* an emotionally charged re-presentation that sought to make that past *present* again. This resulted in

a spectral presence of Diana, who seemed to be at the same time dead and alive—or rather, had to be brought back to life only to be killed again. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the ethical paradox involved in such affective re-presentations—the need to (re)*produce* the very traumatic events for which one elicits sympathy—has a parallel in the sentimental novels of the 18th and 19th century: In order to evoke sympathy by showcasing the plight of others, these novels needed to fictionally invent that very plight (Wood 12–18), so that the moral sentiments of sentimental novels frequently come with their shadowy other: Evoking compassion relied on representations of cruelty, showcasing chastity on depictions of forceful seduction and rape, the bourgeois nuclear family raised the spectre of incest (Fluck 63–4; Pollak). In 2017, making an audience 'feel' also means having to make Diana die and 'the nation' suffer again and again.

'Affective documentaries' frequently conjure up the spectre of Diana. First, as a voice: A National Geographic documentary, *Diana: In Her Own Words*, was entirely narrated using secret audio recordings made by her close friend, James Colthurst, in 1991–92. These clandestine recordings had been smuggled out of Diana's home at Kensington Palace and passed on to Andrew Morton; they formed the basis for his best-selling biography, *Diana: Her True Story* (1992). Morton's publisher, Michael O'Mara, published a new "anniversary edition" of the biography in June 2017. It also opens with 84 pages of "Diana's own words" taken from these audio recordings. (While the publication was clearly marketed to coincide with the 20th anniversary of her death, it was 'tastefully' advertised as honoring the 25th anniversary of the biography's first publication instead). Second, Diana was brought back to life on video: A different program sharing the same title, *Diana: In Her Own Words* (Channel 4, August 6, 2017), showed, for the first time in the U.K., video tapes of Diana made by her voice coach in 1992–93. (Parts of both recordings of Diana had previously been shown by NBC in the U.S. as *Princess Diana: The Secret Tapes* in 2004.) In these programs, Diana speaks from beyond her grave (or rather, is made to speak in acts of ventriloquism given that her voice is combined and intercut with archival footage). She also returns as an actual ghost in the TV adaptation of Mike Bartlett's play *King Charles III* (2017)—a history play about an imagined future which will be considered in more detail later. In conceptual terms, such ghostly re-presentations of Diana may partake in an ongoing "hauntology of performance" (Taylor 2003, esp. 134–6, 141, 157), in which the ritualized performance of mourning, with its own, seemingly universal repertoires, conjures up the ghost of Diana once more so that she can be re-sentimentalized and her death made mean-

ingful in new contexts, twenty years onwards. If in 1997 the myth of communal mourning was used in the construction of Labour's 'New Britain,' Diana's anniversary in 2017 occurred on the cusp of a 'new' Britain as well—a post-Brexit U.K. In March, Tory Prime Minister Theresa May had triggered the formal withdrawal process by invoking article 50 of the treaty of the EU. The nostalgic myth of a 'nation united in mourning' in 1997 gained new currency in 2017 as Britain continued to be torn between proponents of the 'leave' and 'remain' campaigns, and Scotland was renewing its push for devolution, which had been narrowly rejected in 2014 (for Brexit and nostalgia cf. Henneböhl, ch. 7). Even Diana's ghost was instrumentalized in these debates: *The Daily Mail*, a newspaper which had heavily advocated Brexit, reported that her spectral presence had contacted an old friend to say that she supports Brexit, effectively drawing a line in the sand between the unsuccessful 'remainers,' now frequently ridiculed as 'remoaners,' and Diana's remourners whom the *Daily Mail* firmly associated with the 'leave' campaign.

Affective documentaries frequently anchor their sentimental strategies by employing a 'factual' historical frame, resulting in a peculiar affective-reflexive form. *Diana: Seven Days That Shook the Windsors* (Channel 5, 30 May 2017) is one of several documentaries that use the seven days from Diana's death to her funeral as a narrative pattern. This also provides a mythological and biblical framework which helps inscribe the story of Diana into Christian providential narratives, including those of sin, suffering, and redemption. ITV's *Diana: The Day Britain Cried* (August 29, 2017, expectably retitled for international release *Diana: The Day the World Cried*), likewise provides a chronological record of the day of the funeral, with a focus on the decisions made in the organization of the event. It competed with two documentaries produced in conjunction with Diana's sons, Princes William and Harry: *Diana: Seven Days* (BBC One, August 27, 2017) employs the familiar chronicle pattern again. Their first documentary, however, the hagiographic *Diana, Our Mother: Her Life and Legacy* (ITV, July 24, 2017), inverts this principle and uses an overtly sentimental frame to chronicle Diana's "life and legacy." It is structured around Diana's family and friends sharing "their most intimate memories" while looking through "recently discovered" family photos and private home movies. The audience is invited to join this group. It would be reductive to argue that the documentary simply makes William and Harry's "personal psychological and emotional work available to the public" and shows them mourning vicariously "on behalf of the nation" (Jordan/Polland 12–13). Rather, its overall theme is "sharing memories," and a complex configuration of sentimental remembering and self-reflexive

medialization is at work—in short, a complex form of *nostalgia* that plays out in "the uncertain zone between memory and history" (Walder 2). This nostalgia extends beyond the sentimental object, Diana; the documentary nostalgically revisits sentimental strategies used in representing Diana and the nation in 1997. For example, it foregoes the framework of historical documentation and foregrounds affective moments of communal sharing, a crucial part of the myth of a nation united in mourning. This is imagined on and through television, which in 2017 had itself acquired the status of a 'traditional' medium. Diana also mainly features as a silent visual icon again, and not, in a revisionist sense, as 'her own voice.' Using her recently discovered family photos further curtails her agency since, as one of the princes observes, while she took most of the photos, the ones featured in the documentary are mainly those that portray her instead. The documentary is thus nostalgic in the very sentimental strategies it employs, but in doing so it paradoxically brackets off Diana historically—her "life and legacy" may live on in the memories the audience shares, but the documentary turns Diana very specifically into a medialized object of the past: dated family photos and home movies.

'Affective documentaries' about Diana thus seem to fall into two categories—those that foreground historiography to stage sentimentality and those that employ sentimental strategies to effect processes of historicization and memorialization. A similar bifurcation may be observed in the TV movies I will consider in more detail in the remainder of this section—a melodrama that imagines how 'ordinary people' were affected by Diana's death (*Diana and I*) and a play adaptation that employs an alternate history to imagine Diana's past in the future (*King Charles III*).

A Melodrama of Ordinary Lives: *Diana and I* (BBC Two, September 4, 2017)

In 2017, *Diana and I*'s director Peter Cattaneo was still best-known for his film *The Full Monty* (1997). First released in the U.K. two days before Diana died in Paris, *The Full Monty* provided the emotional flip side to the Blairite myth of a 'nation in mourning.' Whether the remarkable commercial success of this comedy may have been helped by the 'tragedy' unfolding in the media or not, the film provided a space for a shared reaction to the vestiges of neoliberal Thatcherite policies—only not, in the Blairite sense, by shared tears but by laughter. Its picaresque plot revolves around working class men putting on a striptease show in a working men's club to cope with rising unemployment—and by extension, with larger social changes the U.K. faced since the

1980s, such as industry being supplanted by the financial and service sectors and an erosion of the manufacturing base (Walkerdine 103–4; Feldmann/Krug 212–15).

Twenty years later, *Diana and I* was heavily advertised as being by the director of *The Full Monty*, not least because of its focus on 'ordinary' people again (although as with *The Full Monty*, what constitutes such ordinariness is carefully selected). According to the BBC's press releases, the TV movie was supposed to shine a spotlight on the "Princess's people" rather than the "People's Princess"—a revisionist focus that the BBC had already used on Diana's first anniversary in 1998: *The Princess's People* was a vox populi documentary based on discarded crowd interviews from the first week of September 1997 (McGuigan 35). *Diana and I* likewise features an ensemble cast to show how, according to the BBC, "ordinary people were affected by Diana's death." Spanning the seven days from the first media reports about Diana's accident once more, it comprises four plots that eventually intersect at her funeral: in London, a teenager whose mother dies the same night as Diana comes out as gay to his family (including his dead mother); a junior journalist on his honeymoon in Paris covers the reactions to her death; a young Asian mother in Bradford finds the courage to leave her arranged marriage and embarks with her daughter on a journey of self-discovery; and a middle-aged florist from Glasgow travels to London to sell flowers to people mourning Diana but ends up placing them in front of Kensington Palace. These 'ordinary' people represent various parts of the United Kingdom (with England being subdivided into the North and South), different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, a range of age groups, middle- and working-class settings, and various professional occupations. However, the film does not originate with ordinary people. Rather, Diana's iconicity provides a lens to construct that very ordinariness: Her championing sexual rights has brought forth the gay teenager, the flowers placed in front of the Palaces have produced the florist, her story of female liberation prompts the unhappy mother who flees an arranged marriage, and the journalists accused of hunting Diana down are embodied in the junior journalist. The Diana myth has "people[d] this little world"; conjured them up in a manner similar to Shakespeare's King Richard II who imagines his subjects while he is in prison (V.v.9, more on this later).

The myth of Diana also determines the roles they play, as the first plot demonstrates. It keeps sliding back and forth between Diana and her paradigmatical substitute, the teenager's mother. When Jack loses her to cancer, news of Diana's death plays on the television in the hospital; to commemorate her, he constructs a religious shrine out of mementos of his mother around a TV set

showing live coverage of Diana; at the end, he will have her funeral service at the time of Diana's (according to Jack, "[t]hey died together are going to heaven together"). For the service, he places a photo of Diana in his mother's hand. While only briefly visible, the photo is iconic: It shows Diana shaking hands with the resident of an AIDS hospice in October 1991. The use of this photo in the TV movie conflates AIDS and sexual orientation: Over his mother's (and in extension, Diana's) dead body, Jack finds the courage to come out as gay to his parents. In such moments the film traverses melodrama and soap opera, emulating the modes in which Diana was herself represented in the media.

Finally, the Diana myth also impacts the moral evaluation of characters and their actions. In *Diana and I*, everybody finds love except for the journalist, who loses it—his new wife leaves him on his honeymoon when he chooses to hunt down stories rather than stay with her. Once the Scottish florist has learned that flowers for Diana must not be sold for profit but need to be donated, given from the heart, she is compensated with a new husband. Yasmin, the young Asian mother who leaves her husband, discovers her independence; she stumbles into a karaoke bar and manages to impress a hen party by singing, first timidly but then with increasing confidence, Des'ree's "You Got to be" (1994), having dedicated the song to Princess Diana. At the end of the film, she is symbolically inscribed into the British national family when she joins her uncle Zaheer and his wife Rachel in a London suburb. Zaheer is a Muslim immigrant who is portrayed as a stereotypical Englishman, including faithfully serving cups of tea to people in distress. His role is to evaluate the feelings of the nation—or rather, remind the latter of the *correct* feelings. Zaheer represents melodrama's *tout dire*, its tendency to unequivocally 'say all'; he frequently speaks in moral *sententiae* ("I myself am a devout Muslim, married an atheist—but the heart follows no creed") and also frames the national meaning of Diana's death: "This beautiful country is kinder now than I have seen it in all my days as an Englishman." At the end, a suburban Muslim immigrant and his Anglo-Saxon atheist wife will be the substitute family for Yasmin, the young Asian woman and her child, in what is the film's vision of the modern British nation.

The film's final montage has all the characters' narratives intersect in London. *Diana and I* thus highlights the metropolitan dimension of the myth of mourning for Diana: There is a centripetal movement to London where the film's 'nation' unites—in front of a video wall in Hyde Park and outside Kensington Palace to place flowers. This unity is achieved in a formal sense by voice-over media coverage playing across all segments of the montage: first

the Queen's speech to the nation, next, Earl Spencer's speech in Westminster Abbey, and finally, Israel Kamakawiwo'ole's musical rendition of "Somewhere Over the Rainbow" (1993). Only in very rare instances, and mainly towards the end, does *Diana and I* conflate historical TV footage with the film's diegesis, and the characters seem to inhabit documentary TV images. As the final credits start rolling, however, the film fully transitions from fiction to 'faction' and incorporates vox-pop-segments of mourners in 1997—the film's melodramatic types are translated into historical people, and melodrama has been validated as (media) history.

Diana and I self-reflexively foregrounds Diana as a medialized simulacrum. Television sets, radios, and newspapers provide a constant stream of news in the background. The focus, however, is on media consumption, and throughout the film, there are only fleeting glimpses of Diana herself. In fictional films, the myth of Diana is now so powerful that it hardly needs any visual references to function any more—her 'iconic' imagery has long been medialized into the public consciousness. Diana is also conspicuously absent throughout the entire run of Channel 4's outrageous sitcom *The Windsors*, the abject companion piece to *The Crown*—both were in their second seasons in 2017. In *King Charles III*, the 2017 film adaptation of Mike Bartlett's acclaimed play (2014b), she again makes only fleeting appearances as well—but her (ghostly) presence is felt throughout.

Future Pasts: *King Charles III* (BBC Two, May 10, 2017)

King Charles III is an investigation into the social and political role of the modern British monarchy, its constitutional and symbolic power. It imagines a future in which Queen Elizabeth has died and Charles has succeeded her to the throne. He now needs to find his role in a political system that expects his limited constitutional powers to be purely ceremonial. When he exercises them politically, by refusing to give his approval to a bill and by using his Royal prerogative to dissolve Parliament, a constitutional crisis ensues that spills out into the streets, and the King is finally forced to abdicate in favor of his son, King William V, and his daughter-in-law Queen Catherine III.

King Charles III is also a modern re-imagining of a Shakespearean history play. Written mostly in blank verse and iambic pentameter, it features soliloquies addressed directly to the camera and an ambivalent ghost whose predictions prove a hermeneutical challenge to the people it visits. Diana is this ghost—she appears to both King Charles and to Prince William—, but *King*

Charles III is also haunted by the ghost of Shakespeare, as references to canonical Shakespeare plays abound (Morra 216–18; Ward 117–26). Diana's spectre evokes the ghosts of *Hamlet*, *Richard III*, *Julius Caesar* or *Macbeth*—and the deceptive nature of her predictions is reminiscent of the three witches, the sisters of fate, in *Macbeth* (a major reference for Bartlett).

The first of Diana's spectral appearances occurs after Charles has discussed a controversial new bill that would limit the powers of the press with both the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister. The latter urges him to sign it into law by evoking, in a feeble attempt at manipulation, the death of Diana:

> I have to say it does surprise, that with
> The great intrusion they have made into
> Your life, you'd have them left untouched like this.
> What of the pack of wolves that mercilessly
> Did hunt to death your late and much missed wife? […]
> I would have thought of all the victims,
> You'd feel the strongest something must be done.

Shortly after, King Charles catches a first glimpse of a white-clad Diana at the very end of a long corridor—a spectral apparition accompanied by an extradiegetic song: "I who have died am alive again today." On her next two appearances, she delivers almost identical prophecies to King Charles and Prince William. Charles's prophecy has been slightly revised in the film to form a perfect couplet (and to be less mocking than in the play): "An indecisive man, and oft so sad, / Will be the greatest king we ever had." It can be read as a projection of Charles's psyche—a reading Bartlett self-consciously addressed in lines he eventually cut before the first performance of the play: "This is psychology so manifest / If shown upon the stage I would cry out / A fraud. Simplicity! And badly done!" (Bartlett 2014a). Diana makes her second prophecy to William immediately after Kate (clearly channeling Lady Macbeth) has spurned him on to follow his ambitions. This couplet is deceptively simple: "Such pain, my son, such hurt. But now be glad / You'll be the greatest king we ever had."

Both Charles and William interpret their prophecies in ways that favor them, and Diana is brought up again in a climactic scene when both of their ambitions come to a head. Here, William suddenly appears to his father at night in much the same way Diana did before, so that in terms of mise-en-

scène, he has taken Diana's place. The King immediately seizes on the symbolic implications of this visual substitution:

> There's something in your face I recognise.
> It was Diana where I saw it last,
> And I had hoped that it had died with her.
> But here it is, in you, ambition lurks!

Diana's spectral presence thus exceeds her embodiment as a ghost; she lives on in other characters as well: In the play, Charles also first suspects her ghost to be his mother, Queen Elizabeth II, and scholarship has read Kate "as the new Diana" (Wilson). Even her informal style as "Queen of Hearts" functions as a free-floating signifier: Diana is last mentioned in the play when the Leader of the Opposition tells Charles, who has just abdicated, that he will always remain his "king of hearts"—revered but, for all intends and purposes, (politically) dead. Diana's pervasive presence thus holds the play together, but not in terms of any sentimental attachments any more. Bartlett chips away at sentimental strategies until what is exposed are naked ambition and manipulation.

The overt references to Diana we considered so far, as a figure representing a past that keeps its hold on the present, clearly demonstrate how easily she can be inscribed into the generic form of a Shakespearean history play. Bartlett uses the Shakespearean paradigm to investigate the relations between the monarchy, the state, and civil society, and *King Charles III* also includes a (mock-)Shakespearean state-of-the-nation speech. Here, the voice of the common people is not represented by a Gardener (as in *Richard II*) but by a black Kebab shop owner. He is primarily concerned with the new monarch's lack of feelings ("His mother dies, he don't even cry? Now what's that about?"). His extended simile for the nation is a kebab, made up of small, individual pieces of meat held together by a steel skewer. The play and the film differ subtly in their political interpretation of this metaphor—whether the focus is on the cohesion provided by the steel core, the monarch, holding Britain together (this is what the film stresses) or on the forces that cut away the meat from the skewer until "Britain get[s] so cut down, that it's not Britain any more" (III.v.36-7; lines from the play that have been cut in the film). The film more than the play also imagines the nation as a multiracial family in crisis (Green MacDonald 167–73; Pittman 187–90). 'Family' is a flexible concept in *King Charles III* that can be scaled up and down to variously include the nuclear family, the monarchy as an institution, and the nation. In each case, it also involves inclusions and ex-

clusions. Prince Harry's working-class (and prose-speaking) girlfriend Jess is the focal point of such debates. In her first meeting with Harry, she questions his parentage—if his ginger hair was due to the fact that Diana had an affair with her riding instructor James "Hewlitt" (*sic*), "You'd be out of the family." In the 2017 film, Jess is played by a black actress, Tamara Lawrance, which lends poignancy to her character's own inclusions and exclusions, as did the fact that the actual Prince Harry and his future wife Meghan Markle had gone public with their relationship in November 2016. King Charles first welcomes Jess to "our family," but his sentimental gesture of holding hands with her and Camilla seems a calculated, manipulative move in his political struggle, and Harry finally excludes her from the coronation of the new King.

Individual textual allusions are neither the only nor perhaps not the most significant aspects of how *King Charles III* links up with Shakespeare. References to the mode of Shakespeare's succession plays, the genre of history plays, and Shakespeare's metatheatricality are important as well. The latter points towards a link between theatricality and statecraft (e.g. Orgel), and according to Irene Morra, the chosen idiom of Bartlett's play likewise reinforces an "idea of empty, conventional state theatre—misunderstood, blindly re-enacted, perpetually fragmenting and socially manipulative" (220). Finally, Diana's presence in *King Charles III* raises more general questions of temporality and history. Diana represents a past that keeps its hold on the present and is cast in the paradigm of a modern Shakespearean chronicle play, and her prophecies—the latent possibilities inherent in the past—are addressed to more than one person and need to be interpreted to forecast, and to fashion, the future. For American audiences, some editions of the play included an explanatory subtitle, "A Future History Play," to indicate its specific historical perspective, and in even more general terms, Bartlett's play may well highlight the confluence of a mixed temporality of the Early Modern chronicle drama and a new experience of a "fullness of contemporary time" in the twenty-first century, in which different temporalities again interact (Nicosia).

Like Shakespeare's history plays, *King Charles III* is a self-conscious reflection about memory and remembrance in the process of fashioning (a future) history. In the play, Charles believes his story has already been written; he likens himself to a finished script: "I'm like a book myself, stuck on the shelf / For years, ignored and waiting."(V.i.97-8) William reminds his father that history is malleable, and that Diana's prediction can come true for Charles—but only if Charles submits to William's revised future history:

> The greatest king? And so you shall.
> For when they write the history books 'bout this
> They will tell stories crisis-like about
> The stormy days after the Queen had died
> And how for weeks you contemplated hard
> Upon the right and proper thing to do,
> And, in the end, decided for the good of all,
> Your people and their long-term happiness
> You'd selflessly stand aside and pass it on,
> To younger hands, more popular and with
> More time to reign […].

Again, *King Charles III* clearly evokes Shakespeare's *Richard II*. Like Charles, Richard has to face the ambivalent nature of his symbolic power—while it may ultimately not prove to be a match to Bolingbroke's realities of power, it can nevertheless be used to great effect, albeit only temporarily. Richard II is forced to abdicate, but he turns his self-deposition into a ritualized ceremony and draws it out. At the end of *King Charles III,* Charles takes the crown and holds on to it, until he finally places it on the head of William—choosing the future history William has outlined for him. Charles prolongs his literal grip on power by musing on the crown, and his verses conflate several references to *Richard II*: "[…] from the side, bejewelled, it looks so rich / But turn it thus, and this is what you see / Nothing." To glimpse the emptiness of "the hollow crown" (*Richard II*, III.ii.160), it needs a specific 'perspective,' since looking at it from a distance will only show one of if its aspects, its splendor. Only by looking "awry" (II.ii.19), from a different angle, its simultaneous emptiness is revealed as well. In *Richard II*, "perspective" is also the technical term for anamorphic paintings that encode different points of view and temporalities simultaneously (e.g. Hans Holbein's *The Ambassadors* with its *memento mori*, a skull), and it is also a reflexive metaphor that organizes the historical 'double vison' of the play.

Coda: 1597

Bartlett's use of Shakespeare is symptomatic. Shakespeare is frequently referred to in moments of crisis for the monarchy (Wilson), and as modern myths, his plays provide templates to discuss questions of state and nation. As

Christina Wald (9–12) has argued, Shakespeare scholarship has long explored how his plays remain obliquely embedded in contemporary popular culture (at least on the stage, in television, and film) in terms that exceed simple models of a linear intertextual 'influence': Such scholarship considers a "Shakespeare rhizome" (Lanier), stages "collaborations" (Henderson) or "creative collisions" (Holderness) between early modern and modern culture, and explores their links by means of "crossmappings" (Bronfen 2018, 2020).

In a coda to this essay, I would like to pick up the spectral presence of Diana in *King Charles III* (which is by no means singular, cf. her ghostly appearances in the sixth season of *The Crown* in 2023), pick up on Bartlett's frequent echoes of *Richard II*, and sketch the outlines of such a crossmapping—between the sentimental myth of Diana in 1997 and what might be called a proto-sentimental myth of Shakespeare's Richard II in 1597. This is not meant as a formal research design but rather as an informal heuristics. It involves borrowing a specific perspective from the play, its 'double vision' (cf. Žižek): Looking "awry" at Richard II and Diana—considering them heuristically as part of a similar sentimental 'scenario' and gazing obliquely at the one with the other—may help bring similarities as well as differences into focus.

Both Shakespeare's Richard II and Diana are liminal monarchical figures that have been discarded from an official monarchy but seek to reclaim their position by fashioning informal identity positions for themselves: Diana as the "People's princess," Richard as the 'King of Griefs': "My crown I [resign], but still my griefs are mine. / You may my glories and my state depose, / But not my griefs; still am I king of those." (IV.i.191–3). Both of these self-fashionings prove to be extremely powerful in informal ways. In Richard's case, the very act of 'unkinging' (cf. IV.i.220) paradoxically grants him performative power—he draws it out in the long deposition scene by improvising his own ceremonies (IV.i.203–221). After their death, mourning Richard and Diana is hedged in and reinscribed into a commemorative national history, but to some extent both retain their liminal state of inclusive exclusion. As John Joughin has noticed in passing, Richard and Diana may both represent 'sacrificial' national figures whose exemplary status in a "psycho-drama of mourning and melancholia" allows their respective audiences "the opportunity to shape a new politics of communal identity, where the nation is positioned as a form of futural or imagined identity" (Joughin 2006a, 28–9).

This 'sentimental scenario' is propelled by grief and mourning. An introspective, self-reflective mourning play, *Richard II* is fundamentally about grief and sorrow. If Richard is the 'King of Griefs'—grieving about himself, shedding

theatrical tears, and devising how he will be mourned even before he is dead (V.i.38–50)—, his wife Isabel is the 'Queen of Sorrows,' grieving about a future that for her (but not the audience) is still unknown. Isabel is pregnant with a future history: "methinks, / Some unborn sorrow, ripe in Fortune's womb, / Is coming towards me" (II.ii.9–11). Her sorrow and grief are born out of "nothing"—a term that in this play connotes not so much emptiness as potentiality: "For nothing hath begot my something grief, / Or something hath the nothing that I grieve" (36–37). Richard's excessively theatricalized performances of grief point towards the histrionic politics of personal grief, of communal mourning practices and official commemoration on the early modern stage—they are both political (in that they draw attention to contested memorial cultures) and meta-theatrical (in that they consistently involve a meditation on the role of acting in the public sphere; Döring 61–66). And they likewise involve the fashioning of a future history: Richard casts himself as the impossible object of his own grief and conceives of his 'self' in terms of the very commemorative practices that will canonize his memory (Joughin 2006b, 54).

The curious (proto-)sentimental scenario can best be observed in the character of Richard after he relinquishes the crown. Hugh Grady has argued that Richard's "disinterpellation" (98), not least the relinquishing of his body politic, opens up the space for an extended enquiry into subjectivity—which for Richard is anchored in an emotional experience (Grady 96, 98), hence the play's preoccupation with sorrow and grief. (Grady relies on Robert Solomon's rational understanding of 'emotion,' but it also seems possible to use the term in a more specifically modern sense that was only just developing in Shakespeare's time; cf. Dixon 2003.) Richard does not explore a Rousseauistic, seemingly more 'authentic,' interiority, he rather engages in poeticized explorations of more unmoored, distinctly modern subjectivities (Grady 80, 98). These explorations involve playful self-interpellations ("Thus play I in one person many people, / [...] Sometimes am I king; / Then treasons make me wish myself a beggar, / And so I am," V.v.31–34), most specifically in Pomfret, where Richard's thoughts "people the little world" of his prison cell (V.v.9). His thoughts conjure up fellow subjects, like the simple-minded beggars which he imagines sitting in stocks (V.v.25–30), and he imagines future subject positions for himself, such as being buried under the King's highway and trampled on by his former subjects (III.iii.155–159). He offers these subjectivities up for contemplation and to elicit sympathy (Aumerle is promptly moved to tears, 160), only to discard them again (a rhetorical strategy reminiscent of Laurence Sterne's invention of the very slaves with which he sympathizes, see

above—which in turn may point more fundamentally towards something I cannot explore here, the self-generating aspect of such sentimental scenarios).

It is, of course, not strictly necessary to call this dynamic proto-*sentimental*—but then again, it is quite telling that as soon as modern concepts of a 'sentimental' mode become culturally available in the 18th century, they are promptly applied to Richard (cf. Forker 10), and once the term is predominantly used in a pejorative sense in the 19th century, Richard likewise becomes a (mere) "sentimentalist" (ibid. 16) and is styled "the sentimental king" ("In action how impotent; in word how strong!", Ransome 192). At the end of the 19th century, as Richard's "sentimental effeminacy" tended to dominate academic criticism of the play (Forker 415), sentimentalization coincides with a feminization. Mid-20th-century scholarship talks of "Richard's sentimental, magical investment in royal semantics" and his "sentimental verbal kingdoms"—but it also notes Richard's (meta)theatrical, reflexive use of such sentimentalism (Stirling, Berger), thus already drawing attention to the sentimental as a political strategy that potentially works by *manipulations* of sympathy—a notion that may already be at work, in a latent fashion, in *Richard II* (cf. Meek 2015 & 2023, who argues that "sympathy," while not yet a moral sentiment, around this time began to gradually attain its modern meaning as a feeling for fellow human beings, rather than just a correspondence of natural phenomena).

After their respective deaths, Richard and Diana prove "a thorn in the side of monumental history" (Joughin 2006a, 29) as the personal grief felt by and for them cannot be completely hedged in by official commemorative practices. This is almost literally the case with Diana: Her monumental grave is located on a secluded island in a private park, but she not only keeps returning to life (to die again) at her anniversaries; her spectre now also marks the affective fault lines between the Royal family and the public, as she continues to be conjured up, for example, in discussions of Meghan Markle. *Richard II* likewise demonstrates the limits of hedging in grief. At the end of the play, Bolingbroke, now Henry IV, attempts to channel Richard's grief into communal mourning practices. He invites the remaining nobles to "Come, mourn with me for what I do lament, / And put on sullen black incontinent. / [...] March sadly after; grace my mournings here / In weeping after this untimely bier" (V.vi.47–52) and stages a funeral procession to end the play. His final speech also picks up the play's historical double vision, its writing of a future history, by inscribing the events of the play into what will become a providential (Tudor) historiography of sin and eventual redemption: "To wash this blood off from my guilty hand,"

Henry promises to "make a voyage to the Holy Land" (49–51). His attempt to use an international, religious conflict to patch up national division, however, is ultimately unsuccessful, as the next play in the tetralogy reminds us. The first part of *Henry IV* opens with the same king proclaiming that the situation in Jerusalem has gotten worse, he has not gone on a crusade yet (he never will in Shakespeare), and England is now embroiled in a civil war: Henry's claim to the throne remains troubled because the symbolism of Richard's deposition lingers on. Richard's spectral presence cannot be laid to rest.

Looking "awry" at Richard and Diana can also involve addressing some of the differences in this sentimental scenario, specifically regarding gender and mediality, which in turn may be used to focus on the cultural specificity of both. Scholarship on Diana has long stressed the role assigned to femininity in her sentimental performances. Coincidentally, the year she died, the BBC also aired Fiona Shaw's ground-breaking performance at the National Theatre in which she played a female (and at times androgynous) Richard II. In an interview, the actress drew a connection to Diana and read her funeral four months later as a spectacular reply to a central idea of the play—that the monarchy needs to serve the people and cannot rely on notions of the divine rights of kings, as Richard did (Shaw 163–4). While the timing was certainly coincidental, the performance did highlight that Richard II's proto-sentimental performances need also be considered in terms of early modern gender performativity and the way suffering and grief acquire cultural currency. York's account of Richard being escorted into London after his deposition may serve as an example:

> [...] men's eyes
> Did scowl on Richard. No man cried God save him!
> No joyful tongue gave him his welcome home,
> But dust was thrown upon his sacred head,
> Which with such gentle sorrow he shook off,
> His face still combating with tears and smiles,
> The badges of his grief and patience,
> That had not God for some strong purpose steeled
> The hearts of men, they must perforce have melted
> And barbarism itself have pitied him. (V.ii.27–36)

Richard's patiently borne suffering, while clearly reminiscent of earlier passion plays (cf. Joughin 2006a, 27–28), also looks forward to a new (and feminine-

connoted) model of heroic behavior. Mary Beth Rose has argued that in the 17th century, a "heroics of endurance," drawing on conventional models (e.g. stoicism) but also on a new sense of interiority and the re(e)valuation of 'private' virtues that were now made to circulate publicly, was increasingly set against a more traditional (and masculine-connoted) "heroics of action" (Rose). The sentimental scenario outlined above could more easily be aligned with the heroics of patience and endurance in the face of suffering, sorrow, and grief. *Richard II* may already anticipate how such heroic models will be negotiated on the stage: While he bears the badge of patience in this scene, he will die by exclaiming "patience is stale," seize a weapon and attack his guard. The historical Richard suffered a much more 'sentimental' fate as he (was?) most likely starved to death in prison.

Finally: mediality. Richard is a character on stage who mourns for himself, Diana is a medialized princess who is being mourned, and as much as Richard is verbose, Diana remains mainly silent in her representations—in late 1997, she circulated as an image rather than voice: "In death, Princess Diana, creature of the modern media, became star of the silent screen," Jenny Kitzinger commented in 1998 (67). Giving her back her voice on the 20th anniversary of her death ("Diana: In Her Own Words") only ostensibly grants her agency since her recorded voice had, of course, long become a commodity, and using it just another form of appropriation. In contrast, Richard uses the rhetorical and performative power of the theatre stage, the (predominantly verbal) mass medium of his time, to become the (not so mute) object of grief.

On the other hand, he might just be associated with photography after all, and the truly significant difference between Diana and Richard may be that while she was considered the most photographed woman on the planet (Kitzinger 67), he is the one who takes pictures. Scholars have frequently conceptualized the peculiar temporal aesthetics, the anterior futures and future pasts, of Shakespeare's history plays with reference to visual models and techniques—especially (as I have done) early modern ones such as anamorphic paintings (e.g. Gilman). Recently, however, Alice Dailey has used Roland Barthes's phenomenology of the photograph in his *Camera Lucida* (1980) to conceptualize the conflations of temporality in Shakespeare's history plays and to focus more specifically on the still images (the play's "little, little grave[s]," III.ii.154) which Richard produces of his past or dead self as sites of aesthetic objectification and scopophilic anticipation (Dailey 17–21). Such a hermeneutic may be appropriately apt because in its contemplation of death, it already connects the different temporalities with sentimentality

and nostalgia: anticipating and recalling death simultaneously. I opened this essay with a look at the sixth season of *The Crown*. Its sentimental mode of storytelling does something remarkably similar. It works towards Diana's crash in scopophilic anticipation (the actual press photo was never printed in the mainstream U.K. papers) and anticipates a future in which her death has already been aesthetically objectified—again and again.

References

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 2012. *Trauma: A Social Theory.* Cambridge/Malden: Polity Press.

Anderson, Digby, and Peter Mullen, eds. 1998. *Faking It: The Sentimentalisation of Modern Society*. London: The Social Affairs Unit/St Edmundsbury Press.

Barber, Nicholas. 1998. "Television: It's a state of total Dianarchy." *The Independent*, August 29, 1998. https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/television-it-s-a-state-of-total-dianarchy-1175026.html.

Bartlett, Mike. 2014a. "How I wrote *King Charles III*." *The Guardian*, September 20, 2014, p. 19.

Bartlett, Mike. 2014b. *King Charles III*. London: Nick Hern Books.

Berger, Harry. 1988. "*Richard II* 3.2: An Exercise in Imaginary Audition." *ELH* 55 (4): 755–96.

Berlant, Lauren. 2008. *The Female Complaint: The Unfinished Business of Sentimentality in American Culture*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1998. "Designer Creations." In *After Diana: Irreverent Elegies*, edited by Mandy Merck, 103–10. London: Verso.

Biddle, Lucy, and Tony Walter. 1998. "The Emotional English and Their Queen of Hearts." *Folklore* 109: 96–99.

Blair, Tony. 2010. *A Journey*. London: Hutchinson.

Bronfen, Elisabeth. 2018. *Crossmappings: On Visual Culture*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Bronfen, Elisabeth. 2020. *Serial Shakespeare: An Infinite Variety of Appropriations in American TV Drama.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Coles, Richard. 1998. "Feelin's." In *After Diana: Irreverent Elegies*, edited by Mandy Merck, 169–82. London: Verso.

Dailey, Alice. 2022. *How to Do Things with Dead People: History, Technology, and Temporality from Shakespeare to Warhol*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Davies, Jude. 2001. *Diana, A Cultural History: Gender, Race, Nation and the People's Princess.* Houndmills/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dixon, Thomas. 2003. *From Passions to Emotions: The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, Thomas. 2015. *Weeping Britannia: Portrait of a Nation in Tears.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Döring, Tobias. 2006. *Performances of Mourning in Shakespearean Theatre and Early Modern Culture.* Houndmills: Palgrave.

Dyson, John. 2021. *Report of The Dyson Investigation by The Right Honourable Lord Dyson*, May 14, 2021, https://downloads.bbc.co.uk/aboutthebbc/reports/reports/dyson-report-20-may-21.pdf.

Feldmann, Doris, and Christian Krug. 2022. "Zur filmischen Repräsentation britischer Arbeiterklassen, c. 1960–2000: Heroisches, Sentimentales—und Männliches." In *Distinktion, Ausgrenzung und Mobilität: Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven auf soziale Ungleichheit*, edited by Victoria Gutsche, Ronja Holzinger, Larissa Pfaller, and Melissa Sarikaya, 195–219. Erlangen: FAU University Press.

Fluck, Winfried. 1997. *Das kulturelle Imaginäre: Eine Funktionsgeschichte des amerikanischen Romans, 1790–1900.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Forker, Charles R., ed. 2022. *Shakespeare: The Critical Tradition. King Richard II.* London: The Arden Shakespeare.

Geraghty, Christine. 1998. "Story." *Screen* 39 (1): 70–73.

Gilman, Ernest B. 1976. "*Richard II* and the Perspectives of History." *Renaissance Drama* 7: 85–115.

Grady, Hugh. 2002. *Shakespeare, Machiavelli, Montaigne: Power and Subjectivity from Richard II to Hamlet.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Green MacDonald, Joyce. 2020. *Shakespearean Adaptation, Race and Memory in the New World*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Greenhalgh, Susanne. 1999. "Our Lady of Flowers: The Ambiguous Politics of Diana's Floral Revolution." In *Mourning Diana: Nation, Culture and the Performance of Grief*, edited by Adrian Kear and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, 40–59. London/New York: Routledge.

Henderson, Diana. 2006. *Collaborations with the Past: Reshaping Shakespeare across Time and Media*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.

Henneböhl, Dennis. 2023. *'Taking Back Control' of the Nation and Its History? Contemporary Fiction's Engagement with Nostalgia in Brexit Britain*. Paderborn: Brill Fink.

Hermes, Joke, and Merel Noordhuizen. 1999. "Diana: Death of a Media-Styled Secular Saint." *Etnofoor* 12 (2): 76–91.

Hey, Valerie. 1999. "Be(long)ing: New Labour, New Britain and the 'Dianaization' of Politics." In *Mourning Diana: Nation, Culture and the Performance of Grief*, edited by Adrian Kear and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, 60–76. London/New York: Routledge.

Holderness, Graham. 2014. *Tales from Shakespeare: Creative Collisions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Homans, Margaret. 1998. *Royal Representations: Queen Victoria and British Culture, 1837–1876*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, Boris. 1997. "Where is this—Argentina?" *The Daily Telegraph*, September 3, 1997.

Johnson, Richard. 1999. "Exemplary Differences: Mourning (and not Mourning) a Princess." In *Mourning Diana: Nation, Culture and the Performance of Grief*, edited by Adrian Kear and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, 15–39. London/New York: Routledge.

Jordan, Christina, and Imke Polland. 2020. "Introduction: Mapping New Realms in the Study of Contemporary European Monarchies." In *Realms of Royalty: New Directions in Researching Contemporary European Monarchies*, edited by Christina Jordan and Imke Polland, 9–26. Bielefeld: transcript.

Joughin, John J. 2006a. "*Richard II* and the Performance of Grief." In *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories*, edited by Dermot Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves, and Stephen Longstaffe, 15–31. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.

Joughin, John J. 2006b. "Shakespeare's Memorial Aesthetics." In *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, edited by Peter Holland, 43–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kear, Adrian, and Deborah Lynn Steinberg. 1999a. "Ghost Writing." In *Mourning Diana: Nation, Culture and the Performance of Grief*, edited by Adrian Kear and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, 1–14. London/New York: Routledge.

Kear, Adrian, and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, eds. 1999b. *Mourning Diana: Nation, Culture and the Performance of Grief*. London/New York: Routledge.

Kitzinger, Jenny. 1999. "The Moving Power of Moving Images: Television Constructions of Princess Diana." In *The Mourning for Diana*, edited by Tony Walter, 65–76. Oxford: Berg.

Landler, Mark. 2022. "BBC Apologizes for Reporting Royal Nanny Had an Affair." *The New York Times*, July 22, 2022, A4.

Lanier, Douglas. 2014. "Shakespearean Rhizomatics: Adaptation, Ethics, Value." In *Shakespeare and the Ethics of Appropriation*, edited by Alexa Huang and Elizabeth Rivlin, 21–40. Houndmills/New York: Palgrave.

Lomax, Emily. 1999. "Diana Al-Fayed: Ethnic Marketing and the End(s) of Racism." In *Diana, The Making of a Media Saint*, edited by Jeffrey Richards, Scott Wilson, and Linda Woodhead, 74–97. London/New York: I. B. Tauris.

McGuigan, Jim. 2010. "British Identity and The People's Princess." In *Cultural Analysis*, 22–38. London: Sage.

Meek, Richard. 2015. "'Rue e'en for ruth': *Richard II* and the Imitation of Sympathy." In *The Renaissance of Emotion: Understanding Affect in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, edited by Richard Meek and Erin Sullivan, 130–152. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Meek, Richard. 2023. *Sympathy in Early Modern Literature and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Merck, Mandy, ed. 1998. *After Diana: Irreverent Elegies.* London: Verso.

Morra, Irene. 2016. *Verse Drama in England, 1900–2015: Art, Modernity and the National Stage*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

Morton, Andrew. 2017. *Diana: Her True Story—In Her Own Words. 25th Anniversary Edition Featuring Exclusive New Material*. New York/London/et. al: Simon & Schuster.

Nicosia, Marissa. 2023. *Imagining Time in the English Chronicle Play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Hear, Anthony. 1998. "Diana, Queen of Hearts: Sentimentality Exposed and Canonised." In *Faking It: The Sentimentalisation of Modern Society*, edited by Digby Anderson and Peter Mullen, 181–90. London: Social Affairs Unit.

Orgel, Stephen. 1975. *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance.* Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1975.

Pittman, L. Monique. 2022. *Shakespeare's Contested Nations: Race, Gender, and Multicultural Britain in Performances of the History Plays*. London/New York: Routledge.

Plunkett, John. 2003. *Queen Victoria: First Media Monarch*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pollak, Ellen. 2003. *Incest and the English Novel, 1684–1814*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ransome, Cyril. 1890. *Short Studies of Shakespeare's Plots.* London/New York: Macmillan.

Richards, Jeffrey, Scott Wilson, and Linda Woodhead, eds. 1999. *Diana, The Making of a Media Saint*. London/New York: I. B. Tauris.

Rose, Mary Beth. 2002. *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.

Schor, Esther. 1994. *Bearing the Dead: The British Culture of Mourning from the Enlightenment to Victoria*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Seidler, Victor Jeleniewski. 2013. *Remembering Diana: Cultural Memory and the Reinvention of Authority*. Houndmills/New York: Palgrave.

Shakespeare, William. 2002. *King Richard II*, edited by Charles R. Forker. London: Arden Shakespeare [3rd Series].

Shaw, Fiona. 2010. "Playing Richard: An Interview with Fiona Shaw." In *Richard II*, edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, 162–6. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Shome, Raka. 2014. *Diana and Beyond: White Femininity, National Identity, and Contemporary Media Culture*. Urbana/Chicago/Springfield: University of Illinois Press.

Stirling, Brents. 2015. "Bolingbroke's 'Decision'." (1951) In *Richard II: Critical Essays*, edited by Jeanne T. Newlin, 217–29. London: Routledge.

Taylor, Diana. 2003. "False Identifications: Minority Populations Mourn Diana." In *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*, 133–60. Durham: Duke University Press.

Taylor, John A. 2000. *Diana, Self-interest, and British National Identity*. Westport: Praeger.

Thomas, James. 2002. *Diana's Mourning: A People's History*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Wald, Christina. 2020. *Shakespeare's Serial Returns in Complex TV*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Walder, Dennis. 2011. *Postcolonial Nostalgias: Writing, Representation, and Memory*. New York/London: Routledge.

Walkerdine, Valerie. 1999. "The Crowd in the Age of Diana: Ordinary Inventiveness and the Popular Imagination." In *Mourning Diana: Nation, Culture and the Performance of Grief*, edited by Adrian Kear and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, 98–107. New York/London: Routledge.

Ward, Ian. 2021. *The Play of Law in Modern British Theatre*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wilson, Richard. 2017. "The Madness of King Charles III." *Critical Survey* 29 (2): 76–93.

Wood, Marcus. 2002. *Slavery, Empathy and Pornography*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1992. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture*. Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.

TV and Film

Bashir, Martin. 1995. "An Interview with H.R.H. the Princess of Wales." *Panorama*, BBC1, November 20, 1995, 54 mins.

The Crown. 2016–2023. Streaming drama, wr. Peter Morgan. Left Bank Pictures and Sony Pictures Television. Netflix, November 4, 2016–December 14, 2023.

Diana and I. 2017. TV movie, dir. Peter Cattaneo, wr. Jeremy Brock. Big Talk Productions. BBC Two, September 4, 2017, 9 p.m. 90 mins.

Diana: The Day Britain Cried. 2017. TV documentary (U.K.), dir. Leslie Woodhead, prod. Lorraine McKechnie. Finestripe Productions for ITV and Smithsonian Channel. ITV, Tuesday, August 29, 2017, 8 p.m. 58 mins.

Diana: In Her Own Words. 2017a. TV documentary (U.K.), dir. Kevin Sim, prod. Charles Furneaux. Kaboom Film & TV for Channel 4. Channel 4, Sunday, August 6, 2017, 8 p.m. 110 mins.

Diana: In Her Own Words. 2017b. TV documentary (U.S.), dir. and prod. Tom Jennings. 1895 Films for National Geographic. August 14, 2017, 9 p.m. ET. 88 mins. DVD: National Geographic, 112 mins.

Diana: The Mourning After. 1998. TV documentary (U.K.), wr. and pres. Christopher Hitchens, dir. Mark Soldinger. Just Television for Channel Four Television. Channel 4, Thursday, August 27, 1998, 11.45 p.m. 45 mins.

Diana, Our Mother: Her Life and Legacy. 2017. TV documentary (U.K./U.S.), dir. Ashley Gething, prod. Nick Kent. Oxford Films for ITV and HBO. ITV, Monday, July 24, 2017, 9 p.m. 65 mins. DVD: HBO Documentary Films.

Diana: Seven Days. 2017. TV documentary (U.K.), dir. Henry Singer, prod. Jenny Saunders. Sandpaper Films for BBC One. BBC One, Sunday, August 27, 2017, 7:30 p.m. 90 mins. DVD: BBC.

Diana: Seven Days That Shook the Windsors. 2017. TV documentary (U.K.), dir. Ben Ryder. Blakeway Productions for Channel 5. Channel 5, Tuesday, May 30, 2017, 9 p.m. 90 mins. DVD (as *Diana: Seven Days That Shook the World*): BBC Worldwide.

King Charles III. 2017. TV drama (U.K.), wr. Mike Bartlett, dir. Rupert Goold. A Drama Republic Production for BBC and Masterpiece. BBC Two, Wednesday, May 10, 2017, 9 p.m. 89 mins. DVD: Universum Film, 2018.

Princess Diana: The Secret Tapes. 2004. Two-part TV documentary (U.S.), dir. and prod. Jason Raff. NBC, Thursdays, March 4 and March 11, 2004, 10 p.m. ET. 90 mins.

The Princess's People. 1998. TV documentary (U.K.), dir. Colin Luke, ed. Edward Roberts. Mosaic Films. BBC Two, Sunday, September 6, 1998, 9:30 p.m. 75 mins.

Richard II. 1997. TV play, dir. Deborah Warner. National Video Corporation Arts, 1997. BBC2, Saturday, March 22, 1997, 10:15 p.m. DVD: Illuminations, 2018.

The Windsors. 2016–2023. TV sitcom, wr. George Jeffrie and Bert Tyler-Moore. Noho Film and Television Channel 4, May 6, 2016–April 30, 2023.