**9**

**‘Certain o'er incertainty’:**

***Troilus and Cressida,* Ambiguity and the *Lewis* episode *‘*Generation of Vipers’**

**Sarah Olive**

One of the concerns of this book is to explore the broadcasting of Shakespeare, in the sense of distributing him widely. Adaptation and appropriation of Shakespeare are predominantly figured as facilitating his broadcasting to expansive audiences, for better or for worse: non-Anglophone audiences, young audiences, non-theatre goers, to name a few. Critics and theatre practitioners have discussed the way in which adaptation and appropriation are seen to achieve the broadcasting of Shakespeare by making him more seem relevant, updating him, and making him anew[[1]](#endnote-1). However, in this chapter, I want to examine a counter case, the ‘Generation of Vipers’ episode of the ITV series *Lewis,* part of the larger *Morse/Lewis/ Endeavour* print and television ‘franchise’ (running since 1987).[[2]](#endnote-2) I argue that the episode constitutes an instance of the interpretation and cultural production of Shakespeare, specifically *Troilus and Cressida*, which eschews recent critical championing of the play’s gender and sexual politics – as ambiguous, permissive and queer. Its scriptwriter, Patrick Harbison, instead reads *Troilus and Cressida* retrogressively, through twentieth century criticism, and older notions of gender and sexuality (sometimes gendered sexuality) evident therein, in order to appropriate the play into a genre that peaked in print in the early twentieth-century but retains a certain popularity on British television and beyond: the Golden Age detective genre. In this sense, the chapter considers the effects of genre on the cultural production of Shakespeare.

*Troilus and Cressida*, observes R.A.Foakes, ‘seems deliberately to open up conflicting or contradictory perspectives on the main characters and themes.’[[3]](#endnote-3) The play might then appear an unusual candidate for appropriation in a gentle, detective series drawing on the traditions of the Golden Age of crime fiction, especially given the genre’s need for ultimate certainty to conquer initial ambiguity and for multiple possible meanings to give way to a single, fixed interpretation of ‘whodunit’. Rising to the challenge, ‘Generation of Vipers’ appropriates *Troilus and Cressida.* It takes its title from Pandarus’ dialogue with Helen and Paris about characteristics that he contends betoken lust – passionate, sexual thoughts and deeds – rather than love (3.1.126). This quotation is the most overt way in which the episode stakes its identity as part of a richly allusive series, one that intermittently references early modern drama, but had not previously used *Troilus and Cressida*.[[4]](#endnote-4) Such appropriation is not an unskilled or uncreative labor and although situated within popular rather than literary culture, it has sometimes been seen as inferior to Shakespeare’s celebrated use of source texts to complicate or challenge literary or theatrical convention.[[5]](#endnote-5) *Lewis*’ use of *Titus Andronicus* and Verdi’s operatic reworking of *Othello* in various episodes courageously eschews the phenomenon, articulated by Susan Baker, of the detective genre appropriating the comedies.[[6]](#endnote-6) Instead, the seriesparticipates in a contemporary cultural project of engaging a wide, non-specialist audience with previously neglected, unpopular, or problematic texts in Shakespeare’s oeuvre, including the putative (but now uncomfortably stereotyping, even racist) comedy *The* *Merchant of Venice*.[[7]](#endnote-7) To give a sense of its reach, it is worth noting that *Lewis* is broadcast in the US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and several non-Anglophone countries in Europe and South America. In the UK, the audience for the series appears to be around the 6-8 million mark on an episode’s first broadcast, figures that compare favourably with prominent reality television shows and other prime-time drama.

The episode’s writer Patrick Harbinson skillfully negotiates the tensions outlined above, mindful of audiences’ expectations of the genre and series, a testament to his extensive experience writing and producing crime drama and thrillers. He is, as Douglas Lanier explains of many writers who appropriate Shakespeare, suitably ‘opportunistic’, manipulating early modern drama and other literature ‘in ways that suit [his] immediate purposes.’[[8]](#endnote-8) For Shakespeare-cognizant viewers, the decision to appropriate such an ambiguous text initially seems likely to compromise the episode’s generic credentials, since the play must be made to support the Golden Age detective sub-genre’s objectives of seeing chaos brought to order and justice being done, thus privileging ultimate certainty and resolution.[[9]](#endnote-9) However, because Harbinson’s appropriation is reactionary rather than radical, prescriptive rather than permissive, especially in its treatment of women and morality, ‘Generation of Vipers’ succeeds as part of this well-established franchise specifically, and as a piece of drama within this sub-genre. On the downside, *Lewis*’ indebtedness to Golden Age detection – which makes it highly popular with ITV audiences (who also enjoy the broadcaster’s *Miss Marple* and *Poirot* adaptations, alongside the more recent ‘cozy’ *Midsomer Murders*) – ultimately and counterproductively limits its attempts to present a more gender-equal society.[[10]](#endnote-10)

Golden Age detection, originally conceived to refer to inter-war detective fiction, is characterized by several elements: its ‘closed’ nature (readers or viewers do not know the identity of the killer, but discover it alongside the detective through the systematic examination of evidence, persisting through false leads and red herrings); the absence of graphic sex or violence; the presence of one ‘great’, most frequently male, detective at its core; the extra-ordinariness or artfulness of the crime; its inevitable solution; and the capture of the criminal by the detective.[[11]](#endnote-11) The terms ‘whodunit’ and ‘classic/al’ detection are used synonymously with these two referring to many of the same authors.[[12]](#endnote-12) Writers on these genres have widely and warmly acknowledged their formulaic nature (as have Shakespeareans writing about his and other early modern dramatists’ recurring tales, to choose examples that are pertinent to *Troilus and Cressida*, of slandered but virtuous women and male jealousy over a woman – see also *Much Ado*, *Othello, Two Noble Kinsmen,* and *Two Gentlemen of Verona*[[13]](#endnote-13)). Marty Roth explains that much of the genre’s allure resides in writer’s creativeness in ensuring that ‘the sameness’ – which is a ‘crucial relay of meaning and pleasure’ in this genre, if not in literature – ‘hide[s] behind nominal signs of change’.[[14]](#endnote-14) Such sameness in the *Lewis/Endeavour/Morse* franchise includes its consistently ‘Sumptuous Oxford setting…Complex family relationships…Well-heeled academics you don't trust…[and] Candid conversations down the pub.’[[15]](#endnote-15)

Throughout this chapter, the term appropriation, rather than adaptation, is used to denote the way in which Shakespeare is ‘employed’ here in the service of the genre’s requirements.[[16]](#endnote-16) Annalisa Castaldo has categorized writers’ agendas for using Shakespeare: to test the ‘cultural literacy’ of one’s audience; borrow Shakespeare’s ‘cultural authority’; ‘re-think’ or talk back to Shakespeare.[[17]](#endnote-17) The first two purposes are evident throughout the series, going beyond Shakespeare to use Sophocles and Keats in fulfilment of these needs of the series; the last is harder to discern in *Lewis*. Baker has discussed Shakespeare’s function in classic detective writing specifically as author, authority (both evident in the episode, they are explored in detail later), motive (not evident here), clue, oracle, signal of and qualification for high rank (all evident in a dispersed, fragmentary way but not as single cruxes which viewers can solve and thereby solve the mystery). ‘Appropriation’ best captures the way that Shakespeare is an element of this program, rather than its totality – whereas Shakespearean adaptation very often applies to a film or television production of one of his plays.[[18]](#endnote-18) Julie Sanders has previously used the term ‘fragmentary allusion’, in opposition to ‘sustained reworking and revision’ to describe the phenomenon.[[19]](#endnote-19) However, ‘fragmentary allusion’ risks evoking the quotation of plays and poems, rather than a wide range of sustained and coherent appropriations. In using the term, however, I do not wish to invoke the moralistic and censuring connotations of appropriation as theft, infidelity or as a disservice to the author of the appropriated text.

It is possible that alternatives to ‘appropriation’ are neither plentiful nor popular because writing on television Shakespeare continues to be dominated by play adaptations and biographical material, although there is growing attention to user-generated audio-visual media such as YouTube as well as the Morse franchise.[[20]](#endnote-20) In what follows, I consider the appropriation of characters, themes and tone from *Troilus and Cressida* in ‘Generation of Vipers’. These include Cressida, Troilus and Thersites; in/fidelity, violent and monstrous love; cynicism and pessimism. While the episode’s resolution exonerates two of its female protagonists of all wrong doing – positioning them as victims of men’s flawed actions and attitudes, as well as unsisterly competition – and punishes the male leads for their misogyny-rooted failings[[21]](#endnote-21), its ability to offer an assured feminist reading of the play is constrained by its writer’s adherence to the genre. ‘Generation of Vipers’ elides the play’s moral ambiguity, replacing it with a conservative, unequivocal moral code typical to Golden Age-style detective series, that merely swaps one chauvinist stereotype of Cressida as whore, for the polar opposite of ‘victim’.

**‘Generation of Vipers’ overview**

For the uninitiated, a brief synopsis of the episode: having successfully arrested a criminal gang in an action-packed, high-stakes drug raid, DI Lewis and DS Hathaway are immediately assigned a new case.[[22]](#endnote-22) Oxford English lecturer Miranda Thornton has been found dead after a video she submitted to an online dating agency (run by an old fellow student Susanne Leland) was made public on a gossip website. TheBarker.biz is the brainchild of another college peer, Kit Renton. Miranda had no close family or friends, despite having been famous in the 1990s for a popular but controversial book in which she argued that women could live without men. She leads a lonely, reclusive, romantically unfulfilled life.[[23]](#endnote-23) The police initially suspect that she committed suicide. However, on discovering that an answerphone tape has been removed from her home and fingerprints wiped from it, their thoughts turn to murder. One line of inquiry for Lewis and Hathaway involves Miranda’s opposition to property developer, and one-time lover, David Connelly’s attempts to buy land belonging to their college. Another is her relationship, initiated via the dating agency but ultimately platonic, with the unhappily married journalist Francis Mitchell – not to mention his wife, who had discovered his use of the dating site and posted abusive messages in the discussion thread beneath the video.

Yet another suspect is Miranda’s embittered ex-student Sebastian Dromgoole. Upset by the poor reference with which she supplied him, depriving him of the chance of further study at an Ivy League university, he has been struggling to make his mark with an audio-recording of the Complete Works of Shakespeare. Working with a group of friends and his girlfriend, he is in the midst of recording *Troilus and Cressida* when Miranda dies. This set of circumstances is typical of the Golden Age genre: Castaldo has noted that ‘a large number of…young adult novels and murder mysteries, have productions of Shakespeare as a backdrop’.[[24]](#endnote-24) Indeed, this series has previously used the ploy of students staging Shakespeare.[[25]](#endnote-25) Sebastian admits to posting Miranda’s video while working for Barker.biz. In the course of the investigation, Hathaway asks Sebastian’s girlfriend, Briony Keagan, to discover the identities of those involved in leaking the video. The next morning, she is found murdered. Unpicking the history of Miranda and her peers, Lewis and Hathaway discover that David had abandoned his then girlfriend, Miranda, after an article written in a student newspaper by Kit, published under the pseudonym Thersites, alleged that she had cheated on David with several men. She had written to him protesting her innocence, but he had returned all the letters unopened and had determined to revenge her by building a housing estate on the fields they frequented as lovers. Since parting, both had remained perversely loyal to their lost relationship: not seeking further relationships, re-directing their energies into their careers. Finally, however, Miranda joined a dating agency: although her dates led to shared stories of relationship woes rather than sexual encounters. Meanwhile, Susanne, infatuated with David, had long nursed a jealousy of Miranda. Convinced that Miranda still stood in the way of her goal and David’s happiness, she killed her. This is consistent with the conventions of the subgenre which construct the perpetrator as ‘a single individual’ whose personality ‘is formalized and conventionalized, generally embodying a single drive or passion that accounts for the crime’.[[26]](#endnote-26) She also murdered Briony in an attempt to conceal her identity as Miranda’s killer.

You may already have noticed the allusive possibilities of several characters’ names: the choice of an inescapably Shakespearean name for the first victim, an odd one (‘admired Miranda’, *Tempest* 3.1.37) to apply to a rejected lover and, as I will demonstrate, Cressida-type; Kit (as in Marlowe?) for a writer, provocateur and generally shady character; and Sebastian Dromgoole for an ambitious thespian. Sebastian is the name of characters in *Twelfth Night, The Tempest* and is used fleetingly in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *All’s Well*. Dominic, Jessica and Patrick Dromgoole are all British directors, the first having led the Globe as its Artistic Director for a decade, while his uncle Nicholas Dromgoole was a theatre critic with the *Sunday Telegraph* for thirty years). Additionally, this episode approaches visual quotation in its choice of Toby Stephens – renowned for his Shakespearean roles in the theatre, as well as screen work – to play David. It also incorporates shots of various academic publishing houses’ editions of Shakespeare, establishing the scholarly credentials of Miranda and Hathaway (a former theology student). Characterization aside, this is part of the playfully rich web of allusion that followers of the franchise have come to expect.

**Why *Troilus and Cressida*?**

Allusion is used to typologize characters; and to lend credibility to the series’ settings in the university and colleges of Oxford, and England throughout.[[27]](#endnote-27) The series’ literariness is one element of its ‘brand image’ which inspires ‘brand loyalty’ among its viewers.[[28]](#endnote-28) Morse’s creator, Colin Dexter, was an Oxonian classics scholar, who worked for an Oxford exam board, and is (much like his invention) a crossword fanatic. His *Morse* novels and their adaptation to the small screen reference Chesterton, Khayyam, Kipling, Marlowe, Milton, Shakespeare and Virgil, a tradition that has been upheld and further developed by the subsequent series’ writers. Other episodes have alluded to Sir Francis Bacon, William Blake, Lewis Carroll, Charles Dickens, Agatha Christie (whom Dexter cited in interviews as influencing his own detective writing), Euripides, Gerard Manley Hopkins, Christopher Marlowe, Percy Bysse Shelley, Sophocles and William Wordsworth.[[29]](#endnote-29)

However, the choice of *Troilus and Cressida* as a source for appropriation in a Golden Age detective series might seem unlikely given the rather different views and treatments of killing in military and civilian contexts. Death on the battlefield is a spectre that haunts the play, including through the description of corpse-filled armor (Hector on the ‘most putrified core’ of a slain soldier, 5.9.1) and the ends of Patroclus and Hector. Yet these killings, occurring in the context of war, are arguably not unexpected or unjust. They are not the acts of a criminal perpetrator but part of an ongoing, bilateral struggle in which the use of violence to obtain power over an enemy has been legitimated. In contrast, death in the detective genre disrupts an otherwise peaceful, civil society. However, these are two contexts that Harbinson himself embodies, perhaps explaining his ability to interweave the two and foreground their similarities. The question ‘why *Troilus and Cressida*?’ might be partially answered with reference to Harbinson’s professional biography. An Oxford graduate, he served briefly as an officer in the British army, before developing a successful career as a screenwriter and producer in the UK and latterly the US. He spent most of his early career at Central (a contractor owned by ITV) – first as a script editor, then the Head of Drama Development – where he worked on *Morse,* doctoring, and even rewriting, scripts without credit*[[30]](#endnote-30)*. His work is dominated by forces drama. The police unsurprisingly feature in his previous *Lewis* episode ‘The Mind has Mountains’, *Heartbeat*, *Law & Order: Special Victims Unit* but Harbinson has always written about the military police in *Red Cap*; forensic psychologists/profilers in *Person of Interest* and *Millennium*; hostage negotiators in *Kidnap & Ransom*; security agents in *The Waiting Time* (featuring *Morse’s* lead actor John Thaw in the main role), *Homeland,* and *24;* firefighters in *Steel River Blues;* A&E workers in *ER* and general practitioners in *Peak Practice*. He has made a career out of writing within the detective genre, police procedural and genres deriving from them.

‘Generation of Vipers’avoids alluding to plays whose meanings now seem over-determined in British education and culture, for example, *Romeo and Juliet* as speaking to the passionate intensity of teenage love and the futility of family conflict. This is in keeping with the series as a whole: other Shakespeare plays it has drawn on include *Merchant of Venice* and *Titus Andronicus.* *Endeavour* has pushed this further by alluding not to the plays but historic adaptations of them: the episode ‘Fugue’ features quotation, verbal, visual and musical to Verdi’s *Otello*. The franchise has become so well established over four decades now that there is a discernible, practical requirement for the scriptwriters’ to avoid repetition, laying out red herrings that are transparent to fans through familiarity, and thereby also boring, in their use of allusion. Literary allusion in the series offers viewers opportunities for active engagement and participation beyond the usual armchair sleuthing associated with the detective genre through a game of ‘whose line is it?’ as well as whodunit[[31]](#endnote-31). Harbinson’s seizing on *Troilus and Cressida* rewards viewers for their level of reader competence. Although it is not usually the only or main hurdle to solving the case, the literary puzzle usually needs working out by *Lewis’* detectives before they can discover the identity and motivation of the murderer. The series adheres to the Golden Age genre’s neoliberal-inflected, ‘fair play’ conventions whereby the audience has the same amount of information available to them in attempting to solve the crime as the detective (so any viewer who does decipher the literary puzzle in an episode theoretically stands a chance of outpacing the detectives)[[32]](#endnote-32). If familiar with the play, viewers may feel that they have rather more insight than the detectives do[[33]](#endnote-33).However, this chapter argues, the likelihood of doing so is low given that the viewer would need to read the play in the same way as the scriptwriter and the literary scholarship underpinning their reading. Those viewers who read the play divergently from them may well have to wait for the moments of *denouement* that build pace towards the end of the episode. In ‘Generation of Vipers’, the reader is likely to be prevented from ‘outwitting the author’/detective by Harbinson’s now unusually conservative interpretation of the play[[34]](#endnote-34).

Harbinson himself demonstrates a certain literariness in the work he undertakes, within and beyond forces drama. He has adapted classic novels and thrillers alike: *Day of the Triffids, Frenchman’s Creek, Hornblower, Wire in the Blood* and *Place of Execution.* He commonly engages in allusive word play, with classically-inspired episode titles such as ‘Deus Ex Machina’, ‘In extremis’, ‘Trojan horse’, ‘Proteus’, ‘Cura Te Ipsum’, ‘Mors Praematura’, ‘Lethe’, ‘Aletheia’, ‘Pandora’ and the Homeric ‘Be still my heart’. Episode titles alluding to other literature include ‘Nautilus’ (the name of the ship in Verne’s *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea*), ‘Scheherazade’ (the heroine of the *Arabian Nights* tales), ‘Such Sweet Sorrow’ (from *Romeo and Juliet*), Dickens’ ‘*Great Expectations’*, Wendell Berry’s poem ‘The Peace of Wild Things’, and Graves’ autobiography ‘*Goodbye to All That*’. In interviews, he has described his ‘odd reading’ into ‘odd areas of research…to try and find the germ of the next idea’ for his storylines, from biographies such as *Darwin’s Eye* to ‘gothic gore’ and stream-of-consciousness writing, with which he has experimented in, for example, *Millennium’s* ‘Sound of Snow’ episode[[35]](#endnote-35). In his youth, Harbinson was heavily involved in theatre, saying in interview ‘I’d always written at school. I’d written bad plays and directed worse ones. I continued to do theatre at university, especially my own writing. I did some tours and was very keen to go into the theatre as a writer-director’.[[36]](#endnote-36) He also worked occasionally as an extra and, on the London stage, produced the work of Ranjit Bolt – a translator of Moliere, Corneille, Beaumarchais, Anouilh, Chekov and Brecht[[37]](#endnote-37). Within the context of his individual writing career, the choice of *Troilus and Cressida* looks far less surprising, less anomalous, than when viewing it in terms of which Shakespeare plays are appropriated in detective works or popular culture.

**Themes: love, violence and monstrousness conflated**

Appropriation in ‘Generation of Vipers’ establishes thematic intersections with *Troilus and Cressida* through the war plot as well as the love plot. Its quotation echoes the images of violence on screen, reinforces the theme of justice, and facilitates reflexivity about its nature. Shakespeare is frequently mis/quoted as an expert on the latter in fictional and real criminal cases.[[38]](#endnote-38) For example, the titular phrase ‘generation of vipers’ is appropriated by Harbinson to refer, not to the act of procreation as invoked by Pandarus/Shakespeare (3.1.126), but to a cohort of venomous people, college contemporaries shown to be ‘machiavels…sulking narcissists and slippery self-deceivers.’[[39]](#endnote-39) The phrase, ‘generation of vipers’, is spoken twice in the episode. In a sequence where the individual members of the cohort ponder Miranda’s death while seemingly continuing their daily routines, the lines from Pandarus’ speech are provided by Sebastian playing back and editing the recording of the line. Similarly, Pandarus’ preceding line ‘hot blood begets hot thoughts’ is made to invoke explanations of the violent feelings that might underpin murder as well as connote sexual desire (3.2.123-125). Later, we read & hear it in a screenshot of Briony’s accusatory email to Sebastian on discovering his involvement in the case: ‘Talk about a “generation of vipers”. I can’t believe what you did to that woman’. Her accusation is all the more emotionally forceful for her quoting a play they have worked on together while lovers, playing another set of paramours, and spitting it back at him as an indictment of his ‘true’ nature; even – in an inversion of their characters’ roles – his betrayal of their relationship.

In keeping with the detective genre’s orientation around killing and justice, the episode opens with the action of a drugs raid overlaid with a sound recording of Ulysses’ lines ‘When the planets/ In evil mixture to disorder wander’ (1.3.94-5). Snippets from this speech are selected to construe policing as a necessary measure against society’s regression into criminal ‘disorder’, ‘chaos’, ‘ultimate anarchy’ and ‘individual license’, which threatens the state.[[40]](#endnote-40) Fragmenting the speech into a series of statements rather than a dialogue avoids the questions usually extrapolated from the whole speech about whether justice actually inheres ‘on the side of the right’ or in the ‘endless jar’ between wrong and right, or its interpretation as a commentary on social mobility.[[41]](#endnote-41) Images of wrong-doers vanquished by the forces of law and order and Shakespearean lines combine to reinforce, rather than problematize, the absoluteness of moral value. Selective quotations of the play converge with the golden age genre’s and television medium’s conventions to present Shakespeare somewhat predictably, as a repository of moral values. Hathaway later questions his own morality in pressuring Briony to act as an informant – yet another betrayal, in the sense of his exposing her to danger. This is typical of his characterization throughout the series as a self-doubter and outsider to the force who struggles with its role and methods. His concerns are swiftly dismissed by Lewis, in a way that is indicative of the latter’s certainty about the value of his role, his organization and the rightness of his moral compass. Like Hector holding that ‘value dwells not in particular will;/ It holds his estimate and dignity/ As well wherein 'tis precious of itself/ As in the prizer’ (2.2.54-57), Lewis insists on intrinsic rather than relative value.

The episode’s highly selective use of the play denies Frank Kermode’s claim that *Troilus and Cressida* ‘will not yield a single ethical sense’.[[42]](#endnote-42) Order, authority and justice might be contested during the course of the episode; relative values debated; or doubts about courses of action aired – but they are reinstated, having settled on the ultimate superiority of the law over any other systems of justice, ‘wild’, ‘divine’ or ‘providential’, before its conclusion. Another problem with appropriating the ‘planets’ speech within the Golden Age genre is the fatalism of its reliance on astrological explanations: Ulysses is stating that bad or disturbing situations and events occur as a consequence of misalignment in the cosmos, something seemingly at odds with the detective genre’s predication on apportioning criminal responsibility to individuals and punishing them accordingly. However, Lewis goes beyond allocating individual blame on several occasions in the episode, questioning the social and technological conditions that create internet hackers and trolls as well as humor based on deriding other individuals’ misfortunes.[[43]](#endnote-43) Just as Ulysses rails against the inversion of nature which has led to a time of conflict and unnaturalness – ‘Each thing melts/ In mere oppugnancy; the bounded waters/ Should lift their bosoms higher than the shores,/ And make a sop of all this solid globe;/ Strength should be lord of imbecility,/ And the rude son should strike his rather dead’ (1.3.110-15) – so Lewis apostrophizes against the cruel misuse of social media, protesting against the lack of morals and compassion on the part of some users and developers of gossip websites. Any discrepancy between the speech’s fatalism and *Lewis*’ insistence on agency is subdued by its juxtaposition with visuals showing the criminals enacting lawless violence and the police initiating their capture.

Despite the limitations imposed on the appropriation of the play by the formulaic nature of the detective genre, perhaps Harbinson perceived a tonal fit between the two which perhaps made it worth persisting with ways to incorporate them. For example, they both share a ‘gloom and cynicism’ as well as a preoccupation with ‘failure and human weakness’.[[44]](#endnote-44) The play’s critical reception identifies its ‘spirit of bitterness and contempt’;[[45]](#endnote-45) ‘disillusionment and cynicism, the air is cheerless and often unwholesome…the bad characters contemptible or detestable, the good ones unattractive’ and ‘sombre examination of a fallen world’.[[46]](#endnote-46) The latter is heightened in *Lewis* by its juxtaposition with the physical beauty of Oxford and the apparent privilege and success of its inhabitants’ lives. Furthermore, the particular structures of *Troilus and Cressida* – with various characters including Thersites, Ulysses and Pandarus persistently observing and commenting on the action at the ostensible center of a scene, before, sometimes, proceeding to shape it – match those of the detective genre. Lewis and Hathaway frequently stalk and shadow figures in the crime, discussing their perceptions with colleagues face-to-face, relaying them via phone or radio transmitter before acting.

There is a demonstrable preoccupation, even fascination, in both texts with the notion of a thin line between love and violence. This idea is a mainstay of the crime and thriller genres within which Harbison works, with killers such as Susan, one of the villains of ‘Generation of Vipers’, frequently confusing the two (I say one of the villains because while David is legally innocent of all wrong, he bears the brunt of Lewis’ moral wrath)[[47]](#endnote-47). Sebastian too displays a warped affection for Briony, constantly labelling her with terms applied to the ‘promiscuous’ Cressida. Similarly perversely, Troilus speaks of love’s monstrous and contradictory aspect: ‘This is the monstrosity in love, lady: that the will is infinite, and the execution confined: that the desire is boundless, and the act a slave to limit’ (3.279-82). More graphically, he figures his love as ‘scabs pus and running sores’ which Charney argues ‘ooze throughout the play’.[[48]](#endnote-48) Cressida’s beauty could be the ‘oil and balm’ for his festering heart, but Pandarus’ praise of her is grotesquely described by Troilus in terms of twisting the knife in a pre-existing wound: ‘thou lay’st in every gash that love hath given me/ The knife that made it’ (1.1.64-65). Love in this episode, as in the Golden Age genre and Shakespeare’s play, tends to be ‘thwarted and unfulfilled’, disappointed, ‘frustrated, unsatisfactory, compromised’, and rarely heroic or romantic.[[49]](#endnote-49)

**Character types: Troilus, Cressida and Thersites**

References to Shakespeare’s characters by, and in relation to, those in ‘Generation of Vipers’ signal affinities between them. There are, for example, two identifiable sets of Troilus and Cressida types among the characters. Firstly, boyfriend and girlfriend, Sebastian and Briony explicitly blur their identities with those of the play’s eponymous characters as shown above. Sebastian half-jokingly refers to himself as ‘dopey Troilus’ and Cressida as ‘played by my tart of a girlfriend’, here enjoying the frisson of sexual betrayal and promiscuity associated with this typing. His phrasing of their roles invokes a widespread interpretation of the pair: ‘She was a slapper; Troilus a twerp not to have noticed’.[[50]](#endnote-50) Like Troilus, he is depicted as a ‘naïve’ or ‘adolescent’ sensualist whose ‘fantasy-laden sense of love’ is very sexualized, though sometimes couched in ‘courtly language’.[[51]](#endnote-51) Sebastian’s fantasy, fuelled by his interpretation of Shakespeare, constructs women as sexually-voracious whores.

In keeping with her boyfriend’s fantastic or jocular construction of their pairing with the play’s leads, Briony describes herself to DS Hathaway as ‘faithless Cressida’. Perhaps encouraged by her reference to this infamous role, the literature-loving Hathaway encourages Briony to betray Sebastian, not sexually, but by investigating his role in leaking Miranda’s video. Where the motivations of Shakespeare’s Cressida in betraying Troilus are arguably obscure or non-existent – her relationship with Diomedes is sometimes conceived of as inevitable in the circumstances – Briony’s are in evidence.[[52]](#endnote-52) She is shown to be unselfish and (legally and morally) just: her doubts about her boyfriend’s behavior, particularly his allegiance to their morally dubious boss, and desire to intervene to save another woman’s reputation, triumph over her desire to protect Sebastian. Where the fate of Shakespeare’s Cressida remains uncertain, Briony is indirectly but fatally punished for her betrayal – killed by Susanne in an attempt to cover up Miranda’s murder. Sebastian as Troilus is left to rue his own behavior – his refusal to immediately confess to his involvement in posting Miranda’s video – as the cause of losing his ‘Cressid’. Sebastian’s receipt of these ‘just deserts’ is one way in which this appropriation of the play erases its arguably relative moral values.

In addition, David and Miranda, lovers who parted years before the action of the episode commences, are posited as a kind of sequel to the play’s love plot. Questioned by the police about his apparent dislike of Miranda, ‘What did she do to you?’ David answers like a latter-day Troilus, with wounded pride, ‘She made a fool of me once. I won’t let her do it again’. Viewers’ first encounter Miranda mid-flow, lecturing undergraduate students on women in Shakespeare:[[53]](#endnote-53) ‘For every female in Shakespeare who conforms to society there is one who flouts it, so for every Desdemona a Cleopatra, for every Ophelia a Lady Macbeth. But before we applaud him as a proto-feminist we must remember that for these women to deny themselves society, they must also deny themselves as women. Witness Lady Macbeth’s ‘unsex me here’, Cleopatra trying on Anthony’s sword, Cressida who wished she was a man, or indeed Cressida who said of women, “who shall be true to us, when we are so unsecret to ourselves?”’ The cameras cut away from this scene, leaving us with Cressida’s predicament hanging in the air, literalising the narrative’s reduction of women’s agency. It also leaves unspoken the fact that – unlike Cressida who is at least alive at the end of the play and other Shakespearean comic heroines like Olivia in *Twelfth Night*, Kate in *Shrew*, and Isabella in *Measure for Measure* whose initial intentions to remain unmarried are overcome by the plays’ ending – women who flout convention in these tragedies die within them, as demanded by generic and formal conventions (as does Miranda within the episode). One of the next pieces of information we receive about Miranda is that, like the female characters she invokes and interprets, she has wished to place herself outside social/gender conventions and denied her sexuality. Her monograph is interpreted by theBarker.biz as ‘man-hating’, further identifying her with Cressida, described by David Bevington as ‘eager to put men down’ (as well as the proud and scornful Beatrice of *Much Ado*).[[54]](#endnote-54) Taking in these multiple aspects of Miranda’s character and experience, she resonates with Jan Kott’s description of Cressida as ‘would[-]be cynical…bitter and comic. She is passionate, afraid of her passion, and ashamed to admit it.’[[55]](#endnote-55)

Furthermore, like Cressida, Miranda has been ‘unsecret’ to herself, declaring her loneliness and desire for a male partner in a video for an online dating agency, which has now ‘gone viral’ and is being watched and commented on by her students. Its public consumption, violating the ownership and control of it she believes she has, parallels Cressida’s treatment during the kissing scene that marks her arrival in the Greek camp. Lines from this scene including ‘most dearly welcome to the Greeks, sweet lady’, ‘Is this the lady Cressid? Even she’, and ‘were better she were kissed in general’ (4.5.17–21) are played throughout the episode. This reaffirms the detectives’ preoccupation with fixing the nature of Miranda’s character, with choosing from several (supposedly) rigidly bounded possibilities presented to them during the investigation: is she a frigid feminist, treacherous whore, or wronged woman? Despite the control over her own life that Miranda’s modern context should bring, that should set her apart from Cressida, she is shown by Harbinson to be *as* vulnerable in terms of society’s treatment of her desires and sexuality as her predecessor. Men do her wrong and get her wrong, as does the golden age genre. Jonathon Crewe’s postulation of the play’s (and many Shakespearean comedies’) dominant meaning as being that ‘a single woman will always be at the disposal of whichever male ‘protector’ successfully lays claim to her’ is shown to be no less true of Miranda than Cressida.[[56]](#endnote-56) Both characters’ reputations are largely decided by men (in Miranda’s case, her partners, colleagues, fellow alumni and finally the detectives), and the conclusions they reach about it become her truth.

Like Cressida to Troilus, Miranda had written to David. Whatever Cressida says in the letter, the contents of which are never shared with the audience, is dismissed by Troilus as ‘words, words, mere words, no matter from the heart’ (5.3.108). Miranda’s letters were dismissed summarily and absolutely, returned to her unopened. Evoking Troilus’ early declaration that ‘I cannot come to Cressid but by Pandar’, David comes to realize that he can only come to a true understanding of Miranda through the detectives’ mediation. Lewis gives David the unopened letters hissing ‘read and weep’. ‘We could have been together’ David opines, to which Lewis answers (neatly summarizing the crux on which so many Shakespearean plots hinge) ‘Yeah, you just had to open the letters’ pointing to David’s betrayal of Miranda by concentrating on her supposed ‘infidelity’. Whereas the play ends shortly after Troilus receives Cressida’s message, the episode depicts David being punished – as a false lover for his willingness to believe the hearsay and malicious lies of a gossip columnist, his lack of faith in the conduct of his beloved, and refusal to engage with her explanations – with a loss of his beloved that is permanent and irreparable. The play’s appropriation within the detective genre blatantly steers the audience’s sympathies away from David, in a way that capitalizes on, and but ultimately resists, its ambiguity.

Supplying the tragic end that Shakespeare denies audiences in his play, Miranda is killed before her Troilus, and David realizes her innocence. Once dead, Miranda becomes the mysterious woman Troilus figures in the first scene of the play, beseeching Pandarus: ‘Tell me…what Cressid is’ (1.1.98-99). The police’s job is, at least in part, to find witnesses who can tell them what Miranda is: suicide or murder victim? The slurs on her sexual behavior, published in a student newspaper by a columnist named Thersites, are revealed through the offices of the two detectives to be slanderous. Thersites, it is discovered, is the one-time pen name of Kit, who was motivated in writing the article – not by his desire for her, for David, sexually or platonically (as in other Shakespearean narratives featuring allegations of female adultery) – but by his jealousy that Miranda, a woman, had beaten him in a college election. His character echoes some critics’ interpretation of Thersites: Foakes writes that he is ‘no more than a sick-minded, irresponsible exhibitionist, who regards everyone with gloating contempt’; a spiteful, conniving ‘master of insult’; a ‘box’, ‘cur’ or ‘core’ of ‘envy’, with a perspective ‘that is not to be trusted’;[[57]](#endnote-57) rather than the detached, intelligent and perceptive Shakespearean character others such as Tony Dawson have perceived.[[58]](#endnote-58) Harbinson’s reading of Thersites – and his creation of Kit – as a redoubtable villain (even if he is ultimately only criminally responsible for libel and hacking, rather than murder) best fits the character scheme required by Golden Age texts.

**Generic influences on appropriating *Troilus and Cressida* in detective drama**

*Troilus and Cressida* is arguably appropriated within this episode because of its writer’s anachronistic perception of – if not quite an innate fit – enigmatic intersections between the play and the detective genre on multiple points. These include typological (character), linguistic (quotation) and thematic (fidelity, justice) resonances. Yet, its appropriation of the play potentially rewrites – for those audience members without early modern expertise – not only *Troilus and Cressida*, but also Homer, Chaucer and other sources that Shakespeare drew on (which, in themselves, rewrote their predecessors). There is no need for interpretation in performance or criticism to pardon Miranda – one of Harbinson’s Cressidas – no need for ‘an extenuating “perchance”’ to redeem her’: she was evidently never guilty.[[59]](#endnote-59) The Shakespearean source for *Lewis* fails to ‘write’ the role of Cressida in the way that Chaucer foredooms Shakespeare’s Cressida. Miranda as Cressida is configured as a wronged, innocent woman, slandered by one man and condemned to bitterness and loneliness by another’s reaction to local gossip about her.

Yet, before we applaud Harbinson as feminist or in any way radically writing back to Shakespeare – in rescuing Cressida from the sometime popular but reductive view of her as a wanton, treacherous woman – the episode ultimately re-affirms traditional moral values and gender roles. Harbison’s reading of Cressida bypasses one reductive, polarized stereotype for another: whore for virgin. In ‘Generation of Vipers’, as in the Shakespearean comedies named above, women are to be loved and honored, or failed, by their male ‘friends’ and lovers, who are either exploitative and malevolent or gullible and fickle. Their bodies and reputations are to be protected or salvaged by the male detectives.[[60]](#endnote-60) Miranda as Harbinson’s Cressida is not a woman celebrated for her sexual freedom or her female desire, as were third-wave feminists; nor for her academic prowess or feminist views. The latter are held by other characters to have been undermined by her apparent ‘hypocrisy’ in privately craving a soulmate while publicly urging others to stay celibate and by the revelation that her battle against David’s development was romantically motivated by the wish to preserve the place ‘where they were happy’. She is mourned, conservatively and conventionally, as a good, conforming woman and a victim. The episode initially imagines a modern Cressida (educated, an influential and rational thinker, financially independent, and fulfilled through work rather than relationships) but ultimately eschews her creation. The most apparent impetus behind this reactionary appropriation is the need for Harbinson to fulfil the manifold requirements of the genre and franchise – now totaling over sixty episodes across the three programs, its producers and audiences – rather than questioning or challenging them[[61]](#endnote-61). This includes subscribing heavily to a conservative nostalgia: *Morse, Lewis* and *Endeavour,* even within the ‘Golden Age’ genre, exhibit this in the extreme, normalising a privileged sphere of educated existence and offering up a ‘class porn’ that is more usually the province of ITV’s period drama, like *Downton Abbey*. In this way, writing within the series sits uneasily with Harbinson’s youthful intention of ‘working with interesting, exciting people doing powerful political dramas.’[[62]](#endnote-62)

Golden Age detective texts objectify women, largely using them to signify ‘sexuality, to flesh out male desire and shadow male sexual fear.’[[63]](#endnote-63) If not occupying one of the main roles in the plot, women are frequently deployed as red herrings, ‘to distract the privileged male players.’[[64]](#endnote-64) They dichotomize women too: as victim/perpetrator, innocent/damned, virgin/whore and ingénue/femme fatale. Sally Munt and Ernest Mandel argue further that ‘women, if appearing at all, do not act, they *react* to primary characters – men’; that detectives engage in ‘games women cannot play’ but where they are ‘the game all along’, for example, motivating the criminal to murder and the detectives to secure their safety, reputation or affection.[[65]](#endnote-65) Spinsters, such as Marple, are arguably allowed a detecting role because their age is seen to confer androgyny or asexuality.[[66]](#endnote-66) Unlike recent, international crime drama such as *The Bridge, Hinterland* and *Trapped*, Golden Age texts ‘refuse to tell love stories’ of detectives, usually loners whose private lives are only rarely glimpsed or relegated firmly to a domestic other-world so as not to ‘distract from the business of crime fighting.’[[67]](#endnote-67) Instead, voyeurism and fetishism are privileged across the genre: watching the violence unfold – often sexual or sexually-motivated; usually ‘little more than a demonstration of individual power and a cathartic release of rage’; and almost always aesthetically-pleasing or erotic – provides a way of ‘witnessing and enjoying [it], albeit perhaps in a shuddering, shameful and guilt-ridden way.’[[68]](#endnote-68) In spite of the franchise embracing female forensic officers, who are there to contribute to the solution of the case but also to be flirted with and dated (usually outside the episodes’ action) by its detectives (see firstly Morse and Dr Russell, latterly Lewis and Dr Hobson, whose home life together is increasingly depicted within the programme), its women are variously, and sometimes simultaneously, objects of pity, lust (contrasted with love), fear and disgust of their behaviour, especially their supposed irrationality; their desires;[[69]](#endnote-69) and their decomposing bodies. This is in contrast to Shakespeare’s predilection for lingering over oozing and leaky bodies in *Troilus’* imagery.[[70]](#endnote-70)

Harbinson’s use of *Troilus and Cressida* augments rather than rewrites Golden Age detection.[[71]](#endnote-71) The franchise has always been at least one step behind the times in handling gender equality: ITV’s *Morse* itself progressively toned down the seedy, male chauvinist side of Dexter’s great detective across the series.[[72]](#endnote-72) It retained, however, plenty of casual and structural sexism – with the long-suffering, primary caring, patient Mrs Lewis supplying endless quantities of fried egg and chips at inconvenient hours for the detective duo, whose relationship was permanently privileged over the conjugal one.[[73]](#endnote-73) Critics have similarly remarked on the problematic representation of women in other detective programmes and thrillers to which Harbinson has made a significant contribution. He might subvert the ambiguity many critics have discerned in *Troilus and Cressida* in his appropriation of it, in a reactionary way, but he does not subvert the conventions of the genre for which he is writing.

Looking to the later installments of *Lewis* (a series now ended) and the future of *Endeavour* (still ongoing), in spite of established trends and writers like Harbinson’s past output, perhaps the producers will increasingly allow the series to break from Golden Age traditions, since these are in tension with their latterly redoubled efforts to reflect women’s presence and power in the police force (through the continuing roles of Chief Superintendent Jean Innocent and, since 2014, Lewis and Hathaway’s fellow officer DS Lizzie Maddox). Furthermore, *Endeavour* has seen the producers change tack, between seasons, regarding the conservativeness of content and style: the first episode of the second season mixed freemasonry with 1960s feminism and veered away from *Morse* and *Lewis’* staple idyllic, sunny Oxfordshire, ushering in a more urban, ‘Scandi-cool’ style.[[74]](#endnote-74) This shift is uncharacteristic of detective series given their reliance on ‘sameness’, described above. Whether this meanswriters of future episodes will be allowed to similarly meld traditional Golden Age and currently ubiquitous Nordic Noir conventions – and to strive for more radical interpretations of Shakespearean in the future – remains to be seen in *Endeavour’s* subsequent seasons.[[75]](#endnote-75)
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