থেস্পিয়ান
THESPIAN
An International Refereed journal
ISSN 2321-4805

THESPIAN

MAGAZINE

An International Refereed Journal of Inter-disciplinary Studies

Santiniketan, West Bengal, India

Title: Love vs. Lust: Media Representation of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet and Antony and Cleopatra

Author(s): Nabila Binte Afser Anika

DOI: 10.63698/Thespian.13.1.1401 || Published: 25 November 2025.

Yr. 13, Issue 25, 2025

Bengali New Bengali Edition
April-May

থেস্পিয়ান
THESPIAN
An International Refereed journal
ISSN 2321-4805

Editorial Board

থেস্পিয়ান
THESPIAN
An International Refereed journal
ISSN 2321-4805

Love vs. Lust: Media Representation of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet and Antony and Cleopatra

Nabila Binte Afser Anika, Writer and Researcher, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Abstract

This study focuses on Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet and Antony and Cleopatra, highlighting how the plays intertwine love and lust rather than presenting them as separate moral concepts. These emotions are depicted as active, shaping both individual character and the social environment around them. Incorporating insights from adaptation theory and media studies, as well as feminist, psychoanalytic, and postcolonial approaches, the paper examines how passion functions not merely as private feeling but also as a force embedded in cultural and political frameworks. Close readings of the plays reveal love in Verona appears as youthful, sacramental, and defiant, while desire in Alexandria is entangled with power, performance, and empire. The analysis extends to modern media adaptations, from film, theatre, and graphic novels to fashion campaigns and digital platforms, demonstrating how love and lust are continually re-scripted to reflect contemporary anxieties and aesthetics. The paper argues that Shakespeare's lovers function as cultural laboratories, where intimacy intersects with politics, gender, and authority, and that their enduring relevance lies in their mutability: love and lust remain volatile energies, perpetually reshaped by culture and media, and capable of challenging how we imagine desire, agency, and risk.

Article History

Received **31 May 2025**
Revised **07 Oct. 2025**
Accepted **08 Oct. 2025**

Keywords

Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, Antony and Cleopatra, Love and lust, Adaptation theory, Media representation, Gender and desire, Popular culture

থেস্পিয়ান
THESPIAN
An International Refereed journal
ISSN 2321-4805

Introduction

In Shakespearean literature, love is rarely a straightforward emotion. It is stylized, idealized, politicized, and often fatal. Scholars have long admired the lyric power of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, yet many continue to draw a sharp line between "love" and "lust" (Adelman 12). Shakespeare, however, never honored that divide (Kottman 3).

What stands out in both plays is how love and lust rarely stay in separate corners. They slide into each other, sometimes tender, sometimes reckless, yet always unsettling the balance of the world around them. This paper begins with that tension as its central question.

While scholarly discourse often treats love and lust as separate moral categories, Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra* depict these emotions as overlapping, transformative, and socially embedded. Existing research has yet to fully explore how these volatile energies are reinterpreted in contemporary media adaptations, creating a gap that this study addresses.

Shakespeare's stage presents love and lust not as opposites but as volatile, overlapping energies that alter people's lives and destabilize surrounding systems (Adelman 12). The urgency of this tension lies not only in the plays themselves but in the way they keep returning in new forms, from Elizabethan theatre to contemporary cinema, fashion campaigns, and social media.

Within Shakespeare's world, these emotions already resist containment. Understanding the dynamics in *Romeo and Juliet* requires revisiting the Petrarchan model that shaped Elizabethan love poetry. Petrarchan love idealizes the beloved through

unattainability and suffering (Kahn 18). Romeo enters the play in this mode, calling Juliet "the sun," divine and unreachable. But Shakespeare quickly disrupts the convention. Unlike the typical Petrarchan lover who pines from a distance, Romeo actually gets Juliet and that makes the stakes higher. Their love, brief and fierce, becomes less about fantasy and more about spiritual defiance against feud and family (Siegel 371; Targoff 30).

Echoes of this disruption appear elsewhere in Shakespeare's work. *Sonnet 130* mocks idealized beauty, finding value in the flawed body. His comedies let love overturn order in unpredictable ways: Hermia runs away with Lysander in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and Helena reminds us, "Love looks not with the eyes, but with the mind" (*A Midsummer Night's Dream* 1.1.234). For Shakespeare, love is rarely static, it is disruptive, embodied, and transformative.

Antony and Cleopatra, however, escalates passion to imperial scale. Love here stretches into ambition, seduction, and collapse. Cleopatra is not merely desirable; she performs desire strategically, wielding it as sovereignty (El-Sawy 13), while Antony is undone as his lust collides with empire. Their affair is messy, theatrical, political, and deeply human. If Romeo and Juliet die to preserve intimacy against tradition, Antony and Cleopatra unravel because their passion destabilizes duty and empire.

To examine this, the study employs a multi-theoretical framework. Linda Hutcheon's adaptation theory guides the analysis of how Shakespeare's plays are reinvented across media (Hutcheon 21). Elfriede Fürsich's media studies lens clarifies how representation produces cultural meaning (Fürsich 115). Feminist and performativity theories examine gendered

dynamics of desire (Butler 45; Adelman 67), while psychoanalytic theory illuminates the psychological tensions between love and lust (Freud 22). Postcolonial approaches contextualize cultural and imperial power structures within the plays (Said 102; Heidari 124).

This paper therefore examines how *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra* present love and lust not as fixed categories but as unstable cultural energies, and how modern media reshapes them across film, fashion, and online platforms. The argument unfolds in three parts: a close reading of *Romeo and Juliet*, a critical analysis of *Antony and Cleopatra*, and an exploration of their media afterlives. Together, these perspectives show why Shakespeare's lovers remain alive: not as static relics, but as cultural provocations that continue to redefine how we think about love, lust, and the risks of desire.

Literature Review

The enduring appeal of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra* lies not only in their dramatic tension or lyrical language, but in their emotional complexity: specifically, in how they stage love and lust as both transformative and destructive. Love and lust are layered, shifting in meaning depending on context, power, and perspective.

In *Romeo and Juliet*, Paul N. Siegel identifies a kind of "religion of love," arguing that Shakespeare frames romantic devotion as a spiritual act capable of transcending familial and social boundaries. For Siegel, the lovers are not just star-crossed; they are sanctified through their suffering, elevated by their willingness to sacrifice for feeling (Siegel 371). Ramie Targoff, in a similar vein, interprets their joint burial not as defeat but as metaphysical

transcendence: death as a unifying ritual, where love outlasts time and social disruption (Targoff 30). Romeo's and Juliet's willingness to embrace death for union dramatizes the tension between desire and repression that Freud describes, where love's intensity becomes indistinguishable from self-destruction (Freud 22).

Yet not all readings celebrate the lovers as divine figures. Robert Metcalf Smith emphasizes psychological realism, arguing that the tragedy is rooted less in destiny than in human impulsivity. Romeo's emotional volatility and the lovers' rapid decisions trigger a domino effect of violence and loss. In Smith's view, their downfall is a classic Aristotelian tragedy, where the characters' hamartia, their fatal flaws, Romeo as a "pilgrim" that elevates their bondset the course toward inevitable collapse (Smith 65). Antonio Barcelona Sánchez adds another interpretive layer by examining the metaphorical structure of their romance. He argues that their passion functions symbolically, reaching beyond physical love into a space of metaphysical union. Their suicides, while devastating, are framed as consummation, an act of defiance against a fractured world in which love cannot survive (Sánchez 685).

The spiritual intensity of Romeo and Juliet's love is also reflected in their language. Shakespeare's use of religious imagery, like Juliet as a "holy shrine," Romeo as a "pilgrim" who elevates their bond to the divine. What begins as ritual soon takes on the weight of liturgy: never seems only physical: it gets lifted, turned into devotion confession, vow, and even martyrdom.

Media scholar Fürsich reminds us that representation does more than reflect reality; it actively constructs it (Fürsich 114). This is particularly resonant when considering Juliet's words, once spoken from a Verona balcony and now circulating widely in new cultural

spaces, whether as Instagram captions, TikTok performances, or even memes. Across these adaptations, Juliet no longer appears as the obedient daughter but as a figure of agency, choosing secret marriage and daring to risk the potion. As Coppelia Kahn observes, Juliet unsettles her world precisely because she insists on loving according to her own terms (Kahn 20). Her decisiveness contrasts with Romeo's impulsiveness: he acts quickly, while she chooses deliberately. That difference gives her a distinctly modern edge, even a radical one. Judith Butler might say Juliet is performing a new kind of womanhood, breaking the mold forced on her. Not just being in love, but using love as a way to resist the order pressing down on her (Butler 10).

If *Romeo and Juliet* wrestles with the line between purity and passion, *Antony and Cleopatra* obliterates that line entirely. Lust, in this play, is unapologetic, interwoven with ambition, theatricality, and imperial collapse. Nastaran Fadaei Heidari, drawing from Edward Said, critiques the Orientalist framing of Cleopatra as an exotic seductress. For Heidari, Cleopatra's portrayal reflects colonial anxieties, casting the East as feminized, decadent, and politically dangerous (Heidari 124). Postcolonial theory clarifies this bias: Egypt is feminized as excessive and unstable, a mirror against which Rome defines its masculine discipline (Said 45).

Amany El-Sawy positions Cleopatra as a destabilizing force who rewrites femininity through performance. She is not just desired, she directs desire. Shakespeare's description of her "infinite variety" (2.2.245) becomes a statement of unruliness, a refusal to be pinned down. Cleopatra's sexuality, far from being passive, becomes rhetorical, a way to command attention, manipulate loyalty, and construct political power (El-Sawy 13). This aligns with

Butler's performativity: Cleopatra stages herself in ways that unsettle fixed categories of femininity, demonstrating how lust itself becomes an act of sovereignty (Butler 12).

Feminist scholars like Janet Adelman deepen this reading by suggesting that Cleopatra disrupts the expected arc of female desire (Adelman 45). While Juliet asserts her feelings within the framework of tragedy, Cleopatra reframes desire as spectacle. Her seduction is never solely about emotion; it's also about dominance. Antony's identity, fragmented between Roman virtue and Egyptian pleasure, becomes increasingly unstable in Cleopatra's orbit. His collapse is not just personal; it reflects a deeper crisis in masculinity.

This gendered tension plays out in the symbolic geography of the play. Rome represents order, discipline, and duty; Egypt stands for indulgence, sensuality, and chaos. Critics often note how Shakespeare uses place as metaphor: Egypt is feminized and fluid, while Rome is masculinized and rigid. Antony's dilemma, then, becomes a struggle between these competing logics, a split between the id and the superego, as Freudian analysis might suggest (Freud 22). His surrender to Cleopatra is not just erotic; it is psychological dissolution.

The media representation of Cleopatra reinforces her mythic status. Suzanne Osmond explores how Cleopatra has been recast across film, fashion, and advertising. From Elizabeth Taylor's lavish portrayal to postmodern editorials, Cleopatra remains a figure of beauty, danger, and control (Osmond 72). Her image persists because it is mutable—adaptable to the fantasies of every era. This links to Elfriede Fürsich's claim that media does not just reflect society; it shapes it, especially in relation to race and gender (Fürsich 114).

Romeo and Juliet, too, have undergone cultural transformation. Their story is now less about feuding families and more about idealized, youthful rebellion. Iris H. Tuan observes that modern media fuses Shakespearean themes with pop culture, turning star-crossed lovers into symbols of aesthetic longing and resistance (Tuan 17). Robina Rashid Bhuiyan's Dhaka-based staging of *Romeo and Juliet* reframes the drama through the lens of class struggle, underscoring how local social and cultural contexts can transform canonical meaning (Bhuiyan, paras. 1, 3).

Altogether, these scholars and creatives show how Shakespeare's lovers remain emotionally and politically alive. They are not static relics; they are tools, mirrors, and vessels. Each new interpretation demonstrates that Shakespeare is never simply repeated. Instead, the plays become opportunities to reimagine the present through the past. When considered through adaptation theory alongside media, feminist, postcolonial, and psychoanalytic perspectives, it becomes clear that Shakespeare anticipated the very cultural processes such as remediation, commodification, and performance through which love and lust continue to shape contemporary experience.

Love in *Romeo and Juliet*

Among Shakespeare's tragedies, *Romeo and Juliet* stands apart as a haunting meditation on love that is at once immediate, idealistic, and unrelentingly doomed. It is a play where love does not arrive gently; it erupts, disorients, and ultimately consumes. Romeo and Juliet do not grow into love; they fall into it, fast and irrevocably, their passion flaring against a backdrop of violence, familial control, and social boundaries (Bradley 45).

From the moment Romeo first lays eyes on Juliet, Shakespeare begins weaving a language of spiritual awe. “Did my heart love till now?” he asks, struck by her presence, “Forswear it, sight! / For I ne’er saw true beauty till this night” (Shakespeare 1.5.50–51). This shift from melancholic obsession with Rosaline to rapturous devotion to Juliet seems abrupt, but it underscores a transformation: from performative yearning to existential connection. Juliet, too, evolves rapidly. Her initial submission to her parents’ wishes—“I’ll look to like, if looking liking move”—gives way to astonishing self-determination. In the iconic balcony scene, she declares: “My bounty is as boundless as the sea / My love as deep” (*Romeo and Juliet* 2.2.133–134), casting her feelings in elemental, infinite terms. This hyperbolic imagery not only sanctifies their love but anticipates its translation into later adaptations: Baz Luhrmann’s 1996 film, with neon lights and pop music, replays this very scene to suggest how desire overwhelms rational order.

Critics have long debated whether such love is sincere or merely youthful folly. But as Paul N. Siegel argues, the lovers’ devotion takes on a spiritual register, embodying a kind of sacramental union that transcends their worldly circumstances (Siegel 371). Juliet is not merely in love; she becomes love’s priestess. Their secret marriage, conducted by Friar Laurence, is both romantic and political: a challenge to a social order that values feuds over feelings. This duality shows what Linda Hutcheon’s adaptation theory insists: that stories like this persist because they can be read simultaneously as romance and rebellion, a double meaning that later cultural forms continue to exploit (Hutcheon 45–46).

Ramie Targoff furthers this interpretation by positioning their death as a form of metaphysical consummation. The tomb becomes their sanctuary, their final refuge from a

world too fractured to accept them (Targoff 30). Their love, in this light, does not end with death; it is fulfilled by it. Death becomes the only space left where they can belong to each other freely. From a psychoanalytic perspective, the tomb dramatizes Freud's paradox of Eros and Thanatos, the drive toward union is inseparable from the drive toward death (Freud 22).

At the same time, Shakespeare does not romanticize blindly. He laces the narrative with warnings. Friar Laurence cautions, "These violent delights have violent ends" (*Romeo and Juliet* 2.6.9), offering a prophetic frame for what follows. Robert Metcalf Smith reads Romeo's impetuousness as central to the tragedy. Romeo acts with haste, whether marrying Juliet, killing Tybalt, or taking his own life; revealing a pattern of reactive behavior that propels the narrative toward ruin (Smith 65). Tragedy, then, emerges not solely from external conflict, but from within the characters themselves. Romeo embodies the id-driven impulsivity Freud describes; he leaps rather than calculates, his emotional transparency becoming both his strength and his undoing.

Still, Juliet's clarity stands in contrast. Unlike Romeo, she plans, reflects, and even enacts a simulated death to reclaim agency. Coppelia Kahn and other feminist scholars argue that Juliet's choices—clandestine marriage, emotional assertion, and defiance of patriarchal control—mark her as a subversive figure within a deeply gendered world (Kahn 23). She does not merely follow Romeo; she charts her own path, one that intersects with his but is not dependent on it. Judith Butler's concept of performativity highlights this agency, Juliet's very articulation of desire is a performance that destabilizes patriarchal norms, showing that love itself can be a radical act of self-fashioning (Butler 42).

থেস্পিয়ান
THESPIAN
An International Refereed journal
ISSN 2321-4805

Their love, therefore, becomes a battleground for competing forces: youth and tradition, passion and prudence, autonomy and fate. Through the poetic layering of sacred imagery, urgent dialogue, and symbolic acts, Shakespeare invites readers to see love not as a static ideal, but as a force that bends, strains, and breaks the structures around it. Romeo and Juliet's deaths do not just end a feud; they hit something much deeper. They force us to ask if love can actually survive in a world that keeps trying to shut it down. Their decision to die is not just about tragedy or teenage recklessness; it's a bold refusal to play by the rules that broke them in the first place. While modern versions of the play often turn this into a tale of doomed romance, Shakespeare's version feels more like a challenge: love here is wild, dangerous, and all-consuming. It's not soft. It's not safe. And it demands everything (Kottman 8).

Their world is not built to handle something like this. It runs on legacy, status, and what people will think. Love, especially the kind they share, does not fit. It pushes back. It does not whisper; it shouts. Juliet, in particular, takes control of her story in ways that still feel radical. The way she thinks, chooses, acts—it's not weakness. It's power. She's not just reacting; she's deciding (Loomba 91).

And then there's Romeo. He does not hide behind pride or politics. He feels everything out loud. That openness, though messy, makes him relatable in ways most tragic heroes are not. He does not calculate; he leaps. And that leaping gets him killed. But it also reveals a kind of raw, emotional bravery that's hard to ignore. If Juliet represents strategic agency, Romeo represents emotional transparency; together they dramatize Shakespeare's vision of love as simultaneously empowering and destructive.

What really lasts, though, is not just the fact that they died, but how fiercely they loved before they did. They did not act cautiously; they did not wait. Yet they gave everything. And maybe that's the point. It's not a guidebook on love; it's a reminder of what's at stake when you dare to feel fully.

Lust in *Antony and Cleopatra*

In *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare refuses to grant any easy separation between love and lust. Instead, he plunges into the murky territory where passion merges with politics, where intimacy is inseparable from empire, and where desire consumes not only individuals but the civilizations they represent. The relationship between Antony and Cleopatra has often been reduced to erotic obsession, but such a framing fails to capture the psychological, cultural, and theatrical dimensions that make their downfall so unsettling (Adelman 29; Loomba 97).

From the outset, Antony is described not as Rome's triumphant general but as a man compromised by desire. His peers scornfully observe: "He is become the bellows and the fan / To cool a gipsy's lust" (*Antony and Cleopatra* 1.1.9–10). These words diminish Antony's identity to Cleopatra's shadow, but the insult also reveals a deeper anxiety: female sexual power, particularly when embodied by an Eastern queen, unsettles the masculine logic of Rome (Heidari 124). In that sense, lust here is not only personal: it is ideological, a fault line between cultures.

Cleopatra herself resists being contained by any single archetype. Amany El-Sawy interprets her as embodying "infinite variety", a fluidity that refuses to be pinned down (El-

Sawy 13). She is not simply desired; she orchestrates desire. Her sexuality is performative, an extension of her statecraft. When she declares, "I'll set a bourn how far to be beloved" (*Antony and Cleopatra* 1.1.44), she speaks not as a lover pleading but as a queen negotiating the limits of loyalty. Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity helps clarify this: Cleopatra stages her identity, constantly shifting between vulnerability and command, lover and monarch (Butler 192).

The eroticism of the play, therefore, extends beyond bodies; it is mapped onto landscapes, empires, and identities. Rome symbolizes order, rationality, and martial discipline, while Egypt is depicted as lush, indulgent, and unstable. Antony occupies this tense geography, suspended between versions of himself. Critics like Janet Adelman see in his transformation a crisis of masculinity (Adelman 30). Antony's vulnerability, his longing, his choice of Cleopatra over Octavia signal a departure from Roman stoicism and plunge him into emotional dependence.

Freudian analysis sees this collapse as a breakdown of the superego. Antony, once the disciplined soldier, is overtaken by the id. He abandons rationality for emotional gratification, forsaking Rome, duty, and even self-preservation. His eventual suicide is both literal and symbolic—a surrender to the forces he can no longer control (Freud 22). Yet unlike Romeo's impulsive death, Antony's is drawn-out, theatrical, and almost operatic, filled with regret, illusion, and a longing to reclaim dignity.

Cleopatra, on the other hand, performs her death with precision. "Give me my robe, put on my crown; I have / Immortal longings in me," she declares (Antony and Cleopatra

5.2.279–80), staging her end as a final act of sovereignty. Suzanne Osmond observes that Cleopatra's image both in Shakespeare and in modern media, embodies a sensual defiance that refuses to be domesticated (Osmond 72). Her death is not a surrender but a refusal: she will not be displayed in Caesar's parade, not reduced to spectacle by the empire that seeks to tame her, but instead enshrines her identity through a death that defies subjugation (Butler 192).

Postcolonial critics like Nastaran Fadaei Heidari highlight how Cleopatra's portrayal is filtered through Orientalist discourse. The East, feminized and eroticized, becomes the backdrop against which the West defines itself as rational, moral, and superior (Said 108; Heidari 124). Lust, in this reading, is not just emotional: it is ideological, racialized, and performatively dangerous. Yet Shakespeare complicates this binary. Cleopatra is not just a fantasy constructed by Rome— she is also a woman who manipulates that fantasy to her advantage (Loomba 104). Cleopatra's layered identity—queen, lover, actress, strategist—makes her perhaps Shakespeare's most elusive female character. Her emotional manipulations are not signs of weakness but tools of survival. In her final moments, she not only reclaims narrative control, but aesthetic control, choosing the pose in which she will die, the narrative that will survive her.

Media adaptations of the play have seized upon this ambiguity. Elizabeth Taylor's Cleopatra in Joseph Mankiewicz's 1972 film is a vision of lavish seduction, where costumes and set designs echo the excess of the characters' desires (Ryle 5). Taylor's Cleopatra is both goddess and woman, regal and relatable. Simon Godwin's 2018 production at the National Theatre introduced racial and postcolonial nuance by casting Sophie Okonedo in the title

role. Her Cleopatra, played against Ralph Fiennes' tormented Antony, exuded both vulnerability and strength, desire and defiance (Billington). Cleopatra's influence persists in visual culture—through makeup, fashion, and even internet memes. Her heavily lined eyes and golden accessories continue to signify a legacy of powerful femininity. Elfriede Fürsich argues that media does not just reflect reality; it constructs it (Fürsich 114). In that sense, Cleopatra's lust, once a literary danger, becomes a visual shorthand for autonomy and control.

Shakespeare's treatment of lust resists simplistic moralization. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, it is presented not as a weakness but as a volatile force. For Cleopatra, desire becomes a resource to command and manipulate; for Antony, it grows into a tempest that consumes him. Lust here is not reducible to the physical. It is historical, psychological, and theatrical. It destabilizes established identities, rearranges hierarchies, and compels recognition (Bradley 91).

Where *Romeo and Juliet* present love as a transcendental escape, *Antony and Cleopatra* show what happens when passion is too deeply entangled with ambition and loss. Their deaths do not resolve tension—they crystallize it. Lust here is both ruin and revelation. And in that contradiction lies its power (Kottman 21).

Media Representation of Love and Lust

What makes *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra* stick around is not just the poetry or the drama: it is how they keep coming back in new skins. These plays did not stay locked in the Elizabethan era. They have shape-shifted across time, showing up in film

reels, stage lights, fashion campaigns, and even Instagram filters. Love and lust—the pulse at the heart of both stories, do not stay put either. They slip through genres and formats, becoming whatever the cultural moment demands: rebellion, romance, politics, or performance. Every time someone restages these stories, they are not just repeating them. They are wrestling with them, rethinking them, and sometimes even arguing with what came before (Tuan 17; Fürsich 114). Linda Hutcheon's adaptation theory clarifies why: adaptations are not inferior copies but cultural reinterpretations, and each retelling of Juliet or Cleopatra reflects contemporary desires, anxieties, and aesthetics (Hutcheon 46).

Film, especially, has played a huge part in that transformation. Take Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet* (1996). It did not just modernize the story, it exploded it. With its chaotic, neon-lit version of Verona Beach, gun-wielding Capulets, and TV-anchor narrators, the film turned the play into a fever dream. Shakespeare's words still echo through it, but they bounce off everything from billboards to pop music. DiCaprio and Danes are not just actors—they're icons of a very '90s kind of heartbreak: messy, fragile, and way too fast. And somehow, it works. The whole thing should not make sense, but it does because it captures how love can feel in a world that never slows down. Luhrmann frames *Romeo and Juliet* as star-crossed outsiders navigating a violent, chaotic world, where love is rebellion and lust is amplified through visual spectacle (Iftimie 78). Through Fürsich's lens, this becomes an act of media construction: love itself is produced as a consumable image of rebellion (Fürsich 114).

In contrast, Joseph L. Mankiewicz's *Cleopatra* (1963), starring Elizabeth Taylor and Richard Burton, foregrounds the spectacle of lust and imperial intrigue. Taylor's Cleopatra commands attention through lavish costume and sensual presence, while Burton's Antony

devolves from noble general to broken man destabilized by obsession (Ryle 5). The film reframes lust not as private weakness but as a force capable of toppling empires. From a feminist and performativity perspective, Taylor's Cleopatra demonstrates how sexuality can be wielded as sovereignty, her body and costume functioning as political theater (Butler 42).

More recent productions have pushed further into politics of race and gender. Simon Godwin's 2018 National Theatre production cast Sophie Okonedo as Cleopatra, a choice that reframed the queen through postcolonial consciousness. Okonedo's Cleopatra was passionate, strategic, and unapologetically theatrical, rejecting reductive depictions of lustful femininity. The diverse casting choices reorient the narrative, highlighting how lust operates not just between individuals but as a tool of resistance and representation (Billington). Against Ralph Fiennes' tortured Antony, she emerged as a woman who redefined desire as power. Postcolonial theory explains this shift- casting a Black British actress unsettles the Orientalist gaze, turning Cleopatra from "exotic seductress" into a self-fashioned political subject (Said 108; Heidari 124).

Theatre adaptations across the Global South have further localized Shakespeare's emotional universals. In 2017, the British Council Bangladesh produced A Different *Romeo and Juliet*, directed by Jenny Sealey and co-produced by Nasiruddin Yousuff. This adaptation reframed the Montague–Capulet feud as a class and regional conflict between two Bangladeshi families, Khan and Chowdhury. The production featured traditional wedding rituals, cricket matches, and Dhaka street life, underscoring how love can defy social barriers in culturally specific ways. The play challenged audiences to see Juliet's devotion and Romeo's sacrifice through a South Asian lens (Bhuiyan, para. 3). Hutcheon's adaptation

model makes sense of this: the "same" story generates new meaning when refracted through different cultural rituals, proving that Shakespeare's passions are globally portable (Hutcheon 47).

Beyond stage and film, visual storytelling has flourished. John McDonald's *Romeo & Juliet: The Graphic Novel* emphasizes the lovers' confusion and intensity through expressive illustration. Manga Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, reimagined in a Tokyo-like metropolis, presents Juliet as a warrior-princess and Romeo as an alienated outsider (Leong and Appignanesi). These visual reinventions amplify lust and alienation in ways textual performance alone cannot. *Antony and Cleopatra*, with its dense political backdrop, has fewer graphic interpretations, but Cleopatra herself has become a pop-cultural icon. Over time, Elizabeth Taylor's Cleopatra has transcended the boundaries of film, turning into a cultural language of its own. As Suzanne Osmond notes, Taylor's image has been endlessly reinterpreted in fashion and visual art, becoming a shorthand for glamour, spectacle, and excess (Osmond 72). Building on Osmond's insight, it becomes clear that Cleopatra's allure continues to echo through modern culture, in the sheen of magazine covers, the opulence of perfume ads, and the rhythm of music videos. Vogue's "Egyptian Queen" feature reimagines Taylor's radiance through the lens of contemporary fashion, while Rihanna's Where Have You Been video channels the same regal magnetism. Together, these reworkings remind us that Cleopatra is more than a historical figure; she is an ever-evolving symbol of beauty, power, and reinvention, a mirror that reflects every generation's fascination with desire and identity. This demonstrates Fürsich's argument that media constructs reality- Cleopatra's image survives not as historical accuracy but as a commodified aesthetic of sensuality and command (Fürsich 114).

Romeo and Juliet, meanwhile, continues to influence pop culture through music and fashion. Taylor Swift's hit song "Love Story" retells the narrative through a modern lens, blending teenage rebellion with romantic idealism. The music video features Swift dressed in Juliet-inspired gowns, standing against backdrops of medieval castles and candlelit ballrooms. Vogue editorials have also borrowed from the aesthetic of *Romeo and Juliet*, portraying models as star-crossed lovers wrapped in Renaissance lace and melancholic poses (Hess). These visual homages transform Juliet into a romantic archetype: one that balances innocence with intensity.

Digital media has accelerated the reinterpretation of love and lust in Shakespeare. On platforms like TikTok and Instagram Reels, young creators stage short-form performances of key scenes, often parodying, remixing, or modernizing them. Hashtags like #ShakespeareInLove or #CleopatraCore generate thousands of user-generated posts, with Cleopatra represented as a confident, memeable "baddie" and Juliet as the ultimate ride-or-die romantic heroine. In these formats, lust becomes playful, ironic, and empowered. Even AI-generated videos and deepfake reenactments now circulate, imagining Romeo and Cleopatra interacting across timelines. Elfriede Fürsich argues that media does not merely reflect culture: it constructs it (Fürsich 114). These digital reinterpretations participate in defining how new generations perceive desire, tragedy, and agency.

Media adaptations also offer space for critique. Several modern directors use these stories to challenge heteronormative narratives. LGBTQ+ stagings of *Romeo and Juliet* are increasingly common, where Romeo falls for a non-binary Mercutio or Juliet is reimagined as a lesbian lover (Tuan 18).

These creative liberties not only diversify the romantic landscape but destabilize the original binaries between love and lust, innocence and passion, aligning with Butler's performativity: love and lust are not fixed essences but enacted roles (Butler 44). Shakespeare's stories, stretched and queered, prove that passion remains culturally alive because it can be re-scripted.

Shakespeare exists beyond dusty theaters. He surfaces in fashion shoots, TikTok edits, graphic novels, and even perfume advertisements. The stories of Romeo and Juliet and Antony and Cleopatra have not remained static; they have been stretched, bent, politicized, queered, and commercialized. Love and lust—the turbulent forces driving both plays are continually redefined by the media that conveys them. In line with Hutcheon's adaptation theory, each new rendition functions less as duplication and more as reinvention, showing that Shakespeare's passions endure precisely because they remain infinitely adaptable (Hutcheon 48).

Conclusion

We like to treat love and lust like they're separate forces: one noble, the other indulgent. But Shakespeare does not play by that division. In *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, these feelings do not just overlap; they fuel everything. Love is not gentle in Verona. It charges in, young and bright, tearing through rules and bloodlines with quiet defiance. In Egypt, it mutates: desire turns sharp, clever, and even imperial. Cleopatra does not fall into romance; she wields it. Antony does not lose control by accident. It's part of the script, hers and his.

In both plays, love and lust rise far beyond private feelings. They act like weapons: capable of building, breaking, and reshaping lives. Whether it is a Juliet played against type, a Cleopatra reimagined through new identities, or a Romeo updated for digital culture, each version opens a doorway Shakespeare could not have imagined but somehow prepared us for.

Across this study, that same tension has kept resurfacing. Shakespeare never locks passion inside the private heart. He writes it onto bodies, families, nations, and empires. Love and lust move across boundaries, exposing what it means to want something—or someone—that the world insists should be out of reach. There is no clean ending, no final resolution. Romeo and Juliet do not merely die for love; they die with the hope that love might mean something more than loyalty to bloodlines. Antony and Cleopatra do not collapse under passion; they go to war for it, and in doing so, assert the transformative power of emotion in a world governed by politics.

In a world that is still learning how to name and navigate its emotions, Shakespeare's lovers remain more than characters. They are archetypes, arguments, and provocations. They are warnings and aspirations. And as long as we continue to retell their stories, whether through poetry or pixels, they will remain, vividly and defiantly, alive.

Works Cited

Adelman, Janet. The Common Liar: An Essay on Antony and Cleopatra. Yale University Press, 1973. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00007-F.

Barcelona Sánchez, Antonio. "Metaphorical Models of Romantic Love in Romeo and Juliet." Journal of Pragmatics, vol. 24, 1995, pp. 667–688.

Berry, Allison. "50 Years Later: How Cleopatra Continues to Influence Fashion Today." *Time*, 12 June 2013, https://style.time.com/2013/06/12/50-years-later-how-cleopatra-continues-to-influence-fashion-today/. Accessed 28 Oct. 2025.

Bhuiyan, Robina Rashid. "A Different Romeo and Juliet Staged at BSA." *The Daily Star*, 14 Dec. 2017. https://www.thedailystar.net/arts-entertainment/theatre/different-romeo-and-juliet-staged-bsa-1504483. Accessed 28 Oct. 2025.

Billington, Michael. "Antony and Cleopatra Review – Okonedo and Fiennes Are a Magnificent Match." The Guardian, 27 Sept. 2018, updated 30 Sept. 2018, https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2018/sep/27/antony-and-cleopatra-review-sophie-okonedo-ralph-fiennes-magnificent-match-national-theatre. Accessed 28 Oct. 2025.

Bradley, A. C. Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth. Penguin Classics, 1991. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-22059-5_7.

Butler, Judith. Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. Routledge, 1990.

El-Sawy, Amany. "Encountering Shakespeare's Cleopatra: The Subversion of the Occident's

Threat of Objectification." Selected Papers of the Ohio Valley Shakespeare Conference, vol. 9, 2010, https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/spovsc/vol9/iss1/2. Accessed 15 Oct. 2025.

Freud, Sigmund. The Interpretation of Dreams. Translated by James Strachey, Avon Books, 1965.

Fürsich, Elfriede. "Media and the Representation of Others." *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 61, Mar. 2010, pp. 113–130. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2451.2010.01751.x.

Heidari, Nastaran Fadaei. "Re-visiting Orientalism in Antony and Cleopatra." *International Journal of English Literature and Social Science*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2020, https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.51.25.

Hess, Liam. "Vogue, 25 Years Later, Romeo + Juliet's Costumes Are as Magical as Ever." *Vogue*, 2 Nov. 2021, https://www.vogue.com/article/romeo-juliet-costumes-25th-anniversary. Accessed 15 Oct. 2025.

Hutcheon, Linda. A Theory of Adaptation. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2013. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203095010.

Iftimie, Nicoleta-Mariana. "The Role of the Media in Baz Luhrmann's Romeo+Juliet." *Linguaculture*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2017, pp. 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1515/lincu-2017-0007.

Kahn, Coppelia. "Coming of Age in Verona." *Modern Language Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1977, pp. 17–34. https://doi.org/10.2307/3194631.

Kottman, Paul A. "Defying the Stars: Tragic Love as the Struggle for Freedom in 'Romeo and Juliet.'" *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 63, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1–38. https://doi.org/10.1353/shq.2012.0007.

Leong, Sonia, and Richard Appignanesi. Manga Shakespeare: Romeo and Juliet. SelfMadeHero, 2007.

Loomba, Ania. Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism. Oxford University Press, 2002.

McDonald, John. Romeo & Juliet: The Graphic Novel. Classical Comics Ltd, 2009.

Osmond, Suzanne. "'Her Infinite Variety': Representations of Shakespeare's Cleopatra in Fashion, Film and Theatre." *Film, Fashion & Consumption*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2011, pp. 55–79. https://doi.org/10.1386/ffc.1.1.55_1.

Ryle, Simon J. "Antony and Cleopatra, Mankiewicz and the Sublime Object." Adaptation, 2010, pp. 1–42. https://doi.org/10.1093/adaptation/apq014.

Said, Edward. Orientalism. Vintage Books, 1979.

Shakespeare, William. A Midsummer Night's Dream. Edited by Harold F. Brooks, Arden Shakespeare, 2001.

Shakespeare, William. Antony and Cleopatra. Renascence Editions, University of Oregon, 1999, http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/%7Erbear/shake/ac.html. Accessed 15 Oct. 2025.

Shakespeare, William. Romeo and Juliet. Edited by Burton Raffel, Yale University Press, 2004.

Shakespeare, William. Sonnet 130. In The Sonnets, edited by Stephen Booth, Yale University Press, 1977.

Siegel, Paul N. "Christianity and the Religion of Love in Romeo and Juliet." Shakespeare Quarterly, vol. 12, no. 4, 1961, pp. 371–92. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/2867455.

Smith, Robert Metcalf. "Three Interpretations of 'Romeo and Juliet.'" The Shakespeare Association Bulletin, vol. 23, no. 2, 1948, pp. 59–77. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/23675399. Accessed 15 Oct. 2025.

Targoff, Ramie. "Mortal Love: Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet and the Practice of Joint Burial." Representations, vol. 120, no. 1, 2012, pp. 17–38. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.1525/rep.2012.120.1.17.

Tuan, Iris H. "Pop with Gods, Shakespeare, and AI: Popular Film, (Musical) Theatre, and TV Drama." 2020. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-7297-5.