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Bachies, Bardies, Trekkies, and Sherlockians

Roberta Pearson

Let’s begin with a quiz.¹ Which of the appellations in this chapter’s title would fans/buffs/enthusiasts/devotees/aficionados/cognoscenti/connoisseurs of J. S. Bach, William Shakespeare, Sherlock Holmes, and Star Trek accept, and which not? Adherents of the popular and the middle-brow have nicknames. North American devotees of the great detective call themselves “Sherlockians”; the British prefer the more formal but less euphonious “Holmesians.” Some Star Trek fans accept the “Trekkie” nomenclature; others see it as derogatory and opt for the more serious “Trekkers.” Adherents of high culture don’t have nicknames.² “Bachies” is my coinage and “Bardies” Henry Jenkins’s (for which I thank him); they are not in common currency but perhaps should be. My (entirely unproven) assumption is that Bach and Shakespeare fans would reject the semi-derisory nicknames; I suspect (again with no evidence, but that’s the nature of this chapter) that most would also reject the term “fan” and opt for another of the labels under offer. Both the specific playful diminutives and the general label of “fan” extend popular culture practices to the rarefied realms of baroque music and Elizabethan drama, a leveling that those with allegiances to the supposedly higher realms of “serious” music and literature might resent. The absence of a single agreed-upon name signals the invisibility in which power often cloaks itself. Those involved in popular or middle-brow culture are generally seen as fans or, more specifically, Trekkies, Whovians, Sherlockians, or Wodehousians and the like; their firm categorization is a social judgment, sometimes a negative one. The adherents of high culture are similarly categorized, but the multiplication of labels avoids negative connotation. The terms “buffs”/“enthusiasts”/”devotees” are at worst neutral, while “aficionados”/“cognoscenti”/
“connoisseurs,” with their implications of specialized, and more importantly, worthwhile knowledge, positively value those to whom they are applied.

The differences in labels and their associated valuations gives rise to several questions. Which labels would people choose to apply to themselves and why? Do the words “fans”/“enthusiasts”/“devotees”/“aficionados”/“cognoscenti”/“connoisseurs” signal different degrees and kinds of engagements with the beloved object? What’s the difference between those who engage with “serious” music and those who engage with “serious” literature? What’s the difference between adherents of Shakespeare, a writer acclaimed as the greatest playwright of all time and serving as a bastion of British national identity, and those of Conan Doyle, a second-rank writer who did what he did very well and whose output some might classify as fiction rather than literature? How different are the high-culture Bachies and Bardies from the middle-brow Sherlockians from the vast popular culture fandoms (e.g. Trekkies) in their appropriations/pleasures and their social organizations? Or should we perhaps be seeking similarity rather than difference? As John Frow argues, “There is no longer a stable hierarchy of value running from ‘low’ to ‘high’ culture, and ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture can no longer be neatly correlated with a hierarchy of social classes” (1995: 1). Frow’s cautionary quotation marks signal contemporary scholars’ uneasiness not only with correlating a hierarchy of value with social class but also with having to designate the steps of that hierarchy by distinct terms such as “high-,” “low-,” and “middle-brow.” The relationship among cultural values bears greater resemblance to an Escher print than a real stairway, but in an article of this length, I can do no more than acknowledge the problem, admitting that my personal aesthetic judgments drive the distinctions. The reader should insert her own scare quotes or reflect upon her own aesthetic criteria as necessary.

The larger point here is that while fan studies has extensively engaged with the popular and even occasionally with the middle-brow (see Brooker 2005a), it has almost entirely refused to engage with the high. The study of high culture still undeniably thrives in the academy; Shakespeare is far from taking up residence on the dust heap of history. But within the strain of cultural studies that traces its lineage to Birmingham, high culture figures only as a repressive other against which to celebrate the virtues of the popular. When challenged, the implicit preference among cultural studies scholars for popular culture can become aggressively explicit. Some of my (mostly younger) colleagues are suspicious of my wanting to
study Shakespeare as well as *Star Trek*, viewing this as a dangerous apostasy that threatens to reinstate ideologically invidious cultural hierarchies. Studying high culture and high-culture fans is seen as a back-door method of reintroducing debates around cultural value long abandoned in favor of orthodox adherence to cultural relativism and textual instability. While such study might sometimes be an attempt to reestablish high-culture hegemony, fears of such ulterior motives should not preclude questions of cultural value being at the center of the cultural studies project. These questions must inevitably involve the high as well as the low. For example, does the value of high-cultural forms such as Shakespeare stem purely from ideological and institutional mechanisms or, as some might argue, does the fact that Shakespeare’s texts have survived for over four centuries in and of itself connote some kind of inherent value? Has popular cultural studies valued its objects purely for ideological reasons—the resistance it supposedly attests to among its receivers? And now that the resistance paradigm is somewhat discredited, does popular cultural studies value its objects on the basis of popularity alone? Is it possible to say that one popular culture text is better than another and if so, why? Should popular cultural forms be judged by the same criteria as high culture or should different modes of evaluation be evolved?

But this article is not the place to discuss why cultural studies should return to questions of cultural value; for the moment the focus is on the exclusion of high culture within fan studies. Why have Trekkies et al. been studied ad infinitum and the Bachies, Bardies, and their ilk hardly at all? The stifling orthodoxy of the cultural relativist credo accounts for much, but there’s also a generational explanation for the embrace of popular culture fandoms and the exclusion of everything else. I know other cultural studies scholars of roughly my generation who, like myself, are both passionate about and understand the need to study the more restricted realms of music, literature, or art. And I know of at least one younger scholar, a contributor to this very volume (although I shall refrain from outing him/her) with a detailed knowledge of and love for classical music. And it turns out that one of the editors is a devoted Mozart fan, so we must beware of generational generalizations. But we do undeniably inhabit a historical moment in which the distribution of high-cultural capital has declined due to the very leveling of cultural hierarchies celebrated by cultural studies. Younger scholars may know a great deal about the latest pop idol phenomenon and hit television series but not much at all about baroque music or Elizabethan drama. There’s also a more discipline-
specific reason for younger scholars’ lack of high-cultural capital. My and earlier generations came to the then relatively new fields of film/television/cultural studies from a variety of other disciplines, bringing with us knowledge of many subjects. The subsequent success and growth of those disciplines means that younger scholars may have studied nothing except popular culture for a significant proportion of their academic lives. In the United Kingdom, students can begin film or media studies at sixteen, continue at university, and then go on to postgraduate study. No wonder most of our postgrads feel more comfortable with rock fans than baroque fans.

These remarks may sound like a typical older generational jeremiad, but we should acknowledge the structural determinants of scholarly inquiry in the history of a discipline, even if in slightly grumpy fashion. But the rant’s now at an end. The remainder of this article interrogates my own fandoms (what fellow contributor Matt Hills would call an auto-ethnography—and no, he’s not the classical music fan mentioned above) to sketch some of the issues that scholars studying high-culture fandom might wish to address. My former colleague, frequent coauthor, and dear friend Professor William Uricchio of MIT tells me that I have a fannish disposition while he, despite sharing my love of early (roughly pre-nineteenth-century) music and other high-cultural forms, admits to no fandoms as such. He’s right about me; at various times I’m a sports fan (in the past Duke University basketball, New York Mets baseball, and now occasionally England football and most recently England cricket), a music fan (Bach and Mozart above all, but others as well), a literature fan (Shakespeare above all, but also Dickens, Conan Doyle, and many others), a television fan (Star Trek above all, but others include The Prisoner and The Avengers), a film fan (Keaton, Hitchcock, and Welles rather predictably ranking first among my favorite directors), in addition to less classifiable fandoms (?) such as Horatio Nelson and the eighteenth-century Royal Navy. I’m also what another former colleague, frequent coauthor, and dear friend, Professor Maire Messenger Davies of the University of Ulster, calls a serial enthusiast; in Italy I become temporarily enthralled by Renaissance art, and in the Netherlands, the seventeenth century Golden Age; when a favorite actor appears in an Ibsen, Miller, or Pinter play, I become temporarily fascinated by the rest of the playwright’s oeuvre.

When first thinking about this article, I rang Uricchio and asked him, rather unfairly on the spur of the moment, to elaborate in scholarly fashion upon the fannish and non-fannish disposition idea that had previously figured in casual conversation and friendly banter. He speculated
that non-fans like himself engage in aesthetic reflection or are temporarily moved by cultural texts but that fans like me incorporate the cultural texts as part of their self-identity, often going on to build social networks on the basis of shared fandoms. Centrality to identity and social networks handily distinguish my fandoms from my enthusiasms. Many of my fandoms were acquired in early to midadolescence, a crucial period for the formation of self-identity; a good psychologist could probably determine my fandoms’ origins in my early life circumstances. Many of these fandoms later led to social relationships; I am a proud, if somewhat lapsed, member of the Adventuresses of Sherlock Holmes (ASH), although I can still tell you the number of steps up to Holmes’s flat (seventeen) and the number of varieties of cigarette ash he could distinguish (140). There have also been less formal social relationships; many of my friends have tended to share one or the other of my fandoms. My enthusiasms are more ephemeral, resulting from proximate and identifiable factors such as travel or following the work of a favorite actor. The issue of terminology arises again; I accept the word “fan,” where others would reject it, but apply it to those cultural texts most central to my identity, relegating others to the category of enthusiasms. My personal experiences point to many questions that are to my knowledge as yet unanswered by fan studies. How do people acquire their fandoms or their enthusiasms? Which of these lead to social networks? Do other people make the kinds of distinctions I do with regard to their leisure activities and interests, with some more central to identity than others? And how do the differences among popular, middle-brow, and high culture play out across all these questions?

Central to these questions is the idea of overlapping fandoms. Fandoms have tended to be studied in isolation, or at best as amalgams of interests within the same field of cultural production—the fans of English television discussed by Henry Jenkins in *Textual Poachers*. But if there truly is such a thing as a fannish disposition, then there should be many whose multiple fandoms range widely across fields of cultural production and up and down cultural hierarchies; I’ve certainly met many *Star Trek* and *Avengers* fans at Sherlockian gatherings, and my closest Sherlockian friends number among them Detroit Tigers, New York Mets, Melissa Etheridge, and P. G. Wodehouse fans, as well as a woman who turned her enjoyment of wine into a living and became a professional oenologist. These Sherlockians are, like myself, solidly middle-class, and the ability to range across fields of cultural production and up and down cultural hierarchies is certainly correlated with class. As Jostein Gripsrud puts it,
“While the audiences in the opera almost certainly go to movies and even watch television, the majority of movie and television audiences will never go to the opera; or visit places like museums of contemporary art, certain theatres. The reception of high and low culture is still clearly linked to the social formations we call classes” (1999: 199). Peterson and Kern provide empirical support for Gripsrud’s assertion, arguing that in the United States, there is an historical shift among the higher social categories from highbrow snob (one who does not participate in any lowbrow or middlebrow activity) to “omnivore” (capable of appreciating them all) (1996). Of course, as I’ve pointed out above, traditional high-cultural capital seems to be declining among younger age cohorts, which might mean that the phenomenon of the omnivore, or as I have put it, the person capable of ranging across fields of cultural production and up and down cultural hierarchies, is a historically restricted one.

The issue of class also comes into play with the list of terms that began this article: “fans”/“buffs”/“enthusiasts”/“devotees”/“aficionados”/“cognoscenti”/“connoisseurs.” The worthwhile and specialized knowledge accredited to the aficionados/cognoscenti/connoisseurs implies a higher class position than that of the fans/buffs/enthusiasts and devotees. Fans of high-culture forms may consciously seek to distinguish themselves from fans of popular culture forms through consumption patterns seen as appropriate to their class formations. While high culture is as fully imbired in the commodity circulation of late capitalism as popular culture, it may be so in interestingly different ways; one of the great strengths of capitalism lies in its ever more refined appeals to ever smaller and more distinct niche markets. Again I turn to my own experience. An action figure of Star Trek’s Data sits on top of a bookshelf in my study, one of the few visible manifestations of a fandom that has extended neither to collecting nor to active association with other fans (on-line chat groups, conventions, or clubs). Data was bought in a second-hand shop for five pounds and is displayed in semi-ironic fashion next to a small aboriginal sculpture, which he’s using his tricorder to analyze. No ironic bust of Shakespeare or Bach sits in my study since these artifacts bear class associations (nouveau riche, trying too hard to acquire cultural capital, pretentious) difficult to ironize. But I do have ironic Shakespeare tchatches, one of my favorites being a really kitschy, made-in-China, bought-in-Stratford pencil sharpener. It’s a bit like a flattened snowdome, a tiny cut-out Bard’s head floating above a black and white picture of Anne Hathaway’s cottage. Just the thing for a postmodern academic Bardie who wants to
declare an allegiance without committing a class faux pas. I have also bought the occasional Shakespeare t-shirt and fridge magnet, but there’s a limited range of items I feel comfortable acquiring. Once again, however, I am generalizing from my own aesthetic preferences, and this is a dangerous enterprise. Another of my dear friends, this time a fellow contributor to this volume, John Tulloch, rebuked me upon reading my first draft. He has a friend who “is a great lover of opera and Handel, and has a small bust of Beethoven on her mantelpiece. So does that make her ‘nouveau riche’? She thinks you ‘a bit snobby’ for saying so.”? It’s a fair cop, guv!

I may have an aversion to busts, but had I the income and the leisure I would happily embark on one of the cultural tours to artistic, musical, or literary sites constantly advertised in up-market print venues such as The Guardian, The Gramophone, and The New Yorker. In this 250th anniversary of Mozart’s birth, for example, a spare one thousand six hundred to two thousand five hundred quid will launch you on a “Mozart on the romantic Danube” cruise, visiting “many of the places that played a prominent role in his all too short life.” The governments of the cities that played that prominent role, e.g., Vienna, Salzburg, and Prague, are meanwhile concentrating on extracting every Euro from the anticipated tourist trade of the anniversary year. Readers of this volume might well characterize a Mozart-inspired cruise or city-break as a fan pilgrimage, but I would point out that high culture got there first. After all, what was the grand tour of Europe expected of every elite young American male in the nineteenth century but a high-culture fan pilgrimage? And Bardies have been flocking to Stratford since the eighteenth century (see Pearson 2002). These are precisely the interesting antecedents, parallels, and connections we miss by excluding high culture from cultural studies (although geographers and economists recognize the key role played by high culture in urban regeneration).

Since my economic capital lags considerably behind my cultural capital, my high-culture fandoms must be sated primarily through consumption of the works (going to the theater, cinema, and concerts, purchasing DVDs and CDs, listening to the radio, and engaging in occasional discussions with the similarly high-minded). Trekkies and Sherlockians, however, can acquire an endless array of artifacts in addition to the core television shows and Conan Doyle works, some made for them and some made by them. Truly dedicated fans can even recreate the settings of the beloved texts, turning their flats into the Enterprise or their living rooms into the 221-B sitting room. Consumption in the form of collecting is a key element of the popular stereotype of the nerdy, needs-to-get-a-life fan
(The Simpsons’ Comic Book Guy being a high-profile example). How do different fandoms relate differently to commodification? Do certain cultural forms lend themselves more easily to commodification than others? Fully kitted-out, narrativized virtual worlds such as Star Trek, The Lord of the Rings, and Sherlock Holmes seem to produce the widest range of commodities, but there’s a distinction even here between copyrights vested in a single media franchise and those not; as a result, the first two examples give rise to more centralized production of commodities than the third. Might associations with certain kinds of consumption (attending “serious” theater versus purchasing action figures) contribute to the social valuations made of high and popular culture fans?

The remainder of this article consists of some brief observations about two of my four titular fandoms, Sherlockians and Bachies (Trekkies have had more than enough press and the word count prohibits giving the Bardies any). Sherlockians have so far (with the exception of a previous article of mine; see Pearson 1997) escaped academic scrutiny, despite being probably the oldest established fandom. The first official Sherlockians, those readers who successfully responded to a quiz in Christopher Morley’s column in The Saturday Review, gathered at a New York City drinking establishment in 1934. There they formed the Baker Street Irregulars (BSI), the first and most famous of Sherlockian societies, named after the street urchins whom Holmes occasionally employed to assist him. Holmes fandom remains primarily an Anglo-American phenomenon, with more than a hundred of the so-called scion societies in the United States and several in Britain, including the premier English organization, the Sherlock Holmes Society of London. Sherlockians engage in similar activities to other fans. Members of scion societies meet on a regular basis to eat, drink, take quizzes, listen to talks, engage in theatrical presentations, sing, play games, and, most importantly, escape into a world where all the inhabitants share a similar passion. Individual Sherlockians produce Sherlockian “art”—ranging from paintings to hand-painted sweat-shirts—for their own pleasure or for sale. Sherlockians write what others would call fan fiction, pastiches of the original stories and novels, and what they themselves call Sherlockian scholarship, nonfiction that employs the techniques of textual hermeneutics and historical contextualization to clarify the contradictions and lacunae that stemmed from Conan Doyle’s writing in the serial format.

Sherlockians talk like fans and walk like fans but would they consider themselves fans? When I wrote my article about Sherlockians in cyber-
space, I said in a footnote, “I should note that many of my friends within the Sherlockian world would contest the appellations of ‘fan’ and ‘fandom,’ their resistance to these labels stemming from an implicit hierarchization of the print media over the moving image media” (1997: 160). I made this smug judgment about motivation without consulting those concerned, and this time, partly by way of apology, I decided actually to ask some Sherlockians what they thought of the word “fan.” The word’s associations with the most prominent of popular culture fandoms made my admittedly small sample (three respondents) reluctant to adopt it themselves. Anne Cotton, a 72-year-old retiree, said, “When I think of real fans, I think more of the Trekkers (Star Trek folks) who show up at conventions dressed as favorite characters, or miscellaneous Klingons, or whatever.” Susan Rice, a 63-year-old travel agent, said, “To me it’s redolent of sports fandom and painting one’s face, or rock/movie idols who have idolatrous fans.” Katherine Karlson, a 53-year-old freelance writer and part-time legal secretary, agreed. “I usually associate being a ‘Fan’ with mainly support of sports teams, and by extension, some highly egregious behavior. When dealing with hobby interests, ‘fan’ also has a slightly loony association: vide Trekkies.” It’s the perceived “loony” or irrational nature of the fannish response that puts these Sherlockians off. “I guess I think of a fan response as visceral, not reasoned,” says Susan. Anne, referring to those who dress up as favorite characters, thinks that “the real definition of ‘fan’ just might have to do with the degree to which this alter ego is confused with, or even becomes, one’s own real identity.” For Sherlockians, however, “the dividing line between the literary world and the real one is quite clear.” Rationality is a key distinction between the Sherlockians and those whom they think of as fans. Says Katherine, “Fans don’t necessarily do ‘scholarship’ as we do, and this was the original impetus behind the earliest SH societies. Even with the BSI and their antecedents, it may have been tongue-in-cheek, but a certain amount of knowledge combined with mental dexterity and wit was required for full membership/acceptance.” If not “fans,” what would these Sherlockians call themselves (other than “Sherlockian,” of course, which all would prefer)? Susan sums it up nicely. “If called a fan, I wouldn’t correct the speaker, but it’s not the word I would choose. I would choose devotee or aficionado which both sound snootier than fan, but I would prefer to separate myself from teenagers and testosterone-charged boys of all ages.”

My knowledge of the Sherlockian worlds leads me to believe that most Sherlockians, like my three respondents, would reject the label of “fan,”
even if, like Susan, they are fully aware of the cultural hierarchies at play. The terms they prefer—“admirer,” “enthusiast,” “devotee,” “aficionado”—disassociate them from the excessive affect and hormone-induced behavior connoted by fan. Common sense leads me to believe that Bachies and Bardies would similarly want to distinguish themselves from the loonies who dress up as Klingons and can’t tell fantasy from reality. The first and second generations of fan researchers insisted on attributing rationality to fans precisely to counter the popular image of the irrational fan so prevalent in the media (and still, it would seem, prevalent among Sherlockians). The third generation of researchers has insisted on the importance of fannish affect. Of course, given the reluctance to investigate high culture, no researcher that I know of wonders about the relationship between affect and high-culture fandom. Pierre Bourdieu, whose work fan studies so often invokes, tells us that the perceived engagement of the intellect rather than the emotions often serves to distinguish high from popular culture, and his opinion seems to be generally accepted. But I often find that high-culture texts tap more directly and profoundly into my emotions than popular culture texts.

As I sit at my desk writing this chapter, I’m listening to a live performance of one of the late Mozart quartets broadcast by Radio 3 (the BBC’s classical music station) in honor of the composer’s 250th birthday. The music moves me to the very core of my being, my emotions fully engaged by what I can only characterize verbally as the transcendent, the sublime, the divinely inspired. Affect is central to my experience of Mozart, as it is of Bach. That I’m not unique in this regard can be seen in the seven thousand-plus responses posted on Radio 3’s message board to the Bach Christmas, ten days, twenty-four hours a day, of Bach’s music—every note he wrote, as the promos put it. One of the more prolific posters, Annebach, responded to the thread “what would life be without JSB,” “My life would be much impoverished. His music affects me profoundly and joyfully and enriches every second I hear it and afterwards because it changes me. The music is also so profoundly beautiful and sublime. It calms me, it soothes me, it uplifts me, it energizes me, it makes me think better, it makes me so very happy.” If Annebach admitted emotional dependency on Bach, the language of another thread, “withdrawal from Bach,” playfully but revealingly intimated physical dependency. Said GBGlin, “I suspected I was slightly addicted to Bach’s music. Now I know, and I’m dreading the impending withdrawal phase.” MistyJeanette responded, “The sense of loss when this is over will be great. I have always
been addicted to Bach and this is beyond my wildest dreams.” Then there was the chap, in a post which I’ve unfortunately misplaced, who admitted to hearing “phantom Bach,” even when the radio was turned off. This post has stuck in my memory if not in my files because I too suffered from the same complaint, not a particular composition but constant Bach-like sounds, counterpoint and all, in my mind’s ear whenever I wasn’t listening to the real thing. The Bachies on the message board confessed to the total immersion in the text, the merging of fantasy with reality, the delusional behavior that the elitist critics of popular culture have so often deplored. If Theodor Adorno himself had experienced the Bach Christmas, he too might have complained of phantom Bach.

This outpouring of emotion is a far cry from the cool contemplation supposedly characteristic of the consumption of high culture, but this seething affect didn’t prohibit rational discussion or, rather, debate. The Bachies happily engaged in the distinction making so crucial to most fandoms, arguing the toss over period (on original instruments with great attention to original performance practices) versus modern (on contemporary instruments with no great concern about historically informed performance practices) style or Bach versus Beethoven or Mozart.

26jacqueline26 angrily declared that “it needs to be yelled from the rooftops that radio has been abducted by the ‘period people,’” while an email read on air begged the presenters not to play anything recorded before 1985 (when the period performance style came into the ascendancy re: Bach). Mumblesford, a Bachie par excellence, deprecated the competition. “The choice is between Beethoven’s music which is bombastic junk 80% of the time. Or then there’s Mozart’s frivolous bluffing” whereas in Bach “all the parts are worked out properly . . . as opposed to the frivolous twiddly clichés we hear in so much of Mozart’s music.” Auntie_Joan contributed the following assessment of Bach v. Beethoven: “It does seem a little unfair to compare one of the key figures of Western art with Beethoven—a composer who never really got a handle on how to finish a piece. Or bridge passages. Or subtlety of any form.”

Expecting dissonances between Bachies and popular culture fandoms, I instead found harmony. Bachies are every bit as emotional as their popular culture counterparts and every bit as bloody minded about their own particular preferences (Mozart twiddly! I can barely bring myself to quote the vicious canard, but the slagging off of Beethoven bothers me not at all). So might high-culture fans look a lot more like popular culture fans than we might expect? Sherlockians, by contrast, play down affect in favor
of rationality, perhaps made more insecure by their positioning in the middle of the cultural hierarchy rather than at the top. Or might the favoring of affect over rationality be related to the difference between music fandom and literature fandom? Perhaps, but I suspect that the absent Bardies are every bit as passionate about their icon’s work as the Bachies. The ancient Greeks knew all about drama as catharsis and a great performance of one of the four great Shakespearean tragedies certainly leaves me emotionally wrecked. Interrogating my own fandoms in this manner has raised many questions and given few answers. But I do hope that this chapter has at least given some indication of the fascinating research questions and insights into cultural production and consumption that would result from cultural studies embracing the study of high culture and high-culture fandom.

Notes

1. I’d like to thank the editors, Karen Backstein, and John Tulloch for their helpful suggestions for revision of a hastily written first draft.
2. With the single exception that I can think of, the Jane-ites or Jane Austen fans.
3. Personal email communication.
4. The seven thousand figure is derived from Higgins (2006). According to the article, the station also received nearly two thousand emails, nearly 90 percent of them in favor of the “Bachathon” as it was dubbed.
A Trekkie or Trekker is a fan of the Star Trek franchise, or of specific television series or films within that franchise. In 1967, science fiction editor Arthur W. Saha applied the term "trekkies" when he saw a few fans of the first season of Star Trek: The Original Series wearing pointy ears at the 25th World Science Fiction Convention, on the day series creator Gene Roddenberry showed a print of "Amok Time" to the convention. Saha used the term in an interview with Pete Hamill that Hamill was 7 Bachies, Bardies, Trekkies, and Sherlockians. pp. 98-109. Download. contents. 8 Fans of Chekhov Re-Approaching åŒœHigh CultureåŒœ pp. 110-122. Download. One recent publication is provocatively titled 'Star Trek: Serialised Ideology' and I'm very interesting in hearing more about that, and another article entitled, 'Bachies, Bardies, Trekkies and Sherlockians'. To give you an idea of its importance, Henry Jenkins assigns her work on his course, 'Interactive Transmedia Storytelling'.