

2. SHAKESPEARE IN PERFORMANCE

reviewed by PASCALE AEBISCHER

Theatre history, this year, has been even more than usually concerned with the material traces left by early modern theatre practices. Julian Bowsher and Pat Miller's *The Rose and the Globe – Playhouses of Shakespeare's Bankside, Southwark: Excavations 1988–91* takes this trend to an extreme and brings together all the significant strands of archaeological evidence unearthed in digs, richly and informatively illustrated with maps, sketches and photographs of documentary sources, sites and finds. The book minutely documents excavation data and finds that have been re-examined using the latest technologies. The result is a remarkable and important report that would like to 'appeal to a wide audience'. Because of the uncompromisingly technical approach and style it adopts not only in the specialist appendices that fill a third of the volume but also in its discursive account of the excavations, however, it will probably find a more specialist readership amongst archaeologists and materialist critics in search of the telling piece of archaeological evidence in support of an argument about the social practices affecting the early modern theatre industry. Somebody working on early modern fashions in the theatre is sure to find something intriguing to say about the decorative trimmings and the 'most unusual' number of glass beads that were found and which may have represented 'a special fashion statement on the part of a few of those attending the playhouse' or even been part of 'highly ornate stage costumes'.

Most of all, *The Rose and the Globe* will be compulsory reading for anyone exploring early modern theatre architecture, whether sitting at a desk or through original practices performance in one of the reconstructed theatres: this is a book which, in its quiet, factual way intervenes in ongoing debates about the exact shape of the theatres and the performance spaces within them. The reconstructed Shakespeare's Globe (referred to in this book as 'the third Globe') has twenty sides to its polygon – Jonathan Greenfield here concludes that the building was more likely to have had sixteen or eighteen

sides. No criticism of the new building, which is also briefly discussed, is made at any point, but those who are aware of the heated debates and their implications for how we understand the spatial relationships in the original Globe(s) will find their views challenged and/or confirmed by the carefully laid-out facts and foundation plans. The evidence collected here also intriguingly suggests that the first Globe could not have been largely based on the same dimensions as the Theatre, disturbing a convenient and widespread ontological myth. But certainty is impossible: as Jonathan Greenfield writes of the second Globe, 'the actual dimensions of the overall structure are still open to discussion, and, until further remains are revealed, will remain so'. Furthermore, Greenfield cautions against the practice of 'using evidence from any one of the playhouses to support conclusions about any other one', since what the partial excavations clearly show is that there were significant divergences between the different public theatres. It will take a full excavation of these playhouses and the exploration of 'other areas of Tudor Bankside, other playhouses, baiting arenas, inns, taverns and shops' to convey a full archaeological picture of early modern playgoing practices and theatres. In the meantime, what this book does quite brilliantly is provide the raw materials on which years of scholarship and debate will be based.

Even for those without an investment in theatre architecture and without the background in archaeology that is needed to properly appreciate the information about the geology and topography of the area and the chronology of the digs, this book is an eye-opener. Christopher Phillpotts's account of the Bankside in the sixteenth century fills that neighbourhood, otherwise characterized by ditches and fishponds, with businesses and trades, from tanning to brewing and the sex industry. His section on 'Theatre History' is an excellent, very concise, summary of current knowledge about innyard, private and public theatres in early modern London. Later sections of the book build

THE YEAR'S CONTRIBUTION TO SHAKESPEARE STUDIES

on this account and fill some of the gaps in our knowledge. Thus, for example, it is only thanks to the excavations that Henslowe's expenditure of over £105 for building costs in 1592 can now be put down to the remodelling of the Rose's northern half, including a new stage with a roof over it. Spectators must, it seems, have been thronging around that stage, since the floor around it is heavily eroded. For the Globe, the archaeological find that intrigued me most was the discovery of what may have been seventeenth-century theatrical props, including a sword. In the appendix, a brief section on 'Arms' reveals that the large number of items associated with weaponry found in the digs 'suggests this was an era with a particular potential for violence arising from weapons that were regularly being carried around'. The chapter on 'Plays, Players and Playgoers' adds some fascinating details, not only about the fact that the blade of the potential prop sword was never sharpened, but also about playgoers' dubious toilet habits and the use of clay tobacco pipes in the theatre. The book may be a rather demanding read but it is a treasure-trove of information.

Tiffany Stern's *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* is also a fount of knowledge but it certainly is not a dry read. Stern takes the raw materials of surviving playbooks, plots, bills, title-pages, 'arguments', prologues, epilogues, songs and masques and turns them into a compelling, fresh narrative of how plays were patched together out of disparate texts. To build her argument, Stern moves between the fields of theatre history and textual criticism, harnessing masses of documentary evidence (much of it new), which she manages to order in such a way as not to overwhelm her reader, helped by her talent for telling a good story. Having heard several conference and seminar-paper versions of the material presented here, I was struck, when reading the book, by the extent to which Stern has been able to preserve the lightness of tone, love of anecdote and obvious enthusiasm for her discoveries and conclusions in the written version. Sometimes, in fact, her stories are so compelling and well told that it is difficult to remember Stern's warning, in her introduction, that hers 'is a

book of tendencies, trends and likelihoods' rather than certainties. Significant amounts of evidence are garnered from Restoration and eighteenth-century texts that are used as a complement to scarcer earlier documentary traces, allowing Stern to spot patterns where otherwise we would be able to see nothing but disconnected textual fragments. The conclusions she arrives at may thus not be definitive, though they will be the operative truths for some time to come.

One thing Stern establishes beyond doubt is the fragmentary nature of the early modern play-text. This is not only because, as she argued with Simon Palfrey in *Shakespeare in Parts*, actors learned their lines from separate 'parts', and because, as she showed in *Rehearsal*, prologues and epilogues were separate pieces of text cued to specific performances, but also because right from the start, the play was conceptualized as, and created from, a string of textual fragments. The plot, she tells us, was not only considered by early critics and playwrights themselves as separate from the dialogue of a play, but it was actually a separate piece of writing: what Stern calls a 'plot-scenario' (as opposed to a 'backstage-plot') was a piece of writing that sketched the outline of the action before the dialogue was filled in. Fascinatingly, one of the ways in which various writers could collaborate in composing a play would involve a plotter working with one or several dialogue-writers. A good plot was a valuable commodity, purchased separately by a theatre long before the play based on it existed. Like all valuable commodities, plots may also have been stolen or at least reused: Stern draws attention to the ways in which Shakespeare's *King John* and *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, two very dissimilar plays, share their structure and narrative organization and even contain a couple of very similar stage directions that may have been lifted from the same, shared, plot. Another important document was the playbill, which, pinned to some kind of post (tethering post, 'pissing post', door-post or even a whipping post), advertised forthcoming performances. The problem, here, is that although Stern has no trouble proving that playbills were printed from at least 1587 onwards, no such

bill survives today. Picking up this gauntlet, she does a great job supplementing the missing material witness to this practice by looking at cognate texts. These include other types of poster advertising entertainments and the title-pages that may bear traces of playbills in them and may themselves have been posted as advertisements. Stern argues here for a much closer relationship between playhouse and printing-house, between the experience of watching a play and reading it, than commonly assumed.

The 'Argument' is yet another part of the play-text that is not often examined. Stern argues that this paratext, which seems entirely literary rather than theatrical, was in fact 'a frank piece of theatre available to a particular tier of audience and reproduced in some playbooks'. Arguments were often printed for masques and plays, mediating performances for their elite spectators, much in the way Middleton portrays the masque scene in *Women Beware Women*, which is preceded by the argument that is read out loud for the benefit of its courtly audience. As a consequence, '[t]he division between play as printed text and play as enacted performance is not as stark as it is often said to be, and Arguments provide one of the thrilling moments at which the two intersect, belonging to a strange textual hinterland where performance is most bookish and, conversely, where the playbook is most performative'. Other parts of the play, like prologue, epilogue and songs, were first performed and then circulated amongst readers as texts separate from the play. Stern shows how these texts' separate existence, and that of the letters or scrolls featuring as theatrical properties in plays, resulted in their odd placement within printed playtexts. The peculiar layout of scrolls or letters in printed playtexts, Stern argues, was designed to help the scribe responsible for creating the property scroll incorporate all the features necessary for that letter to do its work on stage: what look like bizarre stage-directions may in fact be 'scribe-directions'. An important point Stern makes in relation to prologues and epilogues is that 'it can never be assumed that the author of a prologue or epilogue (or chorus) is the author (or are the authors) of the play',

since stage-orations were written for specific occasions, may have been written much later than the rest of the play, and may have been reused for different plays. Songs, too, are an interesting category of text, for they seem to have been one of the first things affected by theatrical revision, as easily added to pad out a scene or 'update' it as excised to shorten the running time.

Theatrical revision and the traces it left becomes the focus of the end of the book, as Stern revisits her own earlier work and debates about censorship and questions whether the words spoken on stage, memorized as they were from individual parts transcribed by more or less reliable scribes, actually corresponded to the book approved by the Master of the Revels. Concluding with a section on the improvisation expected of early modern clowns, Stern adds hers to the choir of voices warning us not to confound written plays with spoken plays in the early modern theatre. Even with that warning in mind, however, this must-read for theatre historians and textual critics alike takes us tantalizingly close to witnessing an early modern play in performance and succeeds in reassembling the pieces of the documentary jigsaw in new ways that make excellent theatrical sense.

Brian Walsh's *Shakespeare, the Queen's Men, and the Elizabethan Performance of History*, which shares some of Stern's concern with extemporizing clowns, takes theatre history as its starting point, uses performance studies for its theoretical framework, and dedicates itself to a reassessment of how the *idea* of history (as opposed to actual history) was represented in Shakespeare's Elizabethan history plays and plays in the repertory of the Queen's Men. The Queen's Men are set alongside Shakespeare because they were the first company to 'stage the English past in the popular theatres', paving the way for Shakespeare's own dramatizations of the past and the theoretical engagement with notions of history which Walsh traces in these plays. What makes Walsh's study appropriate for inclusion in a review of Shakespeare in performance is its methodology, which adapts present-day performance theories to the specificities of the early modern theatre: the thinking of Phelan,

THE YEAR'S CONTRIBUTION TO SHAKESPEARE STUDIES

Roach, Blau, States and Taylor underpins Walsh's richly suggestive readings of the ways in which Elizabethan history plays produce a past that is both desired and always already on the point of vanishing; theatre can only revive history on 'borrowed time'. In the theatre, the realization of historians like Camden that history is necessarily discontinuous and 'not a naturally occurring form of knowledge' was embodied in plays that 'enact historicity as a sense of discontinuity and all the while reflect on the strategies through which historical representation, particularly corporeal representation, addresses that discontinuity'.

In his chapters concerned with the Queen's Men's *Famous Victories of Henry V* and *The True Tragedy of Richard III*, Walsh works through the traces of performance that can still be detected in these texts. As he goes on to demonstrate, these early history plays use the company's charismatic clowns (Tarlton, Wilson, Singer and Lanham) to draw attention to the absence of history in the present moment of performance: the clowns disrupt the historical narrative and highlight the rupture between past and present. Just like the figures of Truth, Poetry and Report in the frame of the *True Tragedy of Richard III*, whose debate prompts the spectator to appreciate the crafted nature of witness reports and the construction of historical truth, the clowns' anachronisms, in Walsh's readings, are not a sign of the playwright's clumsiness but contribute to the metatheatrical effects through which the Queen's Men's histories self-consciously reflect on the impossibility of historical representation.

In his chapters on Shakespeare's histories, Walsh continues this line of enquiry, analysing the plays for the ways in which they probe and puncture the notion that historical truth can be staged while simultaneously contributing to the creation of 'history' – as Walsh notes in his chapter on *Richard III*, Shakespeare's play is responsible for fixing Thomas More's negative image of this king in our historical imagination. Walsh finds that *1 Henry VI* enacts a 'critique of genealogy as a mode of historical organization' because the play reveals genealogies to be 'self-interested forms of historical knowledge'.

Richard III, on the other hand, is notable for the ways in which it represents history as a memory rooted in earlier history plays, since the characters keep reminding their on- and offstage audiences of key visual moments in the *Henry VI* plays that depend, for their full effect, on audiences remembering performances of the earlier plays. Thus, for example, the corpse of Henry VI over which Richard woos Lady Anne is a prop that recalls the beginning of *1 Henry VI* more than it does actual history: as Walsh explains, '*Richard III* aligns history with a memory of theater.' Grisly corpses are also key to Walsh's exploration of *Henry V*, which links the onstage bodies of the actors, to which Princess Katharine in her language lesson and Henry in his meditation on the eve of Agincourt draw attention, to the extratheatrical mummified corpse of Katharine of Valois which lay openly in Henry V's tomb in Westminster Abbey, for the curious and morbid to touch. Extratheatrical references such as this draw attention to the discontinuities between the present and the past and prompt audiences to experience the present, in the shape of the tombs and chantries at Westminster Abbey, in new ways. The book certainly managed to make me experience history plays as theoretical engagements with the production of history and I only wish that Walsh had included chapters on the *Henry IV* plays and concluded with a consideration of *Henry VIII*.

Abigail Rokison's *Shakespearean Verse Speaking: Text and Theatre Practice* is a very different sort of book from Walsh's, even though both are animated by the dual preoccupation with history and performance. Rokison targets a mixed readership of performers and critics and takes an academic approach to investigate how Shakespeare's verse is spoken in present-day theatre practice. For this, Rokison researches acting handbooks by famous directors and voice coaches designed to help the actor find the hidden cues Shakespeare wrote into his scripts. She then goes on to compare the practitioners' assertions with the findings of theatre historians, 'contest[ing] some of the claims made by leading theatre practitioners and reiterated by actors and students looking for guidance in speaking Shakespearean verse'. One of the book's stated aims is to

contemporary practice because it is created by theater practitioners whose work is not primarily Shakespearean.

Judging from this year's publications on Shakespeare's plays in performance, that call is already being heeded. As becomes apparent when reading these publications, however, Escolme's desire for this work to be performed by 'contributors to the Anglophone Shakespeare criticism industry' is not entirely unproblematic if it means that non-Anglophone voices are excluded in the discussion of their own performance traditions. This year, three edited volumes and one monograph powerfully argue for the need to pay closer attention to performances of Shakespeare in Asia. Significantly, these publications are heavily weighted in favour of Asian scholars and Westerners with extensive experience of living in Asia: the field asserts itself as too complex, and too locally embedded, to be done justice to by a touristic approach. Reading these books, I was struck by the strong resistance to received post-colonial paradigms, as one author after another insisted on the need to refine the critical approach to make it fit the specificities of the location and production under discussion. Very distinct local histories, performance traditions and intracultural relationships need to be taken into account in order to grasp the work Shakespeare does – and the work that is done through Shakespeare – in local communities across the Asian continent. Only occasionally does this work reach out to the West, and when it does so, it is motivated by the performances under discussion, as when various authors consider the work of directors like Ninagawa Yukio, Tim Supple and Ong Ken Sen, whose touring productions or intercultural approach require that Western responses be taken into account. In view of this, it will be interesting to see whether the forthcoming publication of Minami Ryuta's *Shakespearean Adaptations in East Asia: A Critical Anthology of Shakespearean Plays in China, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan*, which will span 1,600 pages and give Anglophone scholars access to twenty-five newly translated adaptations, will succeed in inviting Western scholars to join in the discussion.

Dennis Kennedy and Yong Li Lan's collection *Shakespeare in Asia: Contemporary Performance* is the most handsomely produced of this remarkable cluster of books on Asian Shakespeares. With twenty black-and-white illustrations and a striking cover, this is an attractive book which will be on many order lists for university libraries, especially since it presents itself as a sequel to Dennis Kennedy's 1993 *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*. That collection had a major impact on the field of Shakespeare studies, challenging its Anglocentrism with accounts of non-Anglophone Shakespeares throughout the world. Or, to be more specific, throughout the Western world: only two essays in *Foreign Shakespeare*, including Kennedy's own Afterword, had considered Asian Shakespeares. Now, with Yong's help, Kennedy is making up for the omissions of the earlier volume by dedicating an entire collection to Asian Shakespeares. Notwithstanding the insistence of the editors, in their introduction, on the 'diversity of Asia', the book's principal focus is on Shakespeare on Japanese stages, punctuated by essays that look at Chinese productions and Indian films.

The editors' forceful introduction underpins the volume with provocative – if somewhat vague – statements (e.g. the assertion that 'intercultural Asian performance . . . asks its spectators about our foreignness to ourselves'). The editors also call for 'discursive terms for thinking about "imitation" that do not oppose it to "authentic" or "original", in order to understand the re-creation of Shakespeare in a different cultural aesthetic'. This gesture towards a theorization of the field is, however, not supported by quite a few of the essays, which are more descriptive than theoretical. The contradictions between the various standpoints of the volume's contributors that do embrace a theoretical standpoint are embraced by the editors, who pitch John Russell Brown (an author carried over from *Foreign Shakespeares*) against Rustom Bharucha in a debate about the ways in which Eastern performance practices may be appropriated by Western practitioners, without attempting to find a theoretical framework that can

THE YEAR'S CONTRIBUTION TO SHAKESPEARE STUDIES

accommodate those opposed views. Only in her own essay on Ong Ken Sen's intercultural Shakespeares, for which 'a different performance style and language' were used for each character or group of characters, does Yong offer a strong and consistent theoretical position that is in dialogue with some of the other contributors to the volume.

As a critic, I usually have a lot of time for contradictions that resist reconciliation, yet at the end of this book, the contributors' irreconcilable positions, the lack of explicit dialogue between individual essays and the editors' deliberate avoidance of comprehensiveness or a balanced representation of Shakespeare production in the region left me feeling frustrated. I didn't feel that the book had made me learn much that helped me make sense of the role of Shakespeare in Japanese culture, let alone Asian culture more broadly. What I was left with instead was a sense of the sheer vastness of my gaps of knowledge, of my inadequacies as a reader and a craving for a strong guiding narrative. Being relatively new to the field, I needed someone to steer me from one case study of Shakespeare in Asia to the next and create a sense of texture, of interconnections between the various Shakespeares discussed and of the ways that they fit into a larger cultural context (the question of why and how Shakespeare matters in Asia often appeared irrelevant to the authors). Such interconnections between chapters as there were – as when an essay on Shōjo Manga, Japanese comic strips for girls, was followed by another essay in which there was a reference to that genre, or an essay late in the book mentioned the translations of Tsubouchi Shōyō that had been described by an earlier contribution, or when different essays discussed Ong Keng Sen's work without entering into dialogue – depended entirely on the reader's ability to remember vast amounts of unfamiliar information. More could certainly have been made of the connections between Chinese and Japanese productions that emphasized the foreignness of Shakespeare: instead, compartmentalized into different chapters, the wider theoretical reflection this similarity seemed to call for did not take place. Even when

concentrating on the dominant Japanese strand of the book, I was struggling to piece together a coherent picture that would allow me to make sense of its individual components. Left in the dark about the relationship between the Tokyo-centric and local dialect Japanese translations of Shakespeare, sometimes in Kabuki style, discussed by Daniel Gallimore, the all-female Takarazuka Revue company (in Minami Ryūta's essay), the Shōgekijō (Little Theatre) movement described by Kumiko Hilberdink-Sakamoto, and the break-up of the Shingeki 'monopoly hold on Shakespeare' analysed by Suematsu Michiko, I found myself unable to distinguish mainstream from fringe or to assess the cultural importance of the productions and styles described. To my discomfort, I felt myself yearning for a narrative history, an organizing framework, for the kind of generalization which as scholars we are trained to shun.

And yet I learned a lot from this book. Richard Burt's obsessively punning essay on Indian Shakespeare-plays-within-the-film introduces us to a group of films in which theatrical Shakespeare is used to signify the old and colonial left-over while framing the new. Helpfully, Burt sets these films side-by-side with the Shakespeare films of the Indian diaspora, warning us to remember that 'flows of capital and migrations of directors and actors link Asia to Shakespeare in the UK and US as much as they link Shakespeare and Asia in India': looking at Indian-made films in isolation risks distorting the global, diasporic nature of the phenomenon. What we need, as Burt points out in a footnote, is a full history of Shakespeare in Bollywood instead of the mere snapshots, however intriguing, that can be offered in such an essay. Films such as *Kuch Kuch Hota Hai*, with its citation of the press book for Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* 'in which Shakespeare, the movie press book trumps both Shakespeare, the movie and Shakespeare, the book', sounded as though they would benefit from a much fuller treatment than they could be giving within the scope of this essay, however much leeway the author seems to have been given for his word count and his subject matter – his was by far the longest

contribution, and the only essay to concern itself exclusively with either film or India.

Placed halfway through the volume, Suematsu Michiko's lucid assessment of the import/export dynamic operative in Japanese Shakespeares would have benefited from being placed at the beginning of the book, because it finally provided some of the organizing framework that allowed me to make better sense of some of the other essays. I enjoyed her discussion of Suzuki Tadashi's 'bicultural' *The Tale of Lear*, with its mutually challenging appropriation of western themes and eastern performance styles. Particularly provocative, in this essay, was Suematsu's opposition between Japanese directors' sense that they need to exploit Japan's "foreignness" in order to sell its Shakespeare as an export commodity for the West', and the way Tokyo audiences found 'the torrent of *japonaiserie* and the exploitation of native theatrical traditions' in Ninagawa's *Macbeth*, which had been such a success in the West, 'extravagant and false.' It's fascinating to learn that, for the British version of his *Hamlet*, 'Ninagawa made sure that the Japanization of the production became more visible by making the design, especially the costumes and hairstyles, appear more Japanese', and to realize that Suematsu is probably right in her assertion that, with cultural traffic expanding to include more negotiations with other Asian cultures, the distinction, for Japanese Shakespeares, 'between importation and exportation lost its significance in the 1990s' as 'Shakespeare became one of the intersections for cultural exchange within and beyond Asian boundaries.'

Li Ruru's essay on Shakespeare in the Chinese-speaking world also makes itself accessible by providing a rich contextual backdrop to its discussion of three productions staged in 2001, in the midst of uncertainties about the country's social and economic future. What makes her essay particularly poignant is the way she allows her personal voice to come through at times, giving a vivid sense of the rapid changes China has undergone in the past two decades (something which is also true of Shen Lin's essay on China and globalization, which includes a discussion of

Lin Zhaohua's *Coriolanus* that pinpoints the angry political debates surrounding popular vs. elite culture in present-day China). As Li puts it, '[t]he story of Shakespeare in China is more about China than Shakespeare'. Accordingly, this essay gripped me not only because of the elegant evocativeness of its descriptions of performances, but also because it conveyed a sense of urgency about the need to understand the cultural moment and Shakespeare's role in articulating change and reflecting on the politics of the present and the recent past. The essay sits well alongside Yong Li Lan's searching assessment of Ong's radical intercultural theatre practice, most evident in *Search: Hamlet*, staged in Kronborg Castle, Elsinore in 2002. The theoretical sophistication of her essay (and of its subject matter, to be fair) singles it out from most of its peers and allows her to refine our understanding of the intercultural: as she reminds us, these days, 'it is the global movements of people and media that actually define' Shakespeare and Asia; 'so-called discrete cultures', Yong explains, 'are themselves the ongoing product of continuing intercultural movements'. It's to her credit that she allows the last word in the volume to go to Rustom Bharucha in a combative mood, since for him intercultural performance is driven by a Eurocentric agenda, if not by a desire to recolonize Asia through an appropriation of Asian performance styles for performances of Shakespeare. I did end up enjoying that particular unresolved contradiction in the book, though to get to that point was hard work.

It was with relief, therefore, that I picked up the next book, Alexander C. Y. Huang's *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange* and found, before I could even get to the introduction, a note that advised me that any gaps in my knowledge about Chinese cultural history and the critical field would be filled by the book's Select Chronology and chapter notes. Immediately flicking to the back of the book, I indeed found a very helpful table that mapped historical events against the growth of worldwide Shakespeares in general and Shakespeare in China in particular. It took just a few minutes for me to feel I had some sense of the relationships between what I already knew and

THE YEAR'S CONTRIBUTION TO SHAKESPEARE STUDIES

what was news to me – I was excited to find out that China's first minister to England, Guo Songtao, attended Henry Irving's *Hamlet* in 1879 and that that play was the first to be translated into Chinese in its entirety in 1921, or that Brecht's *Verfremdungseffekt* was inspired by a Moscow performance by Mei Lanfang and his Beijing opera troupe which he attended in 1935. In no time, I got a sense of texture and of the reciprocal exchanges that form the subject of this book. The laconic note, for 1966, the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, 'All foreign writers banned in China', also managed to convey some of the odds against which Shakespeare had to contend in this country, making the entry for 1999, 'Chinese premier Zhu Rongji quotes *The Merchant of Venice* to endorse the legitimacy of market law', the more surprising. As its title announces, the Chronology is selective and I would have included some different events for the parts I knew something about (I would especially have liked an acknowledgement of Karin Beier's 1996 production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in nine European languages to have been set side-by-side with Ong's similar experiments with Asian languages in his 1997 *LEAR*, which Huang's text describes as 'uniquely multilingual'), but it was a most effective way of giving me an entry point into the book.

Going back to the beginning, the Prologue continued this good work of setting the scene, providing a potted history of the development of Chinese Shakespeares that included a very welcome discussion of the specificities of Taiwan and Hong Kong as sites of cultural production (I was interested to find out that in Hong Kong, Shakespeare seems not to have been resisted as an image of colonization, for example). If the narrative rehearsed here about Shakespeare's expansion to become a cliché in the present-day global marketplace is, as Huang is quick to admit, 'old news', it was still important as a starting-point for his exploration of how 'Shakespeare has evolved from Britain's export commodity to an import industry in the Anglo-European culture, giving birth to Asian-inflected performances outside Asia.' What I liked here was the way the reassertion of what we know

is accompanied by an interrogation of the ideological work performed by the Chinese Shakespeares under discussion. Huang asks important questions about intercultural performances, probing cultural tourism and the effect of subtitling performances and drawing attention to the ways Chinese artists often insist on Shakespearean 'authenticity'. He also differentiates, in what seemed to me a particularly productive way, between Chinese Shakespeares that universalize him, productions that localize him for political purposes and adaptations that 'truncate and rewrite Shakespeare's plays so as to relate them to images of China'.

If Huang's aim is to counter the type of scholarship he satirizes as '[t]his is how they do Shakespeare over there; how quaint', he succeeds admirably, especially in the individual case studies that make up the body of the book. The theorization of 'locality criticism' which precedes them may be somewhat jargon-ridden and handled clumsily at first, but it opens up important debates and allows Huang to voice his call for a 'more capacious and polymorphous sense of China or Shakespeare as a continually evolving repository of meaning rather than a fixed textual corpus'. What is impressive here and throughout the volume is Huang's extensive scholarship that bridges Anglophone and Sinophone critical communities and is coupled with an equally impressive historical and generic range. He analyses how Shakespeare was seen as 'a symbol of the superiority of Anglo-European cultures' in China before any of his texts were available in translation, let alone performance; Lin Shu's vastly influential 'translation' of the Lambs' *Tales from Shakespeare* in 1904, which managed to exaggerate the 'potential for moral instruction in Shakespeare' yet all the while cutting references to Christianity; a silent film of *Merchant of Venice* focusing on Portia; the boom of Chinese Opera (*jingju*) adaptations of Shakespeare since the 1980s, all the way to recent productions of *King Lear* by Wi Hsing-kuo and Stan Lai (Lai Sheng-chuan). In the process, he traces an evolution from a Shakespeare used to express ideas about the modern age, morality or the nation, to a Shakespeare that has become more intimate,

individual, personal. China, Shakespeare and Chinese Shakespeares come alive through Huang's text and its ample illustrations: this is a book whose Epilogue I will use in my teaching of Feng Xiaogang's *The Banquet* (2006) – a film Huang describes as being analogous to *Shakespeare in Love* in its myth-making – in the hope that students will want to read, learn and understand more.

Turning to *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace*, a collection co-edited by Huang with Charles S. Ross, it becomes obvious that a lot of the research for *Chinese Shakespeares* found its first outlet in Huang's work for the collection. For one, Huang's 'Chronology of Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace' which is appended to the book looks remarkably familiar and does just as good a job of conveying the larger contextual picture here as its more Sinocentric equivalent does in *Chinese Shakespeares*. As this collection's title indicates, its twenty-odd essays are thematically very wide-ranging and, however much the editors strive, in their introduction, to impose order and a rationale on the contributions, this is not the sort of book anyone will want to be reading cover-to-cover. The disparate provenance of the contributions – some from a thematic online journal issue dedicated to Shakespeare in Asia originally edited by Ross, others from various events organized by Huang, still others commissioned specially for this collection – explains much of the volume's eclectic feel and its variant spellings (e.g. of General Ao, aka General Aw, in discussions of *Throne of Blood*). The essays, not surprisingly, are uneven: very young Asian scholars who are completing their Ph.D.s jostle for space with established Western scholars, and some of the essays could have done with much more rigorous editorial intervention.

I nevertheless found that there was fun to be got out of dipping into various parts of the volume. In the 'Hollywood' part of the book (otherwise the feeblest of the volume), Charles Ross's little essay on 'Underwater Women in Shakespeare on Film' investigates the bizarre 'Hollywood trope of the underwater woman'. In a move that surprised and delighted me in equal measure, Ross links the drowning/soaked Shakespearian women in 1990s

film to Homer's description of Helen, medieval French literature and Jane Campion's *The Piano*, establishing a long history of the use of water as a symbol for female oppression.

The volume's second part, dedicated to 'Shakespeare in Asia', is more consistently interesting. David Bevington's account of what Shakespeare knew about Asia seems oddly disconnected from the other essays in this section, which contains two essays on Kurosawa by Yuwen Hsiung, who shows how Asian *Macbeths* (including the Taiwanese *Kingdom of Desire* that is later discussed by Huang) draw on their cultures' codes of heroism, and Lei Jin, who investigates the role of silence (and the influence of silent film) in *Throne of Blood*. As in *Shakespeare in Asia*, here, too, I was drawn to the essay by Suematsu Michiko, which describes the enormous impact the first Tokyo Globe had on Japanese Shakespeares from 1988 to 2002, when it closed for refurbishment. She portrays the theatre as 'a liberated and exciting space' that hosted an astonishingly large number of English touring productions alongside Japanese productions in varying genres. As Japanese productions became more adventurous in their 'fantasizing' of Shakespeare, the Tokyo Globe helped dispel 'the last remains of Japan's century-long servitude to the authority and authenticity of the West'. Leaving Japan behind once more, it was refreshing to read about Shakespeare in countries such as Korea, Malaya, Cambodia and Indonesia, where traumatic colonial and war-torn pasts have led to Shakespeare taking on very distinct meanings in the present. I also enjoyed Elizabeth Wichmann-Walczak's observations about the rehearsal methods for the Shanghai Jingju Company's 1990s production of *King Lear* (*Qi Wang Meng*), which benefited from the directorial input of both *huaju* (spoken text) director Ouyang Ming and Ma Ke, whose work is in the *xiqu* (stylized theatre) tradition. 'I found it ironic', she wryly notes, 'that the *huaju*-based director invited for his enriching new methods in fact made effective use of traditional *xiqu* approaches, while the experienced *xiqu* director enriched the performances of his more experienced actors with Stanislavsky-based methods from *huaju*.' Adele Lee's essay on

THE YEAR'S CONTRIBUTION TO SHAKESPEARE STUDIES

the Hong Kong film adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet* as *One Husband Too Many* (1988) will probably be more widely read, and she convincingly argues for the film to be read as a challenge to the 'British cultural hegemony by means of the Shakespearean text', as the film shows the failure of Shakespeare's play to engage the attention of rural audiences.

The most fun essay, though, has to be Peter Holland's, in the volume's section on 'Shakespeare in Cyberspace', who, in the guise of 'Peter Leonsbane, a good cleric avatar (because there was not one of a Shakespeare professor)', entered the world of Ted Castronova's *Arden: The World of William Shakespeare* online game, assisted by the figure of Peaseblossom. Lack of fake Elizabethan diction notwithstanding, this game apparently proved to be a hit only with Shakespeare experts: for play testers, there was '[t]oo much reading, not enough fighting'. Holland opens up the brave new world of Shakespeare's life on the internet, peeking at the work of the Second Life Shakespeare Company before stopping to consider YouTube clips and to muse on the types of viewing experience these clips afford and on the parasitic nature of the fragments on offer. His sense of amazement at some of the materials is contagious, and I found myself looking for some of the clips myself, wanting to share in his laughter. In his account of the ways in which sites such as *Stagework* document rehearsal, Holland questions the validity of some clips as a representation of actual rehearsals and speaks of the simultaneous excitement and frustration of this type of mediated access to hitherto inaccessible rehearsal spaces. It's a great essay on which to end a very uneven book.

Travelling back from Cyberspace to Asia, Poonam Trivedi and Minami Ryuta's *Re-playing Shakespeare in Asia* takes us back to stagings of the plays in various Asian locales. Trivedi's introduction to the volume is forbiddingly prefaced by no fewer than five epigraphs but turns out to be more readable than I was led to expect. For Trivedi, globalization has the positive side-effect of expanding the range of Shakespeares we may consider; the volume's stated aim is to investigate 'how Asian theatres, like Asian societies . . . engage

with Western and Shakespearean theatre on more equitable and interrogative terms than before; and how they produce innovative work which is forging new meanings and arresting imagination beyond the "local," hereby changing the equation between East and West'. The Asia represented in this volume is even more inclusive than in either the Kennedy–Yong or the Huang–Ross volumes, encompassing sixteen essays on Shakespeare performances in China, Japan, India, Bali, Indonesia, Korea, Taiwan, Malaysia and the Philippines. What is interesting here is the volume's dual emphasis on *interactivity* (of the East with the West) and *intraactivity* (between different Asian locations) and its near-total rejection of Western authors in favour of 'voices which are rooted in their perspective of a first-hand experience'. This is the book that most explicitly privileges Asian voices to avert charges of orientalism. In the process, it introduces us to some very established authors whose work is too little known in the West.

Trivedi's introductory outline of the volume is complemented by James R. Brandon's helpful overview of 'Other Shakespeares in Asia', which, in subdividing Asian productions into the categories of canonical, indigenous and intercultural Shakespeares, provides a useful – if necessarily generalizing – taxonomy for the productions analysed in the rest of the volume. In particular, his 'tentative' definition of Richard Schechner's term 'intercultural' is valuable because it is underpinned by several examples and counter-examples that allow him to foster a refined understanding of a buzz word that risks being attached to any collaboration of Asian and Western practitioners. Already in the next chapter, in which Brian Singleton talks about Ariane Mnouchkine's Théâtre du Soleil and its dependence on Asian theatre forms 'to create a pictorial and formalist landscape of the imagination', having Brandon's taxonomy in mind proves helpful. Trivedi herself follows this up with a sharp critique of Tim Supple's acclaimed multilingual production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in 2006, whose claims to speak for India seem to have been more strategic than genuine. In India, the multilingualism that gave the production its edge

for European critics led to different parts of the audience tittering at different moments, creating tensions in the auditorium: hardly the desired effect. Taking no prisoners, Trivedi condemns the multilingualism as 'a superficial tokenism towards authenticating a kind of fractional and bitty "Indian-ness"' and uses it as a springboard for an altogether more positive appraisal of Chetan Dathar's more modest Marathi adaptation of the same play in 2004. Minami Ryuta's essay on the ways in which, after more than a hundred years of Japanese Shakespeares, producing a Shakespeare play in Japan involves 'remembering, reviewing, and revising (the memories of) its preceding counterparts', has a less combative tone and offers a welcome insight into the limits of the *shingeki* movement as a background for a discussion of Ninagawa's *kabuki Twelfth Night*.

With Ian Carruthers's essay on the performance history of Suzuki Tadashi's *King Lear*, the location remains Japan but the focus shifts towards textuality and theatricality as Carruthers considers Suzuki's 'incisive but respectful cutting' of Shakespeare's play between 1984 and 2006. Carruthers's essay culminates in a fascinating appraisal of Suzuki's Moscow Art Theatre production (2004–6) that brought his method into contact with the custodians of Stanislavski's approach, 'wedding... two powerful theatrical languages'. Carruthers's close attention to the text is also characteristic of Li Ruru's inspired consideration of the difficulties of translating 'To be, or not to be, that is the question' into Chinese, a language which does not have an equivalent for 'to be'. Li's analysis concentrates on how six Chinese productions, in both *huaju* and *xiqu* styles, dealt with the problems posed by Hamlet's soliloquy.

The solemnity of the *xiqu* arias on which Ruru ends finds a refreshing contrast in Yoshihara Yukari's analysis of the pop Shakespeares produced by Inoue Hidenori in Japan (which resonates with Bi-qui Beatrice Lei's concluding essay on camp *Romeo and Juliets* in Taiwan), before a return to solemnity with Tapati Gupta's discussion of Utpal Dutt's *Romeo and Juliet* and Bengali theatre history. In quick succession, the collection then takes us

to the Philippines, (Judy Celine Ick), Korea (Kim Moran), Malaysia (Nurul Farhana Low Abdullah and C. S. Lim), Taiwan (Wu Peichen) provincial China (Alexander C. Y. Huang) and Bali (John Emigh). Low Abdullah and Lim's essay, with its two beautiful illustrations, was my first introduction to the Malay art of *wayang kulit* or shadow puppetry, making me want to jump on a plane to see this form of theatre for myself. It is difficult to do justice to these essays, except to say that each opens the door onto a different complex post-colonial situation which complicates received ideas in post-colonial studies. Ick, for example, describes the Philippines as a country whose status as a 'territory' rather than a 'colony' 'forces a re-examination, if a [sic] not a reconfiguration, of postcolonial paradigms. Multi-layered, conflicted, and conflicting, the history of colonialism in the Philippines disturbs simplistic analysis as it demands a more complex reworking of commonly deployed concepts like "hybridity," for instance, to account for the various elements that make up its colonial and postcolonial cultures.' Clearly, the work of directors like Ricardo Abad, whose 2002 *Shrew* allegorized American colonialism in the Philippines, or Tae-seok's Korean *Romeo & Juliet*, which responds to Asian traditions via their reception in the West (Moran) have a lot to teach us not only about the uses to which Shakespeare is put in these locations but also about our need to refine our critical categories when approaching Asian Shakespeares.

What these essays on the various, very locally specific, Asian art forms have in common is a desire not so much to speak of Shakespeare's translation into those forms as to translate the forms for the Western reader. At times, this is accompanied by a good degree of impatience with clumsy attempts to view Asian Shakespeares through the lens of 1990s post-colonial criticism. This is particularly obvious in Paromita Chakravarti and Swati Ganguly's chapter on 'Dancing to Shakespeare' which asks that we renounce 'the notion of a single, unified "Indian" dance' and accept that Saibal Basu's *Wheel of Fire* (2000) and Vikram Iyengar's *Crossings* (2004–5), two dance appropriations of Shakespeare, use distinct dance styles, one classical, the other derived

THE YEAR'S CONTRIBUTION TO SHAKESPEARE STUDIES

from folk dance theatre, and 'their own internal logic to understand the tragedies that they choose to work with'. Chakravarti and Ganguly combine theoretical sophistication with an emphasis on the performance and subversion of gender within a mode of dance that has 'a fixed mode of performing femininity and masculinity'. The essay invites us to move beyond a study of Shakespeare to a consideration of how 'the Shakespearean text acts as a catalyst which draws out both the range and the specificities of the resources of classical and folk dance and theatre forms in India and initiates an intra-cultural dialogue between them'. Chakravarti and Ganguly's passionate rejection of 'the ready-made, postcolonial, or "intercultural" critical grid' and call for an understanding that 'emerges from the changing concerns, resources, and sites of work of contemporary cultural practitioners working with local forms and Shakespearean texts', while making it much harder for Western scholars to even begin to discuss Asian Shakespeares with any degree of confidence, demand to be heard.

As is clear from the publications reviewed this year, the trend towards setting Anglophone Shakespeare within a larger theatrical context, which I noted in my last review, is continuing. It is significant that the excavations that form the subject of Bowsher and Miller's book should have been concerned not just with the Shakespeare-identified Globe but also with Henslowe's Rose. The history of the early modern theatre, as written by Stern and Walsh, is using evidence from a large range of plays to illuminate Shakespeare's work. What has been even more obvious this year than last is that this trend is also influencing performance studies concerned with present-day performances. Shakespeare is absolutely central to traditional projects such as the 'Shakespeare in Production' series and he is also key for many theatre practitioners, as we can see from the work of Rokison, Noble and Purcell. At the exploratory frontiers of performance studies, however, where this year's most risky and exciting work has happened, a significant shift is occurring that repositions Shakespeare. Shakespeare is not marginalized, by any means, but rather, to use Werner's brilliant term, 'resituated',

placed *beside* contemporary films and theatre practices, performances of other early modern plays, or theatre practices belonging to other cultures. Not all the work at the frontiers of the field is polished, but there is a drive, energy and intellectual curiosity behind even the roughest work in this area that gives it an excitement which some of the more traditional modes of enquiry are lacking. The conversation about new directions in Renaissance drama and performance studies has well and truly begun.

BOOKS REVIEWED

- Bowsher, Julian, and Pat Miller, *The Rose and the Globe – Playhouses of Shakespeare's Bankside, Southwark: Excavations 1988–90* (London, 2009)
- Croteau, Melissa, and Carolyn Jess-Cooke, eds., *Apocalyptic Shakespeare: Essays on Visions of Chaos and Revelation in Recent Film Adaptations* (Jefferson, 2009)
- Dymkowski, Christine, and Christie Carson, eds., *Shakespeare in Stages: New Theatre Histories* (Cambridge, 2010)
- Huang, Alexander C. Y. *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange* (New York, 2009)
- Huang, Alexander C. Y., and Charles S. Ross, eds., *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace* (West Lafayette, 2009)
- Kennedy, Dennis, and Yong Li Lan, eds., *Shakespeare in Asia: Contemporary Performance* (Cambridge, 2010)
- Newstock, Scott L., and Ayanna Thompson, eds., *Weyward Macbeth: Intersections of Race and Performance* (New York, 2010)
- Noble, Adrian, *How to Do Shakespeare* (London, 2010)
- Purcell, Stephen, *Popular Shakespeare: Simulation and Subversion on the Modern Stage* (Basingstoke, 2009)
- Rokison, Abigail, *Shakespearean Verse Speaking: Text and Theatre Practice* (Cambridge, 2009)
- Schafer, Elizabeth, ed., *Twelfth Night. Shakespeare in Production* (Cambridge, 2010)
- Semenza, Greg Colón, *The English Renaissance in Popular Culture: An Age for All Time* (New York, 2010)
- Solga, Kim, *Violence Against Women in Early Modern Drama: Invisible Acts* (New York, 2009)

Thanks to Mark Thornton Burnett, Kathryn Prince, Philip Schwyzer and Charlotte Welch for conversations about several of the books reviewed here: your expert views were precious.

Stern, Tiffany, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2009)
 Trivedi, Poonam, and Minami Ryuta, eds., *Re-playing Shakespeare in Asia* (New York, 2010)

Walsh, Brian, *Shakespeare, the Queen's Men, and the Elizabethan Performance of History* (Cambridge, 2009)
 Werner, Sarah, ed., *New Directions in Renaissance Drama and Performance Studies* (New York, 2010)

3. EDITIONS AND TEXTUAL STUDIES

reviewed by ERIC RASMUSSEN

My first *Shakespeare Survey* review, over a decade ago, drew attention to a handful of errors in the collations of Katherine Duncan-Jones's Arden 3 edition of Shakespeare's sonnets. This year saw the publication of a revised edition 'improved by the correction of a number of errata listed by Eric Rasmussen'. However, something went wrong during the production of the revised edition and certain italic letters unaccountably did not print. Some of the resulting phrases are easily made out ('*Oxf d E gli Dic i y*'), while others take a bit more work: '*T R f L c*' (poem by Pope) and '*i P ili id y: C u i P*' (previous book by Duncan-Jones). A further corrected edition has now been produced, with a substantially reworked introduction that may well justify the purchase of the revised edition even by those who own the 1997 original.

Barbara Hodgdon's Arden 3 edition of *The Taming of the Shrew* opens with a wonderfully engaging analysis of the book's cover photo (which apparently went through several versions). In its final state, Katherina extends a hand towards another hand, visible just at the frame's edge, that reaches for hers. Hodgdon nicely observes that the Katherina figure 'almost seems to be dancing in tune to the play's perennial questions: shrew or not shrew? Un-tamed or tamed?' Hodgdon's introduction offers what may be the most lucid account yet produced of the play's multiple textual versions, finely characterizing *Shrew* as a '*texte combinatoire*' of 'textual, sexual, social, political and performative difference(s)'.¹

There are so many facets in a 400-page critical edition that it may seem ungenerous for a review to fixate, as mine often do, on a feature as

relatively minor as textual notes. And yet, there are more than two dozen errors in Hodgdon's collations,¹ and further slips throughout that combine to make the edition somewhat frustrating to use. The running head on page 204 reads '2.2.188' rather than '2.1.188' (there is no 2.2 in the play). The discussions on pages 312 and 323 of the stray speech-prefix '*Par.*' (which may refer to the actor William Parr) repeatedly provide an inaccurate line reference, '4.2.73' instead of '4.2.72'; this is especially confusing because there's a speech-prefix issue at line 73 as well, where Hodgdon has emended Folio '*Ped*' to '*Merchant*'. Folio's '*servingmen*' at 4.1.93.1 is

With thanks to my ever perspicacious editor, Arthur Evenchik.

¹ Induction 1.129 SD F reading for '*Seruingman*' read '*seruingman*'; Induction 2.0.2 lemma for '*three Servants*' read '*and three Servants*'; Induction 2.0.2 collation for '*attendants*' read '*with attendants, some*'; Induction 2.17 F reading for '*Burton-Heath*' read '*Burton-heath*'; Induction 2.63 F reading for '*o'errun*' read '*ore-run*'; Induction 2.133 F reading for '*it is not*' read '*it is*'; 1.1.25 F reading for '*pardonato*' read '*Pardonato*'; 1.1.47.2 F reading for '*Hortensio*' read '*Hortensio*'; 1.1.71 F reading for '*Maids*' read '*Maids*'; 1.1.106 F reading for '*love*' read '*loue*'; 2.1.75-86 for '*beene*' read '*beene*'; 2.1.75-6 F reading for '*neighbours*' read '*neighbors*'; 2.1.77 F reading for '*kindness*' read '*kindnesse*'; 2.1.198 F reading for '*joynd*' read '*ioynd*'; 2.1.207 F reading for '*Should be*' read '*Shold be*'; 3.1.74 F reading for '*cfaut*' read '*Cfaut*'; 3.1.76 F reading for '*Ela, mi*' read '*Ela mi*'; 3.2.16 F reading for '*invite, and proclaim*' read '*inuite, and proclaime*'; 3.2.181 SD for '*opp. 56*' read '*opp. 182*'; 3.2.210 F reading for '*tomorrow*' read '*to morrow*'; 4.1.126-8 F reading for '*Kate,*' read '*Kate,*'; 4.2.7 F reading for '*master*' read '*Master*'; 4.5.27 F reading for '*company*' read '*Company*'; 4.5.39 F reading for '*whether*' read '*Whether*'; 5.2.0.3-4 F reading for '*Biondello, Grumio*' read '*Biondello Grumio*'.

SHAKESPEARE SURVEY

64

Shakespeare as Cultural Catalyst

EDITED BY

PETER HOLLAND



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
 Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
 Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
 The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
 Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107011229

© Cambridge University Press 2011

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
 and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
 no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
 permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2011

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-01122-9 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
 accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
 in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such
 websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.
