

EDITED BY

JAMES C.
BULMAN



≡ The Oxford Handbook of
SHAKESPEARE
AND PERFORMANCE

PART IV

GLOBAL SHAKESPEARE

CHAPTER 25

GLOBAL SHAKESPEARE CRITICISM BEYOND THE NATION STATE

ALEXA ALICE JOUBIN

There is a world elsewhere.
(Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*)

ON a sunny afternoon in early June 2015, in a rehearsal room at the University of Warwick, director Tim Supple was rehearsing a globally envisioned *King Lear* with a group of talented actors from Ukraine, France, Nigeria, South Korea, India, and other parts of the world. When the actress Hong Hye Yeon playing Kent lamented in an aside, 'If but as well I other accents borrow, | That can my speech defuse' (1.4.1–2) in Korean (commenting on her and Kent's disguise as part of the character's effort to serve and assist Lear), the Ukrainian Lear (Oksana) responded powerfully in Russian. The cross-cultural dialogue was rich and beautifully embodied by the actors, their choice of modern editions or translations of the play, and their individual acting styles. The entire multinational cast was cooking up something delicious and original.

During the brainstorming session that followed, Supple asked: 'What came before language?' The question was designed to draw attention to multilingual spaces onstage and off and the implications of acting and doing Shakespeare in such a space. He asked the group to take note of what we might find 'when we move away from [verbal] language' and of the 'seeds of what we might find'. The answers the group came up with were diverse and rich: emotions; physicality; body language; that which incarnates the words; what lies under the words; and, last but not least, clarity of intent. In other words, there is a rich non-verbal language that comes before and alongside utterance, which is particularly true in the case of non-English-language or multilingual performances of Shakespeare.

The rehearsal room exercise suggests that unconscious contents, or implicit thoughts, reach consciousness in embodied forms by first being enacted in one way or another. That is what comes before and goes beyond language. Characters, actors, and people in all walks of life re-enact their desires and trauma in non-verbal forms of emotional communication, which is a core layer of the human experience. Lady Macbeth sleepwalks (a re-enactment of trauma) before she puts her thoughts into words. Lear 'disintegrates' physically, appearing ragged, as his mind unhinges. Global Shakespeare as a performance practice and research field shows that Shakespeare's narratives are capable of resonating with audiences across cultures and time periods through not only poetry but also the space between poetry and unarticulated emotions.

Renowned for his multilingual and transnational *Midsummer Night's Dream*—a production that showcased the rich diversity of India and was commissioned by the British Council, 2006–8 with tours to India, UK, Australia, and North America—Tim Supple, a former artistic director of the Young Vic (1993–2000), is currently director of Dash Arts. He sees as his mission to share concrete understanding of other cultures with his audiences in order to combat the tendency to 'see the elsewhere as a generality'. As for producing plays with a multinational, multilingual cast, he believes it is 'not just about us, but rather about the actors whom we are working with. About their stories. Their lives'.

Supple raises an important question about the role of language in stage performance. In Shakespearean performance, language is often granted more significance than the materiality of performance, leading to the tendency to privilege certain modernized and editorialized versions of Shakespearean scripts in English and their accurate 'reproduction' in foreign-language performances. This tendency creates a problem, making us blind to many other aspects of global Shakespeare on stage, reflecting the saying attributed to Henri Bergson that 'the eye sees only what the mind is prepared to comprehend'. In intercultural performances, the spoken language and textual presence of English surtitles further demarcate the actors' and audiences' discrete linguistic communities. Performances of Shakespeare have always borrowed other accents ('If but as well I other accents borrow').

The diversity of voices and accents in global Shakespeare is the subject of this essay. To study Shakespeare in performance is to engage with the notion of 'others within' and to rethink the question of freedom: claiming poetic licence, taking liberty with Shakespeare, innovating established performance traditions. To critics such as Stephen Greenblatt, Shakespeare as a writer 'is the embodiment of human freedom' even as he contends with his own era's investment in 'absolute limits' (1). In world cinema and theatre, Shakespeare, as a foreign playwright, has been integrated as the 'other' within—something that both participates in a long local performance tradition and usefully provides an alien presence to inspire new works. Shakespeare is both daunting, thanks to centuries of interpretative traditions, and liberating, thanks to the historical distance. Shakespeare as a platform for thought experiment offers artists and audiences the freedom to explore, as in the case of Tim Supple's rehearsal room. In anglophone cultures, Shakespeare has also been coloured by other accents in terms of increasingly hybrid performance styles, multilingual and multinational casts, and international networks of

funding and marketing partners. In these cases, engaging with intercultural styles provides artists with a new level of freedom to do Shakespeare.

To move global Shakespeare studies beyond the more limiting scope of nation state and cultural profiling, I would like to propose we consider a number of critical concepts as methodology. These concepts critique the limitations of cartographic imagination, and connect the performance site and locality to myth and to spaces of knowledge production:

- (1) the site of performance and the myth of global Shakespeare;
- (2) diaspora and racial tensions;
- (3) art in postnational space;
- (4) the ethics of quoting Shakespeare and world cultures;
- (5) the production and dissemination of knowledge through archives.

SHAKESPEARE ON A GLOBAL STAGE

Shakespeare's Globe toured Dominic Dromgoole's production of *Hamlet* to 197 countries and territories from 2014 to 2016. Writing for *The Economist*, journalist Jasper Rees observes that global Shakespeare shows us that while 'cultures may find reasons to be at one another's throats, there is something primordial that binds all of us: the human need to stand up and tell stories of love and death'. When Dromgoole's twelve-actor *Hamlet* toured through Africa, Annastacia, a 16-year-old girl, travelled 60 kilometres to Kasane, Botswana, with her school group to see the show. The message she took was this: 'In our culture when somebody marries his brother's wife this is dangerous because children end up doing mistakes in life' (Rees). Multiple local perspectives enrich the reception of a play.

Global Shakespeare as an industry involves local diasporic communities, touring theatres, international festivals, policymakers, and transnational networks of funding. However, global Shakespeare is not simply a story of Shakespeare's works being disseminated from Britain to the rest of the world. In the UK, for example, performance styles borrowed from other cultures have helped to bring a sense of novelty to Shakespeare's familiar plays. British directors began employing hybrid performance styles as early as the 1950s, with Peter Brook being a notable example. His *Titus Andronicus* (1955), starring Laurence Olivier, is one of the landmark productions that rehabilitated the play. It transformed *Titus* from an undervalued melodrama to a study of primitive forces that can be taken seriously. Realistic but heavy-handed portrayal of horrors and violence was replaced by abstract, elegant, Asian-inspired stylization that was supplemented by minimalism and contrast between aural and visual signs: scarlet streamers flowing from Lavinia's mouth and wrists to symbolize her rape and mutilation; harp music accompanying her entrance. Brook's Asian symbolism tapped into the kinetic energy of the play as ritual and inspired Jan Kott when it toured to Warsaw. His *Titus* is significant in the context of boomerang Shakespeare, as it anticipated the use of red ribbons

as symbols of blood and gore in Japanese director Ninagawa Yukio's 2006 production of *Titus* in Stratford as part of the RSC Complete Works festival. Ninagawa treated the play as myth, because recurring ritual in a cycle is best understood through symbolism. In 1994, the Barbican Theatre hosted a festival entitled *Everybody's Shakespeare* that offered performances by the Comédie-Française (Paris), the Suzuki Company of Toga, Tel Aviv's Itim Theatre Ensemble, Moscow's Detsky Theatre, and the Düsseldorf Schauspielhaus. Such festivals of global Shakespeare are sometimes criticized for turning touring Shakespeare productions into consumable chunks of popularized notions of foreign cultures (the cherry blossom for Japan, drumming for Africa, the carnival for Brazil, and so on).

The 2012 London Olympics ushered in a new era of British appreciation of worldwide performances of Shakespeare. By giving expression to marginalized, oppressed, and disenfranchised cultural voices, Shakespeare becomes a vehicle of empowerment, an agent to foster the multicultural good. Within the Anglo-European West, both home-grown and touring companies have staged Shakespearean performances in Britain that may sometimes have seemed foreign to the sensibilities, styles, and linguistic repertoire of local audiences. Internationally active British directors such as Tim Supple have presented the beauty of estrangement through multinational casts, hybrid performance styles, and the use of one or more foreign languages on stage.

WHAT IS A SITE OF PERFORMANCE?

To understand the nature of this globally recognized Shakespeare in performance, we have to first consider the sites where it is manufactured and consumed, and we have to examine one of the most important 'sites of origin', the Globe Theatre. Jerzy Grotowski believes that meaningful performances are simply 'what takes place between spectator and actor' (32), and the site of performance is mutually constructed by spectator and actor. A site of performance—whether it is the cultural location where a production is germinated or the location where it tours—is constructed not only by our collective historical consciousness, but also by the artists' effort in creating a local habitat for the fabula of the play and a cultural location. It is the 'human agency in place-making' that transforms and defines a site, as Mike Pearson points out in *Site-Specific Performance* (13). The artistic and political agency enables the ideological construction of such sites for performance of a play as well as the performance of personal stories and local histories. A site for an installation art piece or a stage performance is therefore no longer just a physical location that can be pinpointed on a traditional map. It is no longer 'grounded, fixed, actual' but rather "a discursive vector—ungrounded, fluid, virtual" (Kwon 29–30).

Performing Shakespeare in worldwide theatre is a process of incorporating multiple voices into one artwork. It is a tug of war between competing voices across time and space. Performance styles borrowed from other cultures can help retool some plays and aid directors in search of new values. The global is constructed through local

personas and specific local practices. 'Global Shakespeare' does not refer exclusively to non-Anglo-American performances made 'elsewhere', away from the more familiar metropolitan centres of Shakespeare activities such as New York and London. Rather, a Shakespearean performance is global when it goes on an international tour or when it borrows themes or techniques across cultures. In the case of Supple's *Lear* at Warwick, it was 'global' not because it was made (or staged) outside Britain, but because it created a site where multiple cultures met. In another case, a production can be 'global' when local traditions are reconstructed. When Ariane Mnouchkine translated and directed *Richard II* in French at the Théâtre du Soleil in Paris in 1981, she argued that, as part of her attempt to break away from the Western realist tradition, a 'recourse to Asia' became necessary when performing Shakespeare (in French or other languages). The play's national (English) undertone was overshadowed by kabuki, Noh, Kathakali, and Balinese techniques. Mnouchkine's production highlighted the play's 'sacred and ritualistic' dimensions (Pavis 95–6). The production was neither French nor stereotypically Japanese.

Where Shakespeare is read and performed matters as much as the historical question of 'when' and the dramaturgical question of 'how' these plays are performed. For instance, in twenty-first-century Palestine, *Romeo and Juliet* has acquired a new sense of urgency beyond a tragic love story. In the shadow of bombing and wars, the lovers' fleeting affair has given way to the danger they are in and the risk they take. Juliet asks Romeo how he has made it to her balcony. Romeo says he is aided by 'love's light wings'. This exchange is usually interpreted in a light-hearted manner, with an emphasis on the couple's youthful exuberance. Reading the play with his students in Abu Dis, Tom Sperlinger notes that what might otherwise have been construed as a more innocent lover's complaint or 'teenage hyperbole' (142) now acquires a far more earnest tone, especially when Juliet warns Romeo, 'If they do see thee, they will murder thee' (2.2.70). Engaging with *Romeo and Juliet* in the context of modern military conflicts entails a deeper level of self-reflection and offers the potential to see the play in a new light.

THE MYTH OF GLOBAL SHAKESPEARE

Global Shakespeare is a myth. It is a myth that moves around the world. Shakespeare is one of the most frequently mythologized, translated, and performed secular figures. Shakespeare and his global afterlife have formed a tautology: Shakespeare is believed to be universal, which is why the canon has gone global; on the other hand, global Shakespeare is seen as evidence of Shakespeare's universality. The idea of universality is often backed by statistics (as many things are now) and not simply literary merits. Shakespeare was referenced or recited prominently during the opening and closing ceremonies of the 2012 London Olympics. As part of the Cultural Olympiad, the 2012 World Shakespeare Festival featured 69 international productions, 263 amateur shows, and 28

digital commissions and films throughout the UK. The Royal Shakespeare Company, the principal organizer, claimed that the festival reached 'more than 1.8 million people.'

Having achieved a mythical status, Shakespeare's plays have generated other myths about contemporary culture. These myths have been jointly created by educators, scholars, practitioners, administrators, funders, artists, spectators, and readers. Shakespeare's name itself has been used to signify high culture. In Taipei, Taiwan, there is a luxury apartment complex named after Shakespeare. In Beijing, an English language school is named Shakespeare, with 'to be or not to be' as their slogan. There are also bridal shops and wedding services throughout East Asia named Shakespeare. In anglophone countries, politicians quote Shakespeare as if it is a gentleman's calling card.

A large part of this phenomenon is driven by the forces of the market economy. There are self-syndicated authentic venues (Shakespeare's Globe Theatre in London as a reconstructed historical site and Elsinore as Hamlet's castle). There are also theatrical spaces where Shakespeare's aura is manufactured and consumed. Stratford-upon-Avon represents a historically authentic venue baptized by a Shakespearean presence that fuels the fantasy of origin. These localities shape the myths of Shakespeare and Shakespeare's extensive posthumous encounters with the world, which is why Shakespeare and its myths have occupied an international space for centuries. Representations—theatrical or otherwise—signify relationally, and each locality is further constructed by interactions between local histories embedded in and superimposed on the performances of Shakespearean myths. The myth is sustained by the proliferation of global performances, and global performances are made possible by the reinforced myth. The myth of Shakespeare as global currency has turned global Shakespeare into a business model that reinforces the idea of Shakespeare as a world heritage that connects disparate local cultures.

The desire for a globalized Shakespeare is so strong that a forgery has emerged in the nineteenth century that has been propagated through recent performance histories, namely the myth that Captain William Keeling arranged a performance of *Hamlet* in 1607 on board the *Red Dragon* off the coast of Sierra Leone, which has been exposed as a hoax (Kliman). Enthusiasts of Shakespeare may very much want the anecdote to be true, as it encapsulates a dreamscape in which Shakespeare is making a difference. The blind spot of this myth is that, despite the feel-good factor, we must problematize the homogenizing tendency to use global Shakespeares as a de facto liberatory tool.

ARE WE POST-RACIAL YET?

The myth of global Shakespeare renders invisible some works that do not seem conveniently global, such as local performances by diasporic artists. We cannot talk about performance site without considering the question of embodiment—actors who enact various roles onstage and off. In the art and entertainment industry, race is both visible

and invisible in various forms of embodiment. After all, actors draw attention to, or away from, race and ethnicity. Depending on the context, doing Shakespeare while a minority can invite different responses. It is one thing for Indian actors to perform Shakespeare in India, where the actor is not part of a minority. It is quite another to do Shakespeare in a country where one is perceived to be 'non-mainstream' or different (such as Yellow Earth Theatre's Mandarin Chinese–English bilingual *King Lear* in Stratford-upon-Avon) or in the US (such as *American Moor* by Keith Hamilton Cobb, Anacostia Playhouse, 2015; Young Jean Lee's *Lear*, Soho Rep, New York, 2010; and Oregon Shakespeare Festival's pan-Asian *Winter's Tale*, dir. Desdemona Chiang, 2016) where classic theatre is assumed to be aligned with some versions of upper-middle-class white masculine culture.

These 'locally grown' works are somehow perceived as 'global' or exotic because of the artists' identities. As an important genre of global Shakespeare, diasporic Shakespeare is distinctive from national, international, and touring Shakespeares. Diasporic Shakespearean performances represent the lived experiences of people in diasporic communities, such as the African and Asian communities in the UK, British expatriates in Hong Kong, Americans living in Beijing (e.g. Cheeky Monkey Company), and African American theatre. Diasporic Shakespeares are designed for heterogeneous communities and incorporate elements from several cultures, as evidenced by works by British Indian, Asian American, Chinese Singaporean, Québécois (francophone Canadian), and African and Caribbean Canadian artists. Enriched by multiracial and multi-ethnic casting and by multilingual performance strategies, these performances are far from simple tales of black versus white, or the subaltern versus the authority (e.g., Shakespeare providing the universal theme, while black actors bring the music and dance: Shakespeare has got privileged poetry; black dancers have got 'exotic' rhythm).

For example, being black does not necessarily mean being tribal or believing in witchcraft. Diasporic Shakespeare is all about enriching our experiences with drama. For minority actors, identity politics can be a double-edged sword. Black British actors are often associated with art forms that are considered ethnically authentic and 'matching' their perceived identity and interest, such as jazz. British Indian actors are lined up with Bollywood routines.

The last thing diasporic actors want is to be pigeonholed and shoehorned into an ethnic ghetto where they are expected to only appear in such plays. It is both aesthetically and politically important to see, for example, Sophie Okonedo playing Queen Margaret in BBC's *The Hollow Crown* (2016), and the all-black cast in *The Black Macbeth* (directed and adapted by Peter Coe, Roundhouse, 1972). The ultimate goal for minority artists is to transcend the label of a postcolonial subject or a perpetual other. American actor Hector Reynoso, for example, is strongly opposed to any labels, particularly 'persons of color'. During a panel discussion at Washington, DC's Gallaudet University on Shakespeare and diversity on 29 March 2016, he made clear that colour-conscious or colour-blind casting doesn't work for him. He envisions a post-racial world where his talents, rather than his ethnicity, will draw the spotlight. Likewise, actress Deidra Starnes complained that she could take on stately roles, and would love to play, for example, Cleopatra. However, she is asked to be the nurse repeatedly. Deaf actress and director Monique Holt reminded us

that 'Shakespeare may not have envisioned us [actors of color] performing *Hamlet*. But he will surely appreciate the beauty of our diverse world.'

British Kenyan director Jatinder Verma, artistic director of the Asian theatre company Tara Arts, uses the term 'Binglish' (i.e., the theatre praxis of featuring Asian or black casts in productions by independent Asian or black theatre companies) to challenge the 'dominant conventions of the English stage'. In April 2015, Tara Arts produced its adaptation of *Macbeth* set in a migrant Asian family and explored their 'ancestral (and spiritual) homeland'. Verma deliberately avoided picking an 'Asian' play. Instead, Tara Arts wanted to give black and Asian actors an opportunity to do Shakespeare.

White directors appropriating non-Western traditions face accusations of imperial imposition. Some of them seem to arrive on the scene with an original sin for simply being white and male. When this happens, it is a problem. As for non-white artists, they face the challenge of being typecast. For artists who thrive to transcend the racial line, they face the seemingly impossible choice between heeding the call for cultural assimilation and 'preserving' ethnic cultural roots.

These stage works and life stories behind the scene are full of cultural ambivalence and contradictions. Like the artists, the Shakespearean canon has become a hybrid and heterogeneous subject.

ENTERING THE POSTNATIONAL SPACE

Shakespeare is associated with select historical sites and sites of origin, such as the Globe Theatre in London and the 'Hamlet' castle, Elsinore, in Denmark. Even though it is not the only venue associated with the playwright, the Globe in London, in both its original and its reconstructed form, has generated many of the ideas and tropes about Shakespeare's universal appeal. The fascination with the figure of the globe has extended from early modern to modern times. For example, the earth featured prominently in the 2012 World Shakespeare Festival's publicity material. Its logo, for example, was the earth seen from over the North Atlantic, showing Britain nearest the centre of the world. A promotional trailer began with a low orbit shot at sunrise. The curvature of the earth looms large as the tag line fades in: 'The biggest celebration of Shakespeare starts now.' These images are suggestive of an infinitely mobile Shakespeare in orbit, signifying across geographic spaces and capturing human conditions on Earth.

But before the emergence of locally manufactured global sites, there was the figure of the globe. Early modern England and Europe came a long way in cartographic and navigational technologies from the appearance of Martin Behaim's first globe, Erdapfel (Nuremberg), in 1492. The era of the first Globe Theatre coincided with the rising popularity of terrestrial globes, world maps, and the ideas of the world as theatre and of the theatre containing worldly stories. The Globe's name resonates with Francis Drake's circumnavigation and Ortelius' atlas *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (with its hard-to-miss theatrical metaphor), both landmark events in the 1570s.

Later generations tapped into the appeal of a globally conceived playhouse and canon. The reconstruction of Shakespeare's Globe in London has actively sought global partnerships and opportunities to present performances from different parts of the world. The intercontinental jets flying over the Globe—audible and visible on clear afternoons—reinforce the idea of a global stage. The Globe is a sign of the cultural rebirth of London's once-shady South Bank. Various reconstructed Globe theatres have also opened in Neuss, Germany; Dunedin, New Zealand; Tokyo, Japan; San Diego, California (originally built for the 1934 Chicago World's Fair); Cedar City, Utah (Adams Memorial Shakespeare Theatre); and Regina, Saskatchewan, among other places, and are being planned in Brazil and China.

All of these initiatives have one thing in common: they are fuelled by a cartographical imagination that is linked to politically, rather than artistically, envisioned divisions of geographical space. This is where the trouble begins for global Shakespeare criticism. National profiling is often allowed to overtake more nuanced appreciation of individual artistic talents and concerns. In other words, the journalistic obsession with, say, 'Japanese Shakespeare' as a general category may obscure Ninagawa's unique artistic achievements.

In some cases, artists themselves participate in the creation of polity-driven world map in global Shakespeare performances. At the curtain call of Dhaka Theatre's *Tempest* at the Globe Theatre in London on 8 May 2012, during the Globe to Globe Festival, one of the actors appeared onstage wrapped in the Bangladeshi flag. Several touring productions received funding from their embassies and governments. Patriotism cuts both ways, for, as former *Guardian* arts editor Andrew Dickson notes, the British patriotic sentiments turned into jingoism: 'We become defensive when theatre companies from abroad bring their own Shakespeare to these shores' (p. xiii). The World Shakespeare Festival was at once boldly experimental and reassuringly British because it was anchored by the production that both closed the festival and opened Shakespeare's Globe's own season: Dominic Dromgoole's English *Henry V*. According to the Globe's marketing material, the production 'celebrates the power of English, or any other language, to summon into life courts, pubs, ships and battlefields, within the embrace of "the wooden O"'. The festival therefore served multiple purposes. First, it successfully expanded its clientele by inviting London's ethnic communities to occupy the Globe's space. Second, the multilingual World Shakespeare Festival was a step towards consolidating the underdefined cosmopolitan British identity that was created at the inception of the Globe. Third, it celebrated diversity within the United Kingdom. Welsh and British sign language were among the languages represented.

Global Shakespeare seems to be all over the map, because many productions do not have a single point of cultural origin. The cultural coordinates of these works are complicated, such as Sulayman Al Bassam's *The Al-Hamlet Summit* which has been accused of reinforcing and benefiting from Western prejudices against the Arab region; Karin Beier's *Der Sommernachtstraum* in nine languages (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Düsseldorf, 1995; Berliner Theatertreffen, 1996) that espouses an unabashedly utopian vision of 'ein europäischer Shakespeare'; and Ninart Boonpothong's *When I Slept*

over the *Night of the Revolution* (Bangkok, 2007) that is haunted by the restless ghosts of Hamlet and Thaksin Shinawatra, the ousted Thai prime minister. These productions complicate the notion of globalization as merely 'global Westernization' (Roes).

Cartographic metaphors have been widely used to describe the phenomenon. The world map as a metaphor plays an important role in the rise of global Shakespeare as a field animated by political and aesthetic distances between cultures. Global Shakespeare criticism has relied erroneously on polity-driven historiography—narratives about Shakespeare in global contexts that focus on national political histories. Maps are used as markers of geopolitical power, which is why we have detailed histories of national Shakespeares, while many non-mainstream films and stage productions remain unclaimed goods.

As a result, critics are ill equipped to analyse works that do not fit neatly in geopolitical maps, such as the RSC's Stratford-upon-Avon production of *Much Ado About Nothing* (dir. Iqbal Khan, 2012), which was set in contemporary Delhi. Performed in English by a cast of second-generation British Indian actors to Bollywood-inspired music, the production received mixed reviews because the press compared it to two productions from the Indian subcontinent at the Globe Theatre in London during the same time period: Arpana Company's *All's Well That Ends Well* in Gujarati and Company Theatre's *Twelfth Night* in Hindi. These touring productions carried with them the cachet of ethnic and cultural authenticity. Khan's *Much Ado* had rough edges and was not quite polished, but the diasporic identity of the British Indian actors also complicated the reception of their performance.

Mental maps of the world that are informed by divisions between nation states and by area studies models inadvertently create unknowable objects by flattening the artworks against national profiles. As visually appealing as the map is as a navigational and heuristic tool, its clean lines between nations obscure the fact that many productions do not have one single home. As such, the map does not seem to promote an appreciation of transnational cultural flows or the fact that while Lotfi Achour's *Macbeth: Leila and Ben, a Bloody History* hailed from Tunisia, the Franco-Arabic company APA's production—with a French translation of Heiner Müller's German translation—resisted a unified identity. It incorporated traditions of the European experimental theatre, the Arab Middle East, and Africa. There are many other similar cases of hybrid performances. The notion of 'country of origin' is not very useful here. The complexity of the APA's cultural trajectories is too long-winded for the short attention span of journalists looking for a headline-worthy story about Shakespeare in post-Jasmine Revolution Tunisia. There is no place for such a work on a world map with neat borders. The uses of world maps in this case—informed by a metropolitan bias—reify a sense of British ownership of Shakespeare, both global and English.

Global Shakespeare needs different kinds of maps, maps that are based on mobile cultures and can account for the liminality of the aesthetics and politics of performing Shakespeare. A mental map of the world that is based on transnational cultural flows rather than on nation states will show that global Shakespeare is not antithetical to English-language Shakespeare traditions; instead, compelling performances in English

or other languages create their own cultural coordinates that can be best understood in a comparative context. Global Shakespeare as a genre thrives in an interstitial space, and some performances resist being reincorporated into a new cultural territory. While cultural identities may dissolve to some extent, and while travellers may feel disoriented, many artists embrace this space of humility and fluidity.

In other words, global Shakespeare performances have de-territorializing and reterritorializing effects (Deleuze and Guattari) that unmark the cultural origins of intercultural interpretations because they work against assumptions about politically defined geographies. These performances tend to see such geographies as artificial constraints that no longer speak to the realities of globalized art.

A key feature of global Shakespeare is artistic collaboration in a postnational space. Shakespeare works are not transmitted from the centre to the periphery, or from merely one country to another. Global Shakespeare can be best understood through theatrically defined sites. There are many examples of productions with unmarked cultural sites. In Lin Zhaohua's minimalist *Richard III* (Berlin Asien-Pazifik Woche, 2001), the hybrid, jazzy musical landscape hinted at a universalist site-free interpretation of free will and despotism; the production was made in Beijing but presented in Berlin to a mix of Chinese expatriates and Western audiences. The performance of Priam's fall in the Ryutopia Company's production of *Hamlet* (2007) is in dialogue with both *The Aeneid* and *The Tale of the Heike*. Westernized spoken drama (*huaju*) style integrated Beijing opera (*jingju*) techniques in Wang Xiaoying's *Richard III* (Shakespeare's Globe, 2012) to present a comedic but sobering take on the tragedy. Their makeshift costumes became a site of innovation when their costumes were stuck in a container aboard a ship and did not arrive in time. The ostensibly 'Mandarin Chinese' period drama at the Globe took on some unexpected contemporary English sartorial layering when the actors donned robes bought at Primark and costumes borrowed from the Globe.

The postnational space for global arts is shaped by mutual influence. Themes from fluid and hybrid cultural locations inform many theatre productions. It is therefore no longer useful to consider a production within any one national context, such as 'Japanese Shakespeare' or 'English Shakespeare'.

THE ETHICS OF QUOTING SHAKESPEARE

Behind these moves that 'map' global Shakespeare onto various nation states and cultural territories lie the ethics of quoting others. Global citations of Shakespeare—whether in performances or by politicians—demonstrate a spectral quality. Resisting nationalistic cartographical frames helps us move beyond profiling global Shakespeare by perceived national characters and missing the personal, artistic achievements of each work.

Performing Shakespeare is not only a de-territorializing act but also an act of citation. The rise of Shakespeare as a worldly and 'world class' author is partly a result

of the prevalence of politicians and artists quoting Shakespeare. Shakespeare's citationality contributes to reinterpretations of the canon and Shakespeare's posthumous popularity. To understand the phenomenon we have to distinguish quotation from citationality. Quotation is an act of reframing or deferring an idea through the reproduction of someone else's words. Quoting (or for that matter, misquoting) lines directly from Shakespeare's plays carries with it the weight of history and previous performances and uses of those lines. Citation refers to the culture of quoting others whether verbatim or metaphorically, a culture where not only is Shakespeare quoted but also other established interpretations of performances are quoted and reframed.

The two interrelated modes of citational theatricality are contained within the metaphors of life and death: the rhizomatic growth of roots and networks of living artworks through mutual quotations, and the ghosting (or quoting) of past and present voices. Citational theatricality is the most important feature of global Shakespeare. Shakespeare has gone global because his reputation, themes, characters, and lines have been circulated around world cultures of citation and world performance cultures. Acts of quotation are part of the larger culture of citation.

One practical reason why quotations of Shakespeare are prevalent may be that the oeuvre is copyright-free. Quoting others can be complicated and costly. Samuel Beckett's estate has an iron grip on the playwright's works in all forms of performance and appropriation. In 2006, the estate tried to stop the theatre at Pontedera in Tuscany from casting sisters Luisa and Silvia Pasello as Vladimir and Estragon in *Waiting for Godot*. In October 2012, William Faulkner's estate (Faulkner Literary Rights) alleged that Woody Allen's *Midnight in Paris* misquoted the famous line 'The past is never dead. It's not even past' (Leopold).

By contrast, it is free to quote Shakespeare. Global citations of Shakespeare—whether in performances or by politicians—demonstrate a spectral quality across cultures, media, and histories. These works are full of echoes and cross-references to other genres, events, and works. Our experience of the plays is ghosted by our prior investments in select aspects of the play and in previous performances.

These citations come in all forms and have been deployed for various purposes including empowerment. A smuggled copy of *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* inspired Nelson Mandela while he was in the Robben Island jail. The South African prisoners there signed their names next to passages that were important to them. The passage Mandela chose on 16 December 1977, was from *Julius Caesar*, just before the Roman statesman leaves for the senate on the Ides of March (2.2.32–7):

Cowards die many times before their deaths;
The valiant never taste of death but once.
Of all the wonders that I yet have heard,
It seems to me most strange that men should fear;
Seeing that death, a necessary end,
Will come when it will come.

These lines taught Mandela how to dream and how to rise from the ashes.

In *Guns of the Magnificent Seven* (dir. Paul Wendkos, 1969), a film about the rescue of a Mexican peasant revolutionary leader, Chris (George Kennedy) quotes this same passage from *Julius Caesar* to a peasant. At the end of the film, the peasant is heard quoting the same passage to a boy after they have been liberated by the Magnificent Seven.

Political quotations of Shakespeare are ubiquitous, whether it is Egyptian intellectuals quoting *Hamlet*, a play that became 'near-ubiquitous' there in the mid-1960s (Litvin 91), or the former US secretary of state George Schulz referring to the United States as 'the Hamlet of nations, worrying endlessly over whether and how to respond' to terrorism in the 1980s (Johnson 421 n. 129). The ramifications of quoting Shakespeare in these contexts are far-reaching.

In October 2015, during Chinese president Xi Jinping's state visit to Britain, he quoted *The Tempest*, 'what's past is prologue' (2.1.253), to British prime minister David Cameron, and urged the two countries to 'join hands and move forward' despite the antagonistic history between them including the Opium Wars. Significantly, Xi received a collection of the sonnets from Queen Elizabeth II as a gift during the state banquet.

A more recent example of performative quotation of Shakespeare was the opening ceremony of the 2012 London Olympics. Actors quoted, in several significant venues, Caliban's eloquent description to newcomers of his world, an 'isle full of noises' (*The Tempest* 3.2.138–46). It was recited by Kenneth Branagh dressed as Isambard Kingdom Brunel during the opening ceremony in the Olympic Stadium in London (directed by Danny Boyle). While this event may not be aesthetically coherent or interesting, it bears statistical significance as an instance of global citation of Shakespeare, because, along with other sport and cultural events, Branagh's performance was broadcast live, taped, and in 3D on television, radio, and the Internet with subtitles or voiceover to an estimated 4.8 billion viewers and listeners in more than 200 countries and territories (International Olympic Committee). Several athletes recited Caliban's speech in video commercials for the 2012 World Shakespeare Festival. The closing ceremony again echoed the 'Isles of Wonder' theme. Timothy Spall's Winston Churchill recited the same passage Branagh had spoken earlier.

These quotations are taken out of context. The enchanted isle full of noises refers to the British Isles that are gearing up to welcome guests from afar. Caliban has been recruited to represent Britain's cultural others as well as the others within the greater London. Branagh and Spall's use of Caliban's speech is a clever but ethically problematic repossession of a colonial narrative and figure. Multilingual and global Shakespeare performances represented a step towards consolidating the underdefined post-imperial British identity and creating new international identities for touring companies from outside the UK.

Behind these acts of quoting others lie ethical questions. Ethics is an essential, but often missed, term in global Shakespeare criticism. What do we owe Shakespeare or world cultures when we quote them for our agenda? What responsibility might one have? We owe it to the people who make the culture, and we owe it to the artist who creates the works that we study. We owe it to ourselves to listen intently for what

they have to say. Emmanuel Levinas prioritizes ethics over knowledge production. We are responsible for the preservation of the alterity of the Other, even as we make the obscure known by 'feeling it of its otherness'. In other words, we are constantly striving against what Levinas calls 'the imperialism of the same', an assertive move of acquisition that forces unfamiliar things to 'conform to what we already know' (Davis 48).

There is another aspect of the problem. Parallel to the assertive, acquisitive move in knowledge production is 'knowledgeable ignorance', which, according to Norman Daniel, is the tendency to insist on 'knowing' something as one's own ideological construct. It is a form of laziness and irresponsible act to know 'people as something they are not, and could not possibly be, and maintaining these ideas even when the means exist to know differently' (12).

Quoting Shakespeare, an author who is no longer present, may have connotations of forced possession—sometimes against Shakespeare's will, as it were. Appropriation and citation also carry strong overtones of agency, potentially for the appropriated as well as for the appropriator. Therefore, it can have ethical and political advocacy. Take *The Merchant of Venice*, for example. Shylock's 'Hath not a Jew eyes?' speech is one of the most often appropriated and cited passages. Al Pacino's superb performance brought humanity to the character and highlighted the difficulty to wrestle with a complex speech that is simultaneously a human rights declaration and a demonstration of vindictive spirit. The speech features prominently in a trailer for Roman Polanski's *The Pianist* (2002), and in the film, the pianist smuggles in a volume of the play when being taken away to the concentration camp. The citation of multilayered histories and Shakespeare are powerful and moving.

What does it entail to quote a person or a work? In the age of global performance culture, quotation can be a gesture of deference or a demarcated space for reflection. Evoking Shakespeare creates a visually and rhetorically marked space, a rupture between contemporary artists' works and Shakespeare's words. A quotation, whether in translation or in some other appropriated forms, is an attempt to reproduce a predecessor's ideas, or what Marjorie Garber calls 'cultural ventriloquism, a throwing of the voice that is an appropriation of authority' (16). There are two possible outcomes. The contemporary living director or translator may be seen as channelling the voice of the dead (like the Ghost in *Hamlet*, a rhetorical figure speaking the words of another), or Shakespeare's authorial presence may be subsumed under the embodied presence of living, contemporary artists (which some journalists have seen as theft of or infidelity to a classical author, an act of transgression).

ARCHIVE AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

Consignation aims to coordinate a single corpus, in a system or synchrony in which all the elements articulate the unity of an ideal configuration

The archontic principle of the archive is also a principle of consignation, that is, of gathering together.

(Jacques Derrida)

Where is global Shakespeare today? Attempts to map the itineraries of global Shakespeare reveal that there is a limit to Shakespeare's global reach. As a growing field of study, global Shakespeare, like many fields, relies on archives and collective memory of performance events. Collective memory is communal and shared. It is different from formal written history based on accessible extant documents or autobiographies based on personally inflected memories. Collective memory, as Maurice Halbwachs theorizes, hinges on communal landmarks, frameworks, and contexts (172, 175). Shakespearean performances as communal events serve as a powerful framework for personal, institutional, and national histories. However, there are gaps in the collective archive because archives are themselves highly selective, inadequate repositories of memories. Silenced or redacted stories are sensitive or subversive texts that are removed from sight. What is not there is as important as the canonical well-known performances.

The stories an archive tells may be curated, censored, and distorted by native informants and global producers, or otherwise filtered by financial circumstances or ideological preferences. Why do some works travel further than others and as a result populate more archives? There is a degree of textual transparency in Shakespeare, Greek tragedy, and other classics that allows audiences to tell their own stories and thereby to shape their knowledge base of world cultures.

There are three implications of silences in the archive. First, silences or gaps in a body of records may reflect certain realities in the world the archive is trying to map. There seem to be no significant Shakespeare traditions in the Antarctic, Iceland, Greenland, Fiji, Tristan da Cunha, Mongolia, Iran, and in large swathes of sub-Saharan Africa except for South Africa. Materials from these areas are therefore sparse or missing in 'global Shakespeares' as collective memory and as a repertoire of cultures. These gaps may well reflect an actual dearth of Shakespearean performances in those places, but the gaps may also be a result of the field's limited linguistic repertoire and historical knowledge that is insufficient at the present moment to track activities in those places.

Second, authorities may deny scholars full access to sensitive or censored archives for any number of reasons. Censorship not only impedes access to archives but also compromises academic freedom. For example, even when scholars are able to locate politically sensitive materials pertaining to performances of *Hamlet* in post-Arab Spring Egypt, they may not be able to discuss them in public because of concerns for the safety of their collaborators and interviewees who are still living in those countries. They may not be able to publish their findings because they are concerned that they will be banned from entering those countries on future research trips or will not receive funding from those governments. Some materials are simply more challenging to access for scholars, such as wartime performances. The condition of preservation can create another obstacle. This kind of archival silence is created not by the absence of materials but by issues of accessibility.

Third, silences in the historical records may be a manifestation of power struggles between researchers and their objects of study. Some groups, including the Ninagawa Studio, resist the concept of digitally accessible archives in their effort to preserve the production value of their live, ephemeral performances, while the National Theatre (NT) maintains an on-site archive open to researchers which contains videos, rehearsal and production photographs, programmes, prompt scripts, costume designs, and other materials. The NT Archive was established to document the otherwise ephemeral theatre art. It collects materials from the founding of the NT in 1963 to the present day. Its mission statement emphasizes the importance of keeping the theatrical experience accessible: 'Accessing material collected in a theatre archive can help to bring alive past productions and allow one an insight into the working methods of the performers and the production team.'

The necessarily selective processes of archiving can also have a silencing effect. Under financial and space constraints, an archive may have to purge some materials to make room for more recent or more desirable artefacts, though values change over time. Before Shakespeare on film became a field, the Folger Library discarded film scripts and other materials sent to them by film studios. Sir Thomas Bodley, founder of the Oxford library, dismissed 'idle books, riff raff', and 'baggage books' (222), including plays in instructions to his librarian in 1612.

From a scholarly point of view, the archival silence constitutes productive negative evidence in the archaeological and anthropological senses. Archival silence is useful because it compels us to rethink our criteria and frames of reference. On the one hand, while postcolonial critics commonly privilege works that critique the role of Western hegemony, the meanings of Shakespeare in such places as South Africa, Brazil, and India are not always determined by colonial frames of reference. On the other hand, the absence of a coherent, constructed Shakespeare tradition in a certain place does not mean there are no local engagements with Shakespearean material. For example, while there are rich references and allusions to Shakespeare and his characters in Mexican cinema and in Argentinian theatre, there is no sustained scholarly tradition of Shakespeare studies in these localities.

Reception is an equally important part of the historical record of global Shakespeares, and therein lies another kind of archival silence. Some works are purged from the archive, while others are not considered worthy of a place there. These works lack a full record of reception because they are not yet on the map. Take, for example, the Finnish film *Eight Days to the Premiere* (2008), a romantic comedy about a theatrical production of *Romeo and Juliet*. Finnish critics objected to the film's failure to offer enough Shakespearean elements. The film is virtually unknown outside Finland, because Finnish is a language that is neither part of the English or world 'Englishes' communities nor part of cultures that are more diametrically opposed to the West. Even though the local did not go global, the local film was judged according to criteria that were born out of imaginations of the global. Archival silence goes hand in hand with the invisibility of minority cultures in this wave of globalization.

Global Shakespeare is not defined by nation states. As a body of texts and myths, global Shakespeare exists somewhere between to be or not to be. There is always a world elsewhere.

WORKS CITED

- Bodley, Sir Thomas. *Letters of Sir Thomas Bodley to Thomas James*. Ed. G. W. Wheeler. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Letters 220 and 221.
- Daniel, Norman. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*. 1960; Oxford: Oneworld, 1993.
- Davis, Donald R. 'Three Principles for an Asian Humanities: Care First ... Learn From ... Connect Histories'. *Journal of Asian Studies* 74/1 (2015): 43–67.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987. (Originally published as *Mille plateaux*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1980.)
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.
- Dickson, Andrew. *Worlds Elsewhere: Journeys Around Shakespeare's Globe*. London: Bodley Head, 2015.
- Dromgoole, Dominic. *Hamlet Globe to Globe: Two Years, 190,000 Miles, 197 Countries, One Play*. New York: Grove Press, 2017.
- Dromgoole, Dominic, and Tom Bird. 'O for a Muse of Fire'. *Globe to Globe* website homepage, <http://globetoglobe.shakespearesglobe.com/>. Accessed 1 September 2012.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Quotation Marks*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Freedom*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2010.
- Grotowski, Jerzy. *Towards a Poor Theatre*. Ed. Eugenio Barba. London: Routledge, 1968.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Ed. and trans. Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- International Olympic Committee. *Factsheet: London 2012 Facts and Figures*. Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee, November 2012. http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Reference_documents/Factsheets/London_2012_Facts_and_Figures-eng.pdf. Accessed 5 June 2013.
- Johnson, Boyd M. 'Executive Order 12333: The Permissibility of an American Assassination of a Foreign Leader'. *Cornell International Law Journal* 25/2 (Summer 1992): 401–35.
- Kliman, Bernice W. 'At Sea about Hamlet at Sea: A Detective Story'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62.2 (2011): 180–204.
- Kwon, Miwon. *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004.
- Leopold, Todd. 'Famed Quotation Isn't Dead—And Could Even Prove Costly'. *CNN*, 11 November 2012. <http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/06/showbiz/movies/faulkner-midnight-paris-allen-lawsuit/>. Accessed 15 February 2016.
- Litvin, Margaret. *Hamlet's Arab Journey: Shakespeare's Prince and Nasser's Ghost*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2011.
- National Theatre. Archive. <https://www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/about-the-national-theatre/archive>. Accessed 1 September 2015.
- Pavis, Patrice, ed. *The Intercultural Performance Reader*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Pearson, Mike. *Site-Specific Performance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

- Rees, Jasper. 'All the World's a Stage.' *The Economist* (November–December 2015). <https://www.1843magazine.com/features/all-the-worlds-a-stage>.
- Reynoso, Hector, 'Shakespeare and Diversity' symposium. Gallaudet University, 29 March 2016.
- Rocs, Michael. Interview with Alexa Alice Joubin. Freie Universität Berlin Internationales Kolleg Verflechtungen von Theaterkulturen, 2 May 2013.
- Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC). 'History'. Company website <https://www.rsc.org.uk/about-us/key-dates>. Accessed 21 March 2016.
- Sperlinger, Tom. *'Romeo and Juliet' in Palestine: Teaching Under Occupation*. Winchester: Zero Books, 2014.
- Supple, Tim. Public lecture. Milburn Studio, University of Warwick, 2 June 2015.

CHAPTER 26

GLOBAL SHAKESPEARE AND GLOBALIZED PERFORMANCE

DENNIS KENNEDY

BEN JONSON famously claimed in the First Folio that Shakespeare 'was not of an age, but for all time!' His fame has expanded wildly beyond Jonson's imagination, and it is now commonplace to call Shakespeare's work universal. 'Universal' is normally taken to mean that his plays transcend time and location because they deal with unchanging aspects of human nature and present characters and plots people everywhere can recognize and understand. In light of the global recognition of his work in the early twenty-first century it is hard to dismiss declarations of its universality. Yet those committed to the universalist view have tended to disguise or ignore a contradictory fact: that how spectators and readers have actually responded to Shakespeare over time has almost always been determined by the locations and cultures they are in (see D. Kennedy, *Foreign Shakespeare* 1–18). Shakespeare today is recognized widely for his superman status, but is that due to the universality of his texts or their malleability? Here's the Great Shakespeare Paradox: he seems universal because he has been respecified. His plays are open documents that can be fashioned to fit many styles and many meanings, a process that has been going on since the seventeenth century. As Gary Taylor argued in 1989, when we allege that Shakespeare is universal, what we are actually saying is that he has been continuously reinvented.

INTERCULTURAL SPECTATORSHIP

One of the most important reinventions in Shakespeare performance since the 1980s has been based on another contradiction, a form of simulated internationalism usually called interculturalism. I define intercultural Shakespeare this way: performances in which a director's or designer's interventions force into the production attributes from one or more cultures plainly foreign to a Shakespeare text or an adapted text derived

Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists (Cambridge UP, 2011). He was the 2012 Sam Wanamaker Fellow at Shakespeare's Globe in London, and one of the six editors of *The Cambridge Guide to the Worlds of Shakespeare* (Cambridge UP, 2016).

Peter Holland is McMeel Family Professor in Shakespeare Studies in the Department of Film, Television, and Theatre, and Associate Dean for the Arts at the University of Notre Dame. A former President of the Shakespeare Association of America, he is Editor of *Shakespeare Survey*, co-General Editor of Oxford Shakespeare Topics (Oxford UP), Shakespeare in the Theatre (Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare), and The Arden Shakespeare Fourth Series. With Adrian Poole he edited the eighteen-volume series *Great Shakespeareans*. His many editions of Shakespeare include *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Oxford World's Classics) and *Coriolanus* (The Arden Shakespeare Third Series). He is currently writing a monograph on Shakespeare and forgetting, and editing *King Lear* for the Arden Shakespeare.

Alexa Alice Joubin is Professor of English and founding co-director of the Digital Humanities Institute and at George Washington University in Washington, DC. At MIT, she is co-founder and co-director of the open access Global Shakespeares digital performance archive. She also holds the Middlebury College John M. Kirk Chair in Medieval and Renaissance Literature at the Bread Loaf School of English. Her latest book is *Shakespeare and the Ethics of Appropriation*, co-edited with Elizabeth Rivlin (Palgrave, 2014). She is co-General Editor of *The Shakespearean International Yearbook* and has chaired the MLA committee on the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. She currently edits the Palgrave book series on Global Shakespeares.

Dennis Kennedy is Samuel Beckett Professor of Drama Emeritus at Trinity College Dublin. He is the author or editor of many award-winning books, including *Granville Barker and the Dream of Theatre* (Cambridge UP, 1985), *Looking at Shakespeare: A Visual History of Twentieth-Century Performance* (Cambridge UP, 1993, 2001), *Foreign Shakespeare* (Cambridge UP, 1993), *The Spectator and the Spectacle: Audiences in Modernity and Postmodernity* (Cambridge UP, 2009), *Shakespeare in Asia* (with Yong Li Lan, Cambridge UP, 2010), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Theatre and Performance* (Oxford UP, 2003), and *The Oxford Companion to Theatre and Performance* (Oxford UP, 2010). He has also worked internationally as a playwright and director, and his short stories have appeared in numerous literary magazines.

Peter Kirwan is Associate Professor in Early Modern Drama at the University of Nottingham. His research interests include historical and contemporary performance of early modern drama, book history, and attribution studies. He is the author of *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha* (Cambridge UP, 2015), co-editor with Christie Carson of *Shakespeare and the Digital World* (Cambridge UP, 2014), and Associate Editor for *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays* (Palgrave, 2013). He is currently preparing a monograph on the theatre company Cheek by Jowl, and reviews theatre at his long-running blog *The Bardathon*.

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2017

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2017

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017941540

ISBN 978-0-19-968716-9

Printed and bound by

CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CRO 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.