Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace

Edited by
Alexa Alice Joubin
and
Charles S. Ross

PURDUE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Introduction to *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace*

Alexa Alice Joubin and Charles S. Ross

With the rise of Asian economic power, new possibilities of creation ushered by Web 2.0, and an unparalleled global interest in Shakespeare, the present time is especially propitious for studying the complex relations between Shakespeare, Hollywood, Asia, and cyberspace. What is entailed in the cultural practice of screening, in both senses of the verb, Shakespeare in transnational audio-visual idioms in modern times? The past decades have witnessed diverse incarnations and bold sequences of screen and stage Shakespeares that gave rise to productive encounters between the ideas of Asia and of Shakespeare. Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood* (*Macbeth*, 1957) and *Ran* (*Lear*, 1985) are far from the earliest or the only Shakespeare films from Asia; around the time Asta Nielsen's cross-dressed *Hamlet* (1921) was filmed, gender-bender silent film adaptations of *The Merchant of Venice* and *Two Gentlemen of Verona* were being made in Shanghai. In 2006, mainland China director Feng Xiaogang adapted *Hamlet*, Hollywood visual language, and the martial arts genre in his feature film *The Banquet*. Hollywood films such as Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo+Juliet* and John Madden's *Shakespeare in Love* have inspired creative re-interpretations of these films and of *Romeo and Juliet* in Anthony (Yau) Chan's Hong Kong film *One Husband Too Many* and Cheah Chee Kong's Singaporean film *Chicken Rice War*.

In the other direction, Hollywood and the global economy in general have brought Asian cultures forcefully into the Western cultural register, as evidenced by the mediation and reception of Shakespeare and world cultures on screens big and small, including silent film, television, feature film, documentary, and such media as online games, anime, and YouTube. Two prominent examples are Kenneth Branagh's *As You Like It* (2006), set in Japan, and the appropriation of eastern spirituality in Thich Nah Hanh's scene in Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000). In both directions of the intercultural traffic, Asian audio-visual idioms have been appropriated along with Shakespeare's text on stage and on screen. Therefore, we need to ask: On what terms do transnational Shakespeares animate and redirect the traffic between differ-

ent geo-cultural or virtual localities? In turn, how do the collaborative processes of signification operate as local stagings of Shakespeare and global locales?

These are some of the questions that have inspired the present collection of articles on a truly global array of appropriative strategies. The proliferation of re-interpretations of Shakespeare in the present time calls for sophisticated models of theorization. At stake is how to reinvent the interpretive energy by destabilizing conventionalized interpretations of "Shakespeare" and its Others—past, present, and to come. Fully attuned to the intricate dynamics between different localities and between the ideology of print and other media, such a theory will help us to understand how and when Shakespeare becomes a necessary signifier against which popular and world cultures define themselves on screen, how the ideas of Asia operate in such a film as Branagh's *As You Like It*, what ideological understanding of Shakespeare informs a computer game such as *Arden: The World of Shakespeare*, a MMOG (massively multiplayer online game), and many other new questions. This collection of essays represents a collaborative effort to bring into productive dialogue studies of Shakespeare in Asian and Western forms of cultural production that range from theater to cinema to cyberspace.

The cultural translation of Shakespeare into Hollywood may be regarded as a commercial enterprise in the same way that the presence of his plays in Asia may be thought of as a colonial legacy. One may bemoan the loss of the language or the vision or the "essence" of Shakespeare and imagine what further horrors the translation to cyberspace has in store. Or one may think of the glass as half full. That is, one may accept the obvious limitations of film as a visual rather than a verbal medium; regard the problems of translation into a language like Chinese as an opportunity to perhaps bring Asian culture to the attention of Americans and vice versa; and look forward to the development of cyberspace as a place that might just make it possible to restore the old-fashioned pleasures of textual reading and creative performance of more than just the few scenes of Shakespeare that linger in the popular imagination, a place that fosters an enabling relation between Shakespeare in print and in other media.

There are, after all, at least thirty-six Shakespeare plays, many waiting their turn for renewal. Each has an uncanny ability to appeal to a generation or a culture: the hesitating Hamlet dominated the European imagination after the fall of Napoleon, as Isaiah Berlin has argued, just as *King Lear* and *Macbeth* struck a chord in twentieth-century Japanese and Chinese cultures. *Troilus and Cressida* was a cult play for the antiwar generation's experience in Vietnam. As shown by some of the essays collected in this volume, Shakespeare's other plays have been used to comment on politics in China. But Shakespeare is about more than political resonance. For Mozart, every key had an associated emotion—one key for seduction, another for anger. Similarly, Shakespeare's plays strike chords often difficult to hear because our experience is limited. At a lecture at Tatung University in Taipei a student asked what prevented *Pericles*, that mystical Mediterranean voyage of discovery, from being performed or filmed or read with sympathy in Taiwan. He wondered if there was

a way to bring its subtle religious themes and brooding sense of morality into the Asian experience; or rather, he wondered why it had not been done. Similarly, one may be surprised that comedies such as *The Taming of the Shrew* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* are a staple of student productions in Asia, since one generally thinks of comedy as more culturally bound than tragedy. It may be that it takes a different culture, perhaps a local city or island or language, to remind us of some aspect of Shakespeare that has a claim on our attention.

This volume is about how Shakespeare has played out in film, performance, and scholarly projects that connect Asia and English-speaking America. About half of this volume derives from a thematic issue of *CLCWeb: Comparative Leterature and Culture 6.1* (2004) <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol6/iss1/> entitled *Shakespeare in Asia and Hollywood*, edited by Charles S. Ross (the volume at hand is Annual 4 of the journal in the Purdue monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies). The other half of this volume derives from selected and peer-reviewed papers presented at symposia or conference panels Alexa Alice Joubin organized, as well as articles by the editors' invitation. The editors are proud to pres-ent the work in the volume on the multifaceted relationships between Shakespeare and Hollywood, China, Indonesia, Cambodia, Japan, Taiwan, Malaya, Korea, and Hong Kong to complement the articles on film, which naturally focus on Akira Ku-rosawa, one of the key Shakespeare filmmakers, as they provide a rich cultural back-ground for his work. The result is a volume in three interconnected sections, each of which questions the products of cultural translation while also recognizing the value of finding ways to connect Asian and Anglo-European modes of representation. Fur-ther, the volume includes a fourth section with a chronology of Shakespeare in Hol-lywood, Asia, and Cyberspace and a selected bibliography on the same topic.

Localization and appropriation

Despite the significance of textual and performative appropriations, critical ideologies and biases have, for a long time, relegated them to the periphery and limited the interpretive possibilities. As late as 1988, "localization" was still viewed as "intoler-able, imprisoning," according to Leah Marcus, who traced the attitude back to 1623, suggesting that

> Even though every interpreter of Shakespeare depends on the work of previous 'localizers' for such basic things as determining the order of the plays' composition and establishing the texts in which we read them, we have tended to set such work apart from the mainstream, as though by assigning the localizers to a fenced-in preserve we can minimize their impact on something we are willing to perceive only as universal and without limits. The tendency is not new. Even though the word *localization* dates only from the nineteenth century, resistance to the activity it names goes back, in the case of Shakespeare, at least as far as 1623. More than any other English writer, Shakespeare has been made the bearer of high claims for the universality of art. (*Puzzling Shakespeare* 1-2)

If textual and performative reconfigurations can be broadly categorized as acts of appropriation, the subjects of appropriation are certainly not only Shakespeare's texts as presented during his lifetime but also local politics (in temporal and spatial terms). As productions like Heiner Müller's *Hamletmachine* (1978), Ariane Mnouchkine's *kabuki*- and *noh*-inflected *Richard II* in Paris in 1981, David McRuvie and Annette Leday's *Kathakali King Lear* at the Globe in London in 2000, Yukio Ninagawa's multiple Shakespeare productions for European festivals, and Ong Keng Sen's *Search: Hamlet* with a multinational cast that appropriated European and Asian performance idioms (2002) have shown, staging a Shakespearean play is a process not simply of representing that play itself but rather of negotiating the dynamics between the locality Shakespeare represents and the locality of the performers and the audience.

Further, some appropriations have themselves become subjects to be appropriated; historically, the works that constitute Shakespeare's afterlife do not always remain secondary. Many productions have had afterlives of their own (Joubin; Gallimore). The Restoration and eighteenth century produced some of most perplexing cases. Nahum Tate's *King Lear* dominated the English stage until 1836, and David Garrick's *Catherine and Petruchio* was regularly staged until 1887. Goethe's *Hamlet*-inspired *Bildungsroman*, *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1796), has an extended presence in Novalis's *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* (1802) and Penelope Fitzgerald's *The Blue Flower* (1995). Beyond Europe, Tsubouchi Shōyō 's translations have had a lasting legacy in Japan, while Shu Lin's rendition of Charles and Mary Lamb's *Tales from Shakespeare* has defined the first generation of Shakespearean performances in China and inspired a new project in 2001 to retranslate Shakespeare's plays in prose narratives—following the footsteps of the Lambs and Lin.

Although worldwide appropriation of Shakespeare is hardly a new phenomenon, this cultural practice did not become a subject of scholarly analysis until the early 1990s with the emergence of a handful of works on related topics, such as Michael Bristol's *Shakespeare's America, America's Shakespeare* (1991). When Jean I. Marsden published the landmark study, *The Appropriation of Shakespeare* (1991), she lamented the lack of scholarly attention to "Shakespeare after the Renaissance" and pointed out that "it is this void that [her collection] address[ed]" (5). Recognizing that "what we think of 'Shakespeare' is . . . culturally determined," Marsden contends, Shakespearean appropriations "present a view of Shakespeare embedded not only in his own culture but in ours, forcing us to consider both the impact we have on the plays and the impact they have on us" (8). Dennis Kennedy's groundbreaking works, *Foreign Shakespeare* (1993) and *Looking at Shakespeare* (1993)—although with an Anglo-European focus similar to Marsden's volume—made "foreign" Shakespearean appropriations important subjects of further scholarly inquiry. The 1991 World Shakespeare Congress in Tokyo fueled the interest in the subject and led to the publication of *Shakespeare and Cultural Traditions* (1994), a collection of essays that examine the traffic between Shakespeare and world cultures (see Kishi). A decade of theoretical reflection and historical studies culminated in the launch in 2005 of a new

peer-reviewed journal, *Borrowers and Lenders*, edited by Christy Desmet and Sujata Iyengar, that is devoted exclusively to the study of Shakespeare and appropriation.

Studies in the field broadly conceived as reception and audience studies (performance, film, popular culture) can be categorized into three related but different lines of work. The first mode of research brings critical theory to bear on various modes of representation (on and beyond the stage), as has been pursued by Michael Bristol, James Bulman, John Joughin, Barbara Hodgdon, Christy Desmet, and W.B. Worthen, among other key critics. The second mode of research draws upon case studies or specific stage histories. Some studies draw upon more personal experiences, such as John Russell Brown's *New Sites for Shakespeare: Theatre, the Audience and Asia*, while other studies concentrate on practices in specific cultures and their theoretical implications (see Dessen, Shaughnessy, Hoenselaars). Still others focus on less familiar appropriations in Europe, Africa, Asia, and other locations, and provide analyses of important materials from these sites that contrast those sites that have been privileged by Anglo-American criticism. This line of work has broadened the horizon of Shakespeare studies (see Chaudhuri and Lim; Makaryk, Orkin, Hoenselaars, *Shakespeare's History Plays*; Esche). A third mode of research engages the histories and reception of Shakespeare's images, biographies, and reputation. One of the best-known works in this category is Gary Taylor's *Reinventing Shakespeare* (1989). A new contribution is *Shakespeares after Shakespeare*, edited by Richard Burt, a two-volume encyclopedia chronicling bits of Shakespeariana in mass media and popular culture. The present collection is the first book to consider Shakespeare across a spectrum of media, including cyberspace, and to examine, side by side, the cultural production of Shakespeare in Asia and in Hollywood.

While textual variations and editorial interventions raise similar issues and share general avenues of approach, textual permutations have not been widely recognized in terms of their appropriation of Shakespeare. A few works, however, do begin to treat textual strategies as acts of appropriation (see, e.g., Erickson's *Rewriting*, which examines Shakespeare's representation of women along with contemporary women's rewriting of Shakespeare; see also Erne and Kidnie). It is also worth mentioning that as appropriation received more critical attention in Shakespeare studies, other relevant fields were also affected by a renewed interest in the theoretical implications of adaptation as a genre. Film studies, in particular, witnessed the emergence of new works that revisit the question of authorship and representation (see Griffith; Cartmell and Whelehan; Naremore).

Reception studies that reassess historical circumstances have shown that the concepts of afterlife and appropriation can be paradoxical. If, as the critical language of our time suggests, literary works could not contain meanings in and by themselves, the notions of appropriation and the original would be redundant, for the "text" is constituted of nothing other than these permutations. This tendency is reflected in critical positions held by the reader-response theorists, by Julia Kristeva's notion of intertextuality, by Jacques Derrida's conception of the "iterability" as the nature of all texts, as well as by some Shakespeareans who subscribe to presentism, such as

Terence Hawkes and Graham Holderness. For example, Hawkes argues that texts cannot provide self-contained meanings; rather, "we mean by the text we choose" (*Meaning by Shakespeare* 3). On the other hand, if meanings are defined by nothing but the literary artifact, appropriation—in the sense of making something one's own—would not be possible. These issues form the core of critical debates not only in Shakespeare studies but also in fiction, film adaptations, and performance studies, prompting recent works to revisit the very problem with naming. In her 2006 book, *A Theory of Adaptation*, Linda Hutcheon devotes the preface and entire sections in section 1 of the book to discuss these problems. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, co-editors of the latest critical anthology of Shakespearean adaptations, devote similarly a section in their introduction to the problem of naming (which considers the inadequacies of terms such as adaptation, appropriation, parody, offshoot, alteration, spinoff) and a section to the relationship between adaptation and contemporary culture theory, emphasizing that adaptation is "not a simple rejection" of the notions of the author and the canon. Fischlin and Fortier argue that "to understand the cultural politics of adaptation, we must also examine how adaptation takes place within a certain structured relationship to . . . a broadly accepted group of works that is a consensual (though not uncontested) site of foregrounded study within the academy" (6).

Asian voices

The articles in the first section of the volume, Shakespeare in Hollywood, differ somewhat from those collected by Lynda Boose and Richard Burt, who argue in the introduction to their first edited collection of essays, *Shakespeare: The Movie*, that it is impossible to make comparisons between modern products and an original because the original referent is "no longer there." It is true enough that few people have the sensibilities of an Elizabethan or can know for sure what those sensibilities are, but there are a few problems with insisting that the original is no longer there. The phrase is self-contradictory, implying some magic moment of disappearance, but by the same token also suggesting some previous moment when Shakespeare's original had not yet disappeared. That is, the statement implies the existence of a time when the original was "there," before it gradually disappeared either over the centuries or in our personal development because our investment in the original takes on less meaning as our critical consciousness grows. Our assumption, instead, is that moment of origin never disappears, because directors have always had access to the text, more or less, and always will have. We challenge the presumption that Shakespeare is disappearing because such thinking blurs the difference between knowing what Shakespeare intended or what his audience understood with the presumption that Shakespeare did not mean anything and his audience did not read anything into his plays, which seems unlikely. The articles in the section on Shakespeare in Hollywood look at both text and film, and at how the directors look at text and film, for however sophisticated we may become in the ways of the cinema and the cultures for which these films are produced, Shakespeare on Film as a pedagogy can always

find something to say about what directors put into a film and what they leave out. The young scholars of comparative literature, many from China and Taiwan, whose voices are heard in the opening section of the volume, generally start with the basic text and then develop reasons for the changes made in the transition from text and theater to film. They look for the ways in which Shakespeare has been culturally translated, either by modifications of the text or by the way directors substitute visual images for words as they search for cinematic equivalents to what they perceive to be the meaning of Shakespeare's texts.

Mei Zhu, in "Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew* and the Tradition of Screwball Comedy," analyzes Franco Zeffirelli's *Taming of the Shrew* as an example of the Hollywood genre of screwball comedy. Zhu helps us see the universal appeal of comedy in cultural terms by noting the influence of screwball comedy on Chinese film as well. Although Su Peirui, who contributes an essay titled "Shakespeare and Al Pacino's *Looking for Richard*," grew up in northern China, she developed a fascination with Al Pacino that in turn should fascinate American readers by providing a Chinese perspective on Pacino's film about producing Shakespeare's play *Richard III.* Pacino's film suits this cultural perspective because its theme in turn is Pacino's fascination with Shakespeare's play and what it meant to him as an actor famous for his role as Michael Corleone in *The Godfather.* We are all in a sense amateurs before Shakespeare. As Harry Levin once said, the goals of comparative literature are impossible. He could read and keep up in English, French, and German, but he had to draw the line at Korean. The conventions and sometimes disappointing formulas of Hollywood film, which remind us of our own cultural limitations, are the subject of Charles S. Ross's "Underwater Women in Shakespeare Films," which looks at the literary and film history of the underwater woman as an image of social oppression. Examples can be found in Chinese fiction, in Kate Chopin's *The Awakening*, and in various Hollywood films from the 1990s, including Luhrmann's *Romeo+Juliet*, Branagh's *Hamlet*, and Taymor's *Titus.* As the trope of the underwater woman indicates, cross-cultural relations are nowhere more strongly contested today than in the relation of women to power, the subject of Xianfeng Mou's "Cultural Anxiety and the Female Body in Zeffirelli's *Hamlet*." Using the insights of her own reading in feminist theory, Mou explains how the way Franco Zeffirelli films Gertrude and Ophelia in his version of *Hamlet* expresses a certain view of women and power. She also argues, in part, that the film techniques of Hollywood often disappoint us politically and as effective readings of Shakespeare.

Shakespeare and Asia, the remix

Gender and politics intertwine in the discourse on culture that characterizes many of the articles in the section on Asia in the volume. The first is David Bevington's article, "Imagining the East and Shakespeare's Asia," first presented at a Shakespeare seminar at National Taiwan University. Although as Bevington reminds us, Shakespeare's text always bears renewed scrutiny, the studies in the volume invite us to see anew

something that has become familiarly known—Shakespeare's plays—and to contemplate the possibility that what seems an untroubled part of ourselves, as Stephen Greenblatt puts it, might not be something from a different time and place. Next, Yuwen Hsiung looks at Kurosawa's influence on two versions of *Macbeth* that were staged in China and Taiwan during the 1980s. The central issue is how to translate Shakespeare, and the solution comes in the form of Asian theatrical conventions that allow different perspectives on individuality while also introducing readers to the problem of literal Chinese translations of Shakespeare. Asian alterations of Shakespeare are also the subject of Lei Jin's essay, "Silence and Sound in Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood*." The thesis of the article is that Kurosawa uses silence, sound, and *noh* music as cinematic equivalents to Shakespeare's text, playing on the emotions of the audience in scenes such as Kurosawa's version of Macbeth's murder of King Duncan. In her study, "The Visualization of Metaphor in Two Chinese Versions of *Macbeth*," Alexa Alice Joubin establishes the central importance of Shakespeare's language as the basis for the stage's audio-visual idiom, as it is for visualization in films and as it will be for whatever form the internet manages to provide: video games, searches, interactive websites. One would hope that language, dialogue, met-rical stresses, the play of pauses, and every aspect of rhetoric would come alive in cyberspace, but we can only wait and see. Joubin's essay leads into a series of essays on Shakespeare in performance in various locations throughout Asia.

Daniel Gallimore's article, "Shakespeare in Contemporary Japan," helps explain the primacy of Japan in this field by arguing that a lack of a dominant tradition has allowed the kind of creativity Western audiences find in Kurosawa's adaptations. As Gallimore says, "Shakespeare production in Japan is arguably as ephemeral as cyberspace in its detachment from any integrative tradition." The independent pro-duction companies whose work in recent years Gallimore surveys and a rich tradition should bring Japan to the attention of serious Shakespeareans. Part of that tradition centered around one of the several replicas in the world of the Globe Theater. In "The Tokyo Globe Years 1988-2002" Michiko Suematsu provides a detailed account of a company that experimented with various blends of Shakespeare, local tradition, and creativity. The goal was to find what worked in performance, as it was in Korea, Malaya, Okinawa, Cambodia, Indonesia, China, and Hong Kong, the geographical subjects of the next set of articles. As Meewon Lee shows in "Hamlet in Korea," Shakespeare came to Korea under the influence of Japan and through the surpris-ing intermediary of Charles Lamb. British rather than Japanese colonial influence produced some humorous results but also drew on local culture in Malaya, as Nurul Farhana Low bt Abdulla shows in "Bangsawan Shakespeare in Colonial Malaya." Masae Suzuki provides historical detail to what in this volume becomes a familiar ac-count of localization in her article "Shakespeare, *Noh*, *Kyōgen*, and Okinawa Shibai." Next, Evan Darwin Winet reviews the evidence for a seventeenth-century *Hamlet* in his article "Spectres of *Hamlet* in Colonial and Postcolonial Indonesia."

After these historical and geographical surveys the Asian section closes with two articles on contemporary performance. In "Remembering the Past in the Shang-

hai Jingju Company's *King Lear*" Elizabeth Wichmann-Walczak gives a fascinating, first-person account of the political environment and artistic decisions involved in a production of *King Lear* characterized by an intense interpretation of the play and traditional Chinese opera forms. Adele Lee then surveys the problem of postcolonialism where it may not be a problem in "*One Husband Too Many* and the Problem of Postcolonial Hong Kong." Here the educational system has to meet expectations that perhaps do not hinder performance.

Cyberspace, game space, and media

With the advent of new technologies of knowledge transmission, Shakespeare has become ubiquitous, available in print, theater, cinema, video game, online in various forms, and now as full text <http://www.playshakespeare.com/news/3668-shakespeare-on-iphone-update> and animated quotes on iPhone. In addition to asking what "Shakespeare" has become, we now have to ask: where is Shakespeare? Presumably if one wishes to look at *Hamlet* as one does the *Mona Lisa,* one can turn to the three editions printed between 1603 and 1623. Until recently, Shakespeare's plays have been firmly located within the bounds of the pages of the folios, quartos, editorially mediated modern editions, and to some extent performances. Digital media and the Internet have complicated the question of where *Hamlet* is. In some instances, new technologies challenge the ideological insistence in particular ways of reading Shakespeare. In other cases, these new technologies of knowing reify rather than deconstruct the idea of the printed text. Cyberspace (archives and interactive theater websites), game space in video and online games, and media illustrate the assumptions and problems of mediation in Shakespeare as a virtual event. Cyber Shakespeares may lead us to expect revolutionary new forms of engagement. And yet the ultimate goal of many online projects is to redirect the audiences to identifiable, palpable sites of the real.

Despite the radical virtualization of events, online games so far have been the staunchest guardians of the currency of the text, foregrounding squarely traditional values of the text and established interpretations of Shakespearean characters. One of the most ambitious games is *Arden: The World of Shakespeare*, a one-of-its-kind MMOG (massively multiplayer online game) currently being developed by Edward Castronova of Indiana University, with Linda Charnes as the consultant for contents related to Shakespeare's plays in *Arden: The World of William Shakespeare*. The game is built around Shakespeare's plays, beginning with *Richard III* in the first phase. Players walk around a virtual Elizabethan playground, with seventeenth-century regalia, London taverns, and characters from Shakespeare's works.

The mediation in *Arden* occurs on at least two levels. On the level of the virtual world, Castronova argues that *Richard III* fits easily into the MMOG conventions because of such elements as battles, "knights in shining armor, and peasants and woodworkers" (qtd. in Terdiman 1) in the play. On the pedagogic level, the game setting is designed to promote learning of Shakespeare, and the Shakespearean

environment is used as a smoke screen for a virtual laboratory for research on macro-level social phenomena. On both levels, Shakespeare's texts, and not just Shakespeare's status as a canonical author, are emphasized repeatedly. In fact, soliloquies and speeches become collectible artifacts in the game. Both Castronova and Charnes believe that the unique element of Arden is Shakespearean texts, "many of which will be the most valuable treasure players can find" and Castronova explains: "If you collect the 'To be or not be' speech and then take it to a lore master or to a skilled bard, he can then apply the magic to your broad sword or you [could] utilize the magic in a battle situation to give you this massive [advantage]" (qtd. in Terdiman 2). This design initiates intensive competition for the best speeches of Shakespeare in the player's play book. *Arden* is by far the most innovative online project with the highest degree of user participation at the core of its design, going beyond the self-contained and controlled approach of most so-called interactive theater websites that promote specific productions. *Arden* envisions new audiences of Shakespeare who make conscious decisions in the process of collecting these texts, interact with other characters and players, and plot their movements. And yet *Arden*'s overwhelming emphasis of the text reveals a lot about the ethos of the designers and the fetishization of Shakespeare in contemporary culture. The *Arden* project turns out to be less radical than it may seem in the first instance. The project valorizes the aura of the texts, with a strong influence of the publishing history of Shakespeare, turning players into collectors of texts. A similar assumption informs the design of online games on the Royal Shakespeare Company's *Exploring Shakespeare* project website . In one of the "interpretation games" the user is asked to match excerpts from theater reviews with photos of particular productions from different time periods. Both the Royal Shakespeare Company's website and the *Arden* project prioritize commentary on historical interpretations rather than tools for users to create their own interpretations.

One hopes that performance and creative readings will always revive Shakespeare's text. Lucian Ghita, in his article "Fragmentation in Julie Taymor's *Titus*," starts with the opening scene that Peter Donaldson analyzed in terms of the revolving angles of a video game in order to give coherence to how Taymor's ritual vision takes the past and pushes it somehow into the future. Simone Caroti's article on "Science Fiction, *Forbidden Planet*, and Shakespeare's *Tempest*" is similarly a pre-vision of how Shakespeare can be accommodated to strange or at least different places, a process that connects all the essays in the volume. Richard Burt, in his article "Mobilizing Foreign Shakespeares in Media," takes a long view of the problem of postcolonial interpretation, setting Europe against Asia and stage against screen while suggesting numerous possibilities for future work in world of rapidly changing technology.

For now the challenge is that the places will not be "strange" enough, creativity not creative enough. Cyberspace is a search engine, as Christy Desmet and Sujata Iyengar show in their review of Shakespeare studies online in their article "Appropriation and the Design of an Online Shakespeare Journal." Cyberspace must

not reify the past, enshrine interpretations, or close off creative outlets, as Peter Holland argues in the closing article of the section, "Performing Shakespeare for the Web Community." He suggests that this exciting cultural landscape calls for a careful critical reassessment of various assumptions. Internet Shakespeare does not supersede stage creativity or live nonvirtual performance. Rather, it creates a space between the backstage and the box office, between various virtual worlds, in which new communities can be formed. It is worth pointing out that although the volume concludes with articles on cyberspace, it should not be taken as a sign of de riguer celebration of new forms of expression as necessarily more liberating, desirable, or promising. What seems to be "social and intellectual advances in digital living" today (Lavagnino 194) may quickly give way to new technologies of reading and writing that will create and inhabit new cultural spaces (see Landow). One hopes that language itself will come alive, and that US-America can adopt transcultural Shakespeares—perhaps learn a little Chinese in the process—by means of the new technologies and that these articles provide an informative introduction on this important cultural exchange.

Critical apparatus and media

This being a book about Shakespeare performance and pedagogy in various media including cyberspace, it would be ironic not to put theory into practice. The critical apparatus of this collection is presented in two parts for two kinds of readers. Readers curious about the long history of the global travels of Shakespeare's texts can consult the chronology at the end of the book. Key historical events and media events (such as the release of a major Shakespeare film or the staging of a major production) are listed along with the most significant Asian-themed performances of Shakespeare. Each article can only necessarily focus on selected historical moments, but the chronology can help to contextualize the larger cultural contexts. The first chronology of its kind, it is both a useful pedagogic tool and an index for cross-referencing.

Scholars in the field and bona-fide Shakespeare fans will find the online *Shakespeare Performance in Asia* useful: it includes annotated streaming videos, an interactive catalogue of adaptations with faceted browsing, and dynamic maps to allow users to track the trajecto ry of an internationally released film or a touring production. While this continuously updated and open-access website was not created exclusively as a companion website for this book, Alexa Alice Joubin has been its core collaborator. The site is an interactive, web-based workspace designed to encourage not only further research on Shakespeare in Hollywood and Asia, but also critical reflection on motifs and questions such as cross-dressing, uses of mask, race-blind casting, and the nature of digital commentary and technologies of memory in the act of archiving and in films such as Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet*. The extended resource center on Asian-themed performances of Shakespeare (theater, film, TV) is based on Joubin's research archive of videos and texts, including films, TV series, radio shows, videotaped stage productions, and cartoons from the Indian Subconti-

nent, Turkey, Southeast Asia, East Asia, Pacific Islands, New Zealand, Europe, and the US. Readers interested in details of the films, productions, or rewritings discussed in this collection can find on this website further transcriptions, translations, and critical notes (accompanied by videos and photographs), as well as interviews, reviews, stage bills, and primary research materials. The archive can provide rich opportunities for reflection on the ontology of performance.

It is hoped the articles in this collection and the critical apparatus will inspire more comparative studies of such topics as the appropriation of eastern spirituality in Almereyda's *Hamlet* and Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood*, and the intertextuality among the big-time and small-time screen Shakespeares: Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo+Juliet* and Anthony Chan's *One Husband Too Many*. As the essays demonstrate, variously articulated Shakespeares in Hollywood, Asia, and cyberspace have each evolved from something that is unfamiliar to something that is familiarly known on stages and screens big and small—something that now needs to be defamiliarized again. Just as Asian directors are no strangers to Shakespeare, the Anglo-European audience is growing familiar with Asian elements in Shakespearean performance, with Ariane Mnouchkine's and Yukio Ninagawa's productions being prominent examples. Whether watching these performances at their places of origin, on tour, or in cyberspace, with or without subtitles, readers, and audiences around the world, will continue to be inspired and provoked by the fascinating, although sometimes uncomfortable, gap between different cultures. The articles of the volume at hand provide an informative introduction on this important cultural exchange.

Acknowledgements

The editors would like to express their appreciation to editors at Purdue University Press and to Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek, editor of the Press's monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies, for their support of the publication of the present volume.

Works Cited

Arden: The World of Shakespeare. MMOG. <http://swi.indiana.edu/ardenworld.htm>.

Bristol, Michael. *Big-Time Shakespeare.* New York: Routledge, 1996.

Brown, John Russell. *New Sites for Shakespeare: Theatre, the Audience and Asia.* London: Routledge, 1999.

Bulman, James, ed. *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance.* New York, Routledge, 1996.

Burt, Richard, ed. *Shakespeares after Shakespeare*. Westport: Greenwood P, 2006.

Cartmell, Deborah, and Imelda Whelehan, eds. *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text.* New York: Routledge, 1999.

Castronova, Edward, and Linda Charnes. *Arden: The World of William Shakespeare* (2006-): <http://swi.indiana.edu/ardenworld.htm>.

Derrida, Jacques. *Limited Inc.* Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1988.

Desmet, Christy, and Robert Sawyer, eds. *Shakespeare and Appropriation*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Desmet, Christy and Sujata Iyengar, eds. *Borrowers and Lenders*: <http://www.borrowers.uga.edu>.

Dessen, Alan C. *Rescripting Shakespeare: The Text, the Director, and Modern Productions*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Erickson, Peter. *Rewriting Shakespeare, Rewriting Ourselves.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.

Erne, Lucas, and Margaret Jane Kidnie, eds. *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Esche, Edward J., ed. *Shakespeare and His Contemporaries in Performance.* Burlington: Ashgate, 2000.

Fischlin Daniel and Mark Fortier, eds. *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Gallimore, Daniel. "Measuring Distance: Tsubouchi Shōyō and the Myth of Shakespeare Translation." *Translating Others.* Ed. Theo Hermans. Manchester: St Jerome, 2006. Vol. 2, 483-92.

Griffith, James. *Adaptations as Imitations: Films from Novels.* Newark: U of Delaware P, 1997.

Hawkes, Terence. *Meaning by Shakespeare*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Hodgdon, Barbara. *The Shakespeare Trade: Performance and Appropriation.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1998.

Hodgdon, Barbara, and W.B. Worthen, eds. *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005.

Hoenselaars, Ton, ed. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation.* London: Arden Shakespeare, 2004.

Hoenselaars, Ton, ed. *Shakespeare's History Plays: Performance, Translation and Adaptation in Britain and Abroad*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Holderness, Graham. *The Shakespeare Myth*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1988.

Hutcheon, Linda. A Theory of Adaptation. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Joubin, Alexa Alice. "Lin Shu, Invisible Translation, and Politics." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 14.1 (2006): 55-65.

Joughin, John J., ed. *Shakespeare and National Culture.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997.

Kennedy, Dennis. *Looking at Shakespeare: A Visual History of Twentieth-Century Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Rpt. 2002.

Kennedy, Dennis. *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Kishi, Tetsuo, Roger Pringle, and Stanley Wells, eds. *Shakespeare and Cultural Traditions: The Selected Proceedings of the International Shakespeare Association World Congress, Tokyo 1991.* Newark: U of Delaware P, 1994.

Landow, George P. *Hypertext: The Convergence of Contemporary Critical Theory and Technology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1992.

Lavagnino, John. "Two Varieties of Digital Commentary." *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*. Ed. Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidnie. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 194-209.

Lehmann, Courtney. *Shakespeare Remains: Theater to Film, Early Modern to Postmodern*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002.

Makaryk, Irena R. *Shakespeare in the Undiscovered Bourn: Les Kurbas, Ukrainian Modernism, and Early Soviet Cultural Politics*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2004.

Makaryk, Irena R., and Joseph G. Price, eds. *Shakespeare in the Worlds of Communism and Socialism*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2006.

Marcus, Leah. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.

Marsden, Jean I., ed. *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstruction of the Works and the Myth.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.

Naremore, James, ed. *Film Adaptation.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2000.

Orkin, Martin. *Local Shakespeares.* New York: Routledge, 2005.

Ross, Charles, ed. *Shakespeare in Asia and Hollywood*. Thematic issue of *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 6.1 (2004) <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol6/iss1/>.

Royal Shakespeare Company's *Exploring Shakespeare* Project. <http://www/rsc/org.uk/learning/Learning.aspx>.

Shakespeare Performance in Asia. (2008): <http://web.mit.edu/shakespeare/asia/>.

Shaughnessy, Robert. *The Shakespeare Effect: A History of Twentieth-Century Performance.* New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Sukanta, Chaudhuri, and Chee Seng Lim, eds. *Shakespeare without English: The Reception of Shakespeare in Non-Anglophone Countries.* Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2006.

Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

Terdiman, Daniel. "Shakespeare Comes to a Virtual World." *cnet.news* (19 October 2006): <http://news.cnet.com/Shakespeare-coming-to-a-virtual-world/2100-1043_3-6127294.html?tag=mncol;txt>.

Worthen, W.B. *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Worthen, W.B. *Shakespeare and the Force of Modern Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Contents

Comparative Cultural Studies,
Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek, Series Editor

The Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies publishes single-authored and thematic collected volumes of new scholarship. Manuscripts are invited for publication in the series in fields of the study of culture, literature, the arts, media studies, communication studies, the history of ideas, etc., and related disciplines of the humanities and social sciences to the series editor via email at <clcweb@purdue.edu>. Comparative cultural studies is a contextual approach in the study of culture in a global and intercultural context and work with a plurality of methods and approaches; the theoretical and methodological framework of comparative cultural studies is built on tenets borrowed from the disciplines of cultural studies and comparative literature and from a range of thought including literary and culture theory, (radical) constructivism, communication theories, and systems theories; in comparative cultural studies focus is on theory and method as well as application. For a detailed description of the aims and scope of the series including the style guide of the series link to <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweblibrary/seriespurdueccs>. Manuscripts submitted to the series are peer reviewed followed by the usual standards of editing, copy editing, marketing, and distribution. The series is affiliated with *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* (ISSN 1481-4374), the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access quarterly published by Purdue University Press at <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>.

Volumes in the Purdue series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/comparativeculturalstudies.html>

Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace, Ed. Alexa Alice Joubin and Charles S. Ross

Comparative Central European Holocaust Studies, Ed. Louise O. Vasvári and Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek

Marko Juvan, *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*

Thomas O. Beebee, *Nation and Region in Modern American and European Fiction*

Paolo Bartoloni*, On the Cultures of Exile, Translation, and Writing*

Justyna Sempruch*, Fantasies of Gender and the Witch in Feminist Theory and Literature*

Kimberly Chabot Davis*, Postmodern Texts and Emotional Audiences*

Philippe Codde*, The Jewish American Novel*

Deborah Streifford Reisinger*, Crime and Media in Contemporary France*

Imre Kertész and Holocaust Literature, Ed. Louise O. Vasvári and Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek

Camilla Fojas*, Cosmopolitanism in the Americas*

Comparative Cultural Studies and Michael Ondaatje's Writing, Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek

Jin Feng*, The New Woman in Early Twentieth-century Chinese Fiction*

Comparative Cultural Studies and Latin America, Ed. Sophia A. McClennen and Earl E. Fitz

Sophia A. McClennen*, The Dialectics of Exile*

Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies, Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek

Comparative Central European Culture, Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek

Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace / edited by Alexa Alice Joubin and Charles S. Ross.
p. cm. -- (Comparative cultural studies)
Includes index.
ISBN 978-1-55753-529-0
1. Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616--Influence. 2. Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616--Adaptations--History and criticism. 3. Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616--Appreciation--Asia. 4. Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616--Film and video adaptations. I. Joubin, Alexa Alice, II. Ross, Charles Stanley.

PR2880.A1S575 2009
822.3'3--dc22
2009007092