THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE

Contemporary Readings in Global Performances of Shakespeare

EDITED BY
ALEXA ALICE JOUBIN

BLOOMSBURY

‘The Great Globe Itself’

An introduction to Shakespeare in heterotopia

Alexa Alice Joubin

Puck in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* boasts to Oberon that ‘I’ll put a girdle round about the earth / In forty minutes’ (2.1.182), which echoes the early modern commonplace of *theatrum mundi* ‘wherein the world is likened to a stage’ (Gillies 2019: 60). In fact, the stage is allegorized to contain a version of the world, as well. The idea that the world is greater than the sum of its parts remains relevant to our understanding of performance today. Contrary to what Prospero says of the play-within-a-play, and of the nature of theatre in general, in *The Tempest* (‘And like the baseless fabric of this vision, / . . . the great globe itself, / . . . shall dissolve’ 4.1.149–153), global performances of Shakespeare do not make the plays melt ‘into thin air’. Performances give the airy nothing of dramatic texts a place to call home. The world in its entirety is unknowable except for discrete, competing and conflicting versions of it as articulated through imaginative literature and through narratives of personal experiences. Theatre and film are key players in creating embodied snippets of knowable worlds. In fact, the notion of place features prominently in performance far beyond the basic question of *where* a story is set.

There are two dimensions of the global in contemporary performance. The global is a set of geographical and cultural sites created by artistic imagination. The global is also a temporal

concept that connects events in different historical moments. In *Makibefo*, a Malagasy film adaptation of *Macbeth* directed by the French-based Alexander Abela in 1999, Shakespeare's early modern imaginations of medieval Scottish politics are transposed to a twentieth-century fishing village on the coastal dunes of Madagascar. The film's Macbeth figure (named Makibefo) fights and captures his enemy Kidoure on a vast patch of white sand dune instead of on the Scottish Highlands. Makibefo and Macbeth carry each other's echoes and shadows across cultural and historical spaces, even though *Makibefo* is not a dialogue-driven film. The Lady Macbeth figure, named Valy Makibefo, wears an intercultural shawl that signifies multiple modern and ancient cultures. Functioning like a toga, her shawl has images of a coliseum and fleur-de-lis, linking Madagascar to ancient Rome and the French royal family. Her costume becomes a gateway to other worlds.

Hamlet, too, has its fair share of ghostly shadows in many locations, including in films that only allude to, but do not re-tell fully, the tragedy. Medieval Elsinore is mapped onto 'a creamy mansion in a wealthy suburb' in modern Tehran's cityscape (Burnett 2019, 189) in Armenian-Iranian director Varuzh Karim-Masihi's film *Tardid* (*Doubt*, 2009). In one scene, Siavash, the protagonist of the film, hangs a framed Farsi text, 'to be or not to be', on the wall of a dimly lit basement before contemplating the parallels between his life and Hamlet's. This is an innovative approach that gives materiality and a sense of local relevance to one of the most famous speeches in English literature. Later, Siavash turns regularly to *Hamlet* for moral guidance as he investigates the cause of his father's death under dubious circumstances. As part of his investigation, Siavash even stages a performance of *Hamlet* at the wedding of his mother and uncle.

Whether the aristocratic Siavash is a representation of the princely figure of Hamlet, or whether tribesman Makibefo qualifies as general Macbeth, is beside the point. More intellectually productive questions are: Where and how do Macbeth and Makibefo meet, and why? What are the political and aesthetic implications of such cross-cultural and trans-historical meetings? How do these meetings change our own understanding of the time and place we live in? How do the meetings on unequal footing affect the characters' and their modern actors' habitats?

All productions of Shakespeare, in English and beyond, are examples of global Shakespeares. Performances become global when they travel to or depict other places and when they invite external forces into their social spaces, such as cross-historical or cross-cultural references. All performances allude to an elsewhere that is bracketed from audiences' realities by narrative devices and technologies of representation (sets, props, costumes). By virtue of this bracketing, all performances are in fact global.

Contemporary Readings in Global Performances of Shakespeare is concerned with fiction's world-making capacities – the ways in which characters and actors give meanings to the spaces they inhabit through social and symbolic practices. It may be a cliché that dramas transport us to a different time and place, but performances build upon, collapse or transform characters' worlds. As heterotopia, or worlds within worlds, plays depict worlds that resonate with or contradict contemporary actors' and audiences' worlds in powerful ways. The interplay between these worlds informs the dynamic of global performances, and chapters in this book use the method of thick description to explore the time and place of the meeting of these early modern characters and contemporary actors. This opening chapter introduces, first, the concept of heterotopia, and secondly, the method of thick description, in the context of this book's organizing principles.

Intercultural and trans-historical heterotopia

All plays exist in at least three localities and distinct time zones, namely the geographical location and time period in which a play is set, the time and place it was written and the time and place when it is performed. *Macbeth*, for instance, reflects early modern English imaginations of medieval Scotland. *Makibefo* sets the action in the twentieth-century Madagascar and alludes to ancient Rome. Channels between different time zones and cultural locations enable trans-historical and cross-cultural conversations. Historical racism and sexism may intrude, or be invited deliberately, into contemporary dialogues about race and gender in a modern performance.

Place provides an anchor for dramatic actions. Characters' and audiences' perception of place looms large in performance (Bozio 2020: 98–122). All plays occur simultaneously in several dramaturgically construed localities, including where the story is set (where its characters 'live'), where it is performed (some venues have symbolic significance) and the locales associated with actors' offstage journeys to where they are today. The first task for directors is often finding a viable place, a social space between fiction and reality, where actors, characters and audiences interact. The performance space is a mediated social construct that generates site-specific epistemologies, namely the production and dissemination of location-based meanings (Joubin 2022). Attending to the significance of place enables closer examinations of the question of belonging and the 'inequities of space and place'. One of the benefits of situating all performances in 'a global Shakespearean citizenship' is better appreciation of a more 'mobile [and] inflected' canon (Burnett 2013, 13).

Here, I would like to draw on one specific thread within French philosopher Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia to expand upon the notions of temporality and locality in performance. First used by Foucault in a lecture on architecture in 1967 and mentioned again in *The Order of Things* in 1971, the term 'heterotopia' refers to cultural spaces that are transformative because of their contradictory or trans-historical ideologies. Foucault made a connected argument about utopia and regulatory mechanisms of prison, which I am eliding here in order to focus exclusively on heterotopia as a set of parallel spaces. While the initial context of the notion of heterotopia was architecture and urban design, it is useful in advancing our understanding of performance culture. Foucault uses the mirror as a metaphor to explain how heterotopia operates as a virtual place:

> The mirror is . . . a placeless place. In the mirror, I see myself there where I am not, in an unreal space that virtually opens up behind the surface; I am over there, there where I am not, a sort of shadow that gives my own visibility, that enables me to see myself there where I am absent. (2008: 17)

The stage or the screen has parallel artistic and social functions to the Foucauldian mirror here, for they, as technologies of representation, project and filter desires and location-specific knowledge of different

(fictional and real) worlds. As Foucault continues, 'But it is also a heterotopia in so far as the mirror does really exist, and as it exerts on the place I occupy a sort of return effect; it is starting from the mirror that I discover my absence in that place where I am, since I see myself over there' (2008: 17). Heterotopia, as a 'parallel' space that contains and evokes other spaces, exists in reality (such as a theatre stage) and holds up a mirror to other realities.

The stage and screen exist in reality, like the mirror, but they are a portal. The portal reminds audiences of their absence in the worlds of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. Audiences are on one side of the dramatic mirror, seeing shadows of themselves, by virtue of their vantage point and not being on the other side of the mirror. Like the Foucauldian mirror, performance functions as and within a heterotopia, making the place that audiences occupy both distinct from the dramatic space and connected with the other worlds contained within and alluded to by the performance.

Heterotopia, or worlds within worlds, captures the vitality and viability of theatre and film. The stage and screen are artefacts that are at once real (with architectural spaces surrounding them) and unreal in the sense that they channel and enable virtual worlds. With their multiple layers of cultural meanings, heterotopia expand and contract based on their tacit and explicit relationships to other places. To study global Shakespeare through the notion of heterotopia is to attend to more nuanced meanings and places than those that immediately meet the eye.

From the point of view of heterotopia, we might say that artists and audiences project their beliefs onto the dramatic narrative that intrudes into, or has been imposed upon, their worlds. The worlds of the characters, actors and audiences collide, merge and transform one another. Foucault addresses at length the garden as an architectural form of heterotopia that contains larger worlds and touches briefly on the performing arts, writing that

> The heterotopia has the power to juxtapose in a single real place several spaces, several emplacements that are in themselves incompatible. Thus the theatre brings onto the rectangle of the stage a whole series of places that are alien to one another; thus the cinema is a very odd rectangular room, at the end of which, on a two-dimensional screen, one sees the projection of a three-dimensional space. (2008: 19)

Since the fictional space created by performance juxtaposes multiple worlds, this space – a microcosm of different temporalities and contrasting worlds – has multiple layers of cultural meanings. Heterotopia enable communities to work together across time and cultural spaces. As interest groups, artists and audiences reclaim histories and create their collective future through performance as heterotopia.

Thick description as method

One of the most effective ways to analyse overlapping, heterotopic layers of cultural meanings is thick description of adaptations. Coined by analytical philosopher Gilbert Ryle and popularized by Clifford Geertz, thick description is a qualitative research method that contextualizes observable and imperceptible traits of artworks. Since subjects of study are often 'polymorphous', it does not suffice to merely describe them in a 'photographical' manner (Tanney 2009 xviii; xix). Ryle calls superficial observations of behaviours thin descriptions and contrasts it with the more productive, contextual, thick description of motivations for behaviours as well as the reception of such behaviours (Ryle 1971, 501). Building upon Ryle's notion, Geertz describes his ethnographic method as 'sorting out the structures of signification . . . and determining their social ground and import' while attending to the 'multiplicity of complex conceptual structures, many of them superimposed upon one another' (Geertz 1973: 9–10).

Thick descriptions of productions and performance histories, as practised in this book, offer insights into the interplay among different layers in heterotopia. Close reading, a method of literary criticism, analyses the techniques and structure of short passages within a work in order to derive nuanced meanings of a turn of phrase rather than of historical contexts of the piece. In contrast, thick-description analyses of performances typically draw upon cultural and historical contexts and make detailed references to the works' social and political milieus. Not only can thick description shed new light on multiple heterotopic layers of cultural significance, but it also helps us combat several problematic tendencies in scholarship, including national profiling that constructs linear, synchronic narratives that flatten the cultural production based on stereotypes of its nation of origin.

Thick descriptions reveal deep connections among works that may otherwise seem siloed. As such, they de-colonize assumptions about global Shakespeare and serve as a corrective to what I call compulsory realpolitik – the conviction that the best way to understand global works is by interpreting their engagement with pragmatic politics. This approach may imply that works from the Global South are of interest solely because of their testimonial value. This assumption leads to research questions driven by polity, for example ‘Why are there so many global Shakespearean adaptations in cultures with no love for Great Britain?’ (Wilson 2020 36). Anglophone Shakespeares are assumed to have broad theoretical applicability and aesthetic merits, whereas non-Anglophone works serve to contrast, through their compulsory political difference, an ill-defined sense of authenticity in presenting Shakespeare in white English. Thick descriptions of the linguistic, dramaturgical and design elements of productions show that Anglophone and non-Anglophone productions are not always diametrically opposed in their ideologies and aesthetics. Taken as a whole, chapters in this volume show that all performances of the canon are global Shakespeare.

Adaptation as a genre and as praxis can be enhanced by the ethics of care. Characters, artists and audiences need and give care to each other through mutual understanding. Adaptations make ‘the inexplicable in Shakespeare understandable’ (Corredera 2022: 232). They canonize (chapter 14), cannibalize (chapter 7) and transform Shakespeare in different cultures. Adaptations are a network that provides maintenance and care to one another and to the social structure of care. As much as they care for ‘Shakespeare’ in certain shape or form, audiences are also taken care of by new vistas in adaptations. Thick description as method, in this context, cultivates a culture of care and promotes substantive diversity.

Thick descriptions of heterotopia: A case study

This section applies the method of thick description to analyses of heterotopia. Yukio Ninagawa’s Japanese-language, high-concept

touring production of *Hamlet* (London, 1998 and 2015) turns the art of theatre-making inside out through its metatheatrical conceit. The production opens with actor-characters warming up, running their lines and touching up on their makeup. They mill around on a set that represents the backstage of a theatre where the actor-characters both prepare for and stage *Hamlet*. The two-story set consists of dressing rooms with privacy curtains, complete with lighted mirrors, photographs and bouquets. The lower level is a common dressing area for everyone, while the upper level is reserved for leading actor-characters' individual dressing rooms. This backstage space is now upstage.

This set doubles as rooms in Elsinore Castle once *Hamlet* starts. The action of the play takes place in the heterotopia that consist of gateways, dressing rooms and castle chambers all at once. Of particular interest is that dressing rooms are worlds unto themselves but also point to other worlds once their doors open. Dressing rooms are interstitial spaces that transform those who pass through them. Actors walk into dressing rooms as twenty-first-century artists and emerge as characters in medieval Denmark. The creation of this backstage-as-playing-space is part of Ninagawa's world-making strategies to both deconstruct and amplify the artifice of performance.

The dressing room mirrors are quite Foucauldian in the sense that they, as devices of heterotopia, juxtapose self-image with stage image and visible and invisible worlds. The billowing curtains – thanks to electric fans – also add a sense of unease and mystery. Each dressing room seems to be a gateway to unknown worlds. Audiences intrude into actor-characters' supposed backstage space which is connected to Hamlet's fictional world which, in turn, resonates with issues of intentionality in communication in audiences' worlds. Jon M. Brokering finds that some passages in *Hamlet* are 'thrown into particular relief by such a setting', including 'Hamlet's railing to Ophelia about her "painted" face: "God hath given you one face, and you make yourselves another" (3.3.144–6); and, of course, Hamlet's assuming an "antic disposition" (1.5.180) to confound the court' (2007: 375). These lines from *Hamlet* ring true metaphorically and literally as they were made in a dressing room setting.

Also juxtaposing other fictional and real worlds is the life-sized, tiered *hina*-dolls display in the play-within-a-play scene

where Hamlet tests the conscience of his uncle as part of Hamlet's investigative project. Dressed up to look like human-sized dolls, the actors participate in the heterotopia that signifies at once the court in Heian-era Japan, rituals on the Girls' Day in contemporary Japan, Hamlet's Denmark and the stage within a stage. The audience's attention was redirected from the representational aspect of theatrical realism to the presentational aspect of metatheatrical narratives in Ninagawa's heterotopia.

In the Mousetrap scene where travelling players who are visiting Elsinore put on a play to help Hamlet determine if his uncle is guilty of murdering Old Hamlet, the Player King and Player Queen descend slowly from the top of the doll tiers to initiate the metatheatrical performance of the Murder of Gonzago. As shown on the cover of the present volume, Kensuke Sunahara took on the cross-gender role of the Player Queen in the 2015 production at London's Barbican Centre. A folding fan in hand, he played the Queen in the Kabuki style of *onnagata* and delivered her lines in a singsong chanting manner. Later, they act out the remainder of the play-within-a-play in aggrandized pantomime. The tiered *hina*-dolls display serves as a mirror image of three distinct spaces: Claudius's corrupt court; the social space of the fictive murder of Gonzago which is witnessed by characters within *Hamlet*; and an ordinary Japanese daily artefact writ large – the doll tiers now populated by life-size dolls.

Heterotopia pushes back against the illusions of Shakespeare's ubiquity and universal meanings by pluralizing the aesthetic and political positions across and within artistic, scholarly and pedagogical communities, past and present. Communities may work with, or against, as the case may be, each other in heterotopia. Characters, who are betwixt and between worlds and allegiances, such as Cleopatra, Viola in *Twelfth Night*, Edmund the 'bastard' in *King Lear* and the changeling in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, are given new arcs when they are interpreted as mixed race or transgender. In a different direction, Shakespearean characterization also helps modern artists innovate. Gender roles in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet*, for example, are reinvented to tone down misogyny or to propose a feminist interpretation, such as Karen Maine's *Rosaline* (2022), Claire McCarthy's *Ophelia* (2018) and Feng Xiaogang's *The Banquet* (2006). In Feng's film, Hamlet's insistence on interiority – inner life – infuses what has come to be known as East Asian soft

masculinity (Louie 2012) into the genre of *wuxia* (martial knight-errant), which would otherwise have prioritized its characters' physical prowess. Similar transformations occur to ideas of race, class and sexuality as well. The idea of heterotopia, as parallel and overlapping worlds, restores multiplicity to global performances and helps us push back against unproductive divisions between the centre and the peripheral and deceivingly harmonious images of Shakespeare's ubiquitous presence around the world.

Discord within heterotopia

Adaptations operate at the crossroads of fiction and reality and represent an aggregate of overlapping localities, which we have described using the concept of heterotopia and the method of thick description. The sheer number of adaptations around the world may give the false impression that audiences everywhere would see universal or identical messages with equal valence in Shakespeare. In fact, the local is not always the antithesis to the global or an antidote to the hegemonic domination that has been stereotypically associated with the West. Directors working in English and other languages have to negotiate similar challenges of presenting historical worldviews to modern audiences or of justifying cross-cultural borrowings.

The vitality of global performances derives from the clashes and synergy of these overlapping localities. The Farsi text of to be or not to be on the wall of Siavash's basement in Tehran evokes Hamlet's Denmark as well as contemporary Iran where the film's protagonist is situated. Peter Brook's film version of *King Lear* (1971) was set and shot in snow-capped Northern Jutland in Denmark, but its bleak landscape was designed to evoke both nowhere and everywhere. Akira Kurosawa's 1985 samurai film *Ran* (*Chaos*) features a Lear figure who is lost in, wrestles with and submits to Nature. Its division-of-the-kingdom scene takes place in a meadow in the mountains after a lavish, extended opening scene of boar hunting. The space is devoid of identifiable cultural signifiers. In the case of *Lear*, its heterotopia shapes the characters' actions, whether it is the royal court or the heath.

Disagreement is part and parcel of global Shakespeare. Obviously, consenting to the premises of the heterotopia of a playing space

is distinct from consensus among communities. One may attend a performance only to disagree with its ideological purchase. Pro-Palestinian activists protested a Hebrew production of *The Merchant of Venice* by the Israeli company Habima in London. Visiting from Tel Aviv, the company was performing at the Globe Theatre in May 2012. Leading actors – Mark Rylance, Emma Thompson and others – called for the Globe to boycott the company because it had performed in Jewish settlements in the West Bank. Others joined a counter-protest. Shylock's Venice, as depicted by Shakespeare, became a venue to stage anti-Semitism and anti-Arab racism.

Rather than affirming Shakespeare's universal validity or appeal, global performances bring to light the fissures among cultures, as evidenced by the uneven reception of John Kani's performance of Caliban in a 2009 pan-African *Tempest* (dir. Janice Honeyman). Co-produced by the RSC and Cape Town's Baxter Theatre Centre, the adaptation featured Antony Sher as a Prospero who kept Kani's Caliban on a tether. Caliban's costumes and makeup bore traces of a South African shaman. Within South Africa, the production was not as successful as Kani's earlier *Othello*. However, it received much more favourable reviews when it toured to Britain, where the postcolonial allegory helped white audiences justify enjoyment of the African carnival (Bosman 2010: 109; 113). Neither Africa nor Shakespeare has an intrinsic, unified identity without context.

Global performances create worlds within worlds by combining the plays' and audiences' senses of place to build cultural spaces that are transformative. Dramaturgically constructed localities – settings, cultural references, performance venues – constitute a new social space where the characters' and audiences' universes intersect. In this sense, world-making – how music, dramaturgy and the performing arts 'interpenetrate in making a world' (Goodman 1978, 106) – is a key adaptation practice. Since the fictional space created by performance juxtaposes multiple worlds, this space as heterotopia – a microcosm of different temporalities and worlds – has multiple layers of cultural meanings that may well conflict with one another.

For example, David Kerr's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (BBC, 2016) is set in a nightmarish, fascist regime enhanced with digital surveillance technologies. Actors and their characters orient themselves in the magical woods – a dream space – where some

social impositions are lifted while others are imposed. Meanwhile, film audiences go through a parallel process as they imagine social spaces that extend beyond the screen as suggested by Kerr's world-making. Heterotopia, created by the craft of world-making, anchors, enables and endorses some characters' transformative experiences and self-discovery.

Thick descriptions and diversity issues

Thick descriptions also contribute to substantive, rather than token, diversity. Editing a companion is a balancing act between fostering new and established voices, and between curatorial modes of presentation and archival and comprehensive coverage. There are two challenges.

The first challenge concerns fostering diverse voices. To expand the field's reach and ensure meaningful diversity, every effort has been made to recruit scholars from distinct racial and ethnic backgrounds with unique lived experiences, such as Amrita Sen and Jewish, Korean, and Brazilian contributors. Contributors' specializations are taken into consideration independent of their geographic location, as their 'displacement' may or may not have been voluntary. Abdulhamit Arvas and Ema Vyroubalová identify as Turkish and Czech respectively, even though they are based in the United States and Ireland. Daniel Gallimore resides in Japan as an immigrant, and Katherine Hennessey, as shown in the interview, has taught global Shakespeare in Kuwait, China, Yemen and several other countries. Collectively, their chapters tell their own and Shakespearean stories of arrival and of the how, why and with whom they arrive in the heterotopia of global performance. Their journeys are more intellectually and artistically productive than questions of provenance ('where one is really from' or which country one is representing). In the spirit of meaningful inclusion and in recognition of diasporic cultures, it would be racist to recruit only contributors who serve as native informants based on perceived authenticity of their race and cultural coordinates.

The second challenge concerns sustaining substantive diversity in the contents we present. Global Shakespeare research has been deployed to enhance diversity 'quotas' in scholarship and curricula in the UK, the United States and Canada (Joubin 2023: 60–1). Scholars

are questioning 'whether a global Shakespeare has been complicit in forms of cultural appropriation derived from a colonialist playbook, . . . positioning a range of elsewheres as exotic distractions' (Thurman and Young 2023: 1). By Susan Bennett's estimation, it has often been 'instrumentalised to serve world markets' (Bennett 2023: 26). This tendency is reflected in habitual juxtapositions of 'global' Shakespeare with Anglophone Shakespeare as well as in the editorial practices where scholars of colour and those working on marginalized topics are asked to explain subjects that do not fit with white Anglocentric worldviews. Amrita Sen has critiqued the uneven expectations of scholarly labour where 'no footnote is required for Aristotle's *Poetics*' but detailed and potentially distracting explanations are required for 'every single thing that is [indigenous]' (Sen 2023). Due to the current structure of academia and hierarchies of cultural prestige, some scholars of white Anglophone theatre regard knowledge of Asian directors as exclusively the responsibility of those who specialize in the subfields or relegate that knowledge to a footnote of Anglo-European critical theories. These often-inherited norms have predetermined what is worthy of scholarly interest in cross-cultural contexts. Maeve McKeown uses the term 'structural conditioning' to describe the 'actions of previous generations' that constraint 'agents in the present by having created the structural conditions in which they can act' (2024: 72).

To model best practices, this book draws on, for instance, the Brazilian theory of cultural anthropophagy, and presents case studies without bracketing 'global' performances as oppositional to white productions. To counter structural conditioning, this book presents Anglophone British and Canadian performance histories as integral parts of 'global' Shakespeare. Aristotle may be better off with explanatory notes on, for instance, the transmission of Aristotelian misogyny into English culture through a translation of an Arabic treatise (Andrea 2017: 20–1). Analyses of white Shakespeare would be more on point by situating it not as a yardstick but as a part of globalization.

Organizing principles of the book

Focusing on modern and contemporary periods, *Contemporary Readings in Global Performances of Shakespeare* expands the

conceptualization of global Shakespeare as a field by not only juxtaposing but also connecting understudied regions and genres, such as how Akira Kurosawa's Japanese film *Throne of Blood* (*Macbeth*, 1957) inspired Antunes Filho's Brazilian stage production *Trono de sangue* (1992). We bring, for instance, studies of adaptations in Latin America and the Arab world into a dialogue in Chapters 7 and 8, and show how Armenian theatre-makers brought Shakespeare to Ottoman Turkey and how Turkish performers influenced Iranian adaptations of Shakespeare in Chapters 4 and 5.

We begin with a section on critical methodologies to read Shakespeare in different languages and world cinema through a site-specific lens of contextualization and to help readers overcome the perceived obstacle of linguistic barrier. With the method of thick description and critical notion of heterotopia, this section also demonstrates that Shakespeare's own works evolved in a multilingual environment. This is followed by a section on 'Big Pictures', which offers selective coverage of geographical regions in gripping micro-historical narratives. Last, but not least, the third section, 'Case Studies', features thematically organized studies that demonstrate a fruitful application of thick description and heterotopia as a method to the analysis of key productions.

To counter the common misconception of the global as simply the non-Anglophone world and the tendency to 'iron out the differences within and between source and target cultures' (Iyengar 2023: 132), this book makes a point of offering case studies that place the cultural production of the UK and Canada in comparative contexts against Anglocentric exceptionalism. Traditional approaches tend to assume that performances in the UK, the United States and Canada are normative and aesthetically universal, whereas Shakespeare elsewhere bears location-specific, often political, meanings. The global is often erroneously imagined to be whatever the United States and the UK are not.

This volume seeks to correct this bias that privileges only regions that are commonly imagined to represent the global. This section offers a chapter on the construction of 'brand Britain' in the wake of the referendums on Scottish Independence in 2014 and Brexit in 2016, and a chapter on slapstick sketches' unique contributions to Canadian nation-building in the 1950s. Putting Anglophone Shakespeares on equal footing with non-Anglophone performances deconstructs the tendency of national profiling that falsely

assumes each performance tradition exists in siloes. This section demonstrates the commonality and synergy between Anglophone and non-Anglophone productions.

Section I: Methodologies

This section focuses on more meta-critical concerns. In Chapter 1, Daniel Gallimore uses 'coherence' (semantic links across the text), 'detail' (of the source and target texts) and 'context' (of the play, of the translator, of the reader) as three key criteria in his analysis of the theme of death in two contrasting versions of *Hamlet* (1972 and 1996). Gallimore argues that the foreignness of Shakespeare's text allows translators to express concepts in their language that they could not otherwise convey.

Chapter 2 offers a strategy for reading world cinema. Mark Thornton Burnett demonstrates the application of three overlapping approaches to understanding global films: (1) the auteur theory that prioritizes individual creativity, (2) the regional approach that provides cultural contexts and (3) thematic concerns that render particular plays popular for filmic treatment.

Chapter 3, by Michael Saenger, expands upon questions raised by the previous two chapters to ask: What happens when we do not understand some or all of the languages in a production? One case study is Dominique Pitoiset's 2007 *La Tempête* in France in which Prospero spoke English, Ariel spoke Arabic, Antonio spoke German, Trinculo and Stephano spoke Italian, and Ferdinand was a marionette.

Modernity is the central concern of Chapter 4. Abdulhamit Arvas proposes the cultural kaleidoscope – an optical instrument that creates repeated reflections – as a metaphor and method to read modernity and Christian, feminist, leftist and Kurdish appropriations. *Hamlet* has played a constitutive role in Turkish modernity by giving the once repressed Kurdish language more recognition.

Section II: Big pictures

The second section of the book offers a bird's eye view of adaptation as heterotopia that is necessary for an in-depth study

of global Shakespeare. The regional knowledge here prepares readers to think about site-specific case studies in the next section. Chapter 5, co-written by Shauna O'Brien and Ema Vyroubalová, models best practices in historical research by attending to minor history. Echoing the metaphor of adaptation as an act of devouring Shakespeare in Chapter 7, this chapter argues that Persian adaptations – despite Iran's shift to the theocratic Islamic Republic – testify to the remarkable adaptability of Shakespeare's works.

Chapter 6, by Kathy Foley, examines the trends in adapting Shakespeare in Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam and other Southeast Asian locations – places that have been peripheral on the map of global Shakespeare. One unique type of adaptation, unexplored so far in this book, is the emulation of Western productions in Elizabethan costumes. At first blush, this practice may seem reverential – deferring to Western cultural superiority, but Foley points out that it expands local theatre forms and serves as common ground for international collaborations in this region.

Chapter 7, co-authored by Anna Stegh Camati and Maria Clara Versiani Galery, builds upon the 'kaleidoscope' from Chapter 5 by using the theory of anthropophagy – the metaphorical devouring of foreign texts by local traditions – to analyse works in Brazil, Mexico, Cuba, Argentina and Chile. One common thread running through these works is a rejection of local, orthodox theatre practices in favour of new traditions being established by the artists.

Chapter 8, by Katherine Hennessey, comes full circle by linking and amplifying the various forms of kaleidoscope and heterotopia. It illustrates the diversity of performances in the Arab world through *Richard II* in Palestine, an Omani rewriting of *Othello*, and Sulayman Al Bassam's *Twelfth Night*-inspired play. Each director's work is in constant dialogue with a diverse range of constantly fluctuating and overlapping cultural locations.

Chapter 9, by Thea Buckley, echoes the themes of heterotopia and intra-regional diversity in previous chapters by sampling contrasting versions of Shakespeare in Hindi, Bengali and Tamil. Buckley highlights some common patterns of indigenization. She argues that, in Sanjay Leela Bhansali's 2013 film *Ram-Leela*, Romeo and Juliet's first kiss transforms Shakespeare's imaginations of Italy, modern-day India and of Ram and Leela's world.

Chapter 10, by Natalia Khomenko, surveys the history of performing Shakespeare in the Slavic world, namely Russia, Poland,

the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Ukraine and Belarus. Khomenko argues that Slavic scholarship and performance culture have ignited productive intercultural conversations within the Slavic world and beyond.

Coverage is necessarily selective rather than encyclopaedic. Readers are encouraged to consult existing scholarship beyond the scope of this volume, such as *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Global Shakespeare*, edited by Alexa Alice Joubin, and videos in the *MIT Global Shakespeares* open-access digital performance archive, co-edited by Alexa Alice Joubin and Peter S. Donaldson.

Section III: Case studies

The third and last section of the book employs the theory of heterotopia and the methodology of thick description to offer close readings of select productions. This section also adds site specificity to the regional contexts outlined in the second section. Therefore, this final section brings together insights from the first two sections to address artistic and critical issues raised in the entire volume.

Chapter 11, by Amrita Sen, examines the politics of hybrid cultural spaces in a widely-taught film: Vishal Bhardwaj's *Haider* (2014). The film has complex relationships to Kashmir where it is set and shot. Sen believes it is ethically problematic to have Shakespeare serve as an authorizing agent to appropriate tragic events in Kashmir.

Chapter 12, by director, actor and translator Hyon-u Lee, examines *Hamlet*, directed by Yang Jung-ung in 2009, and *The Tempest*, directed by Oh Tae-suk in 2010. Drawing on shamanic ritual (*gut*), these two Korean productions have toured widely internationally. Yang's production locates *gut* within *Hamlet*, while Oh's production reads *The Tempest* through the lens of *gut*.

Chapter 13, written by Aline de Mello Sanfelici, turns to Brazilian theatre during the global pandemic of Covid-19. Digital performances in the Global South have largely been ignored by books such as *Viral Shakespeare: Performance in the Time of Pandemic* (Aebischer 2022), *Lockdown Shakespeare* (Allred, Broadribb, Sullivan 2022) and *Shakespeare and Digital Pedagogy* (Hnederson and Vitale 2021). One exception is *Digital Shakespeares from the*

Global South, edited by Amrita Sen (2022). This chapter also fills in a critical lacuna.

The last two chapters of this section apply global studies methods – methods that situate all performances within intercultural contexts – to British and Canadian performances in order to counter the common misconception of a division, rather than continuity, between Anglophone and non-Anglophone performances. Chapter 14, by Stephen Purcell, argues that Shakespeare has been instrumentalized to provide a united British national identity, beginning with the project to build a reconstructed Globe Theatre in London in 1997, the same year when Hong Kong was handed over to China which symbolized the end of the British Empire. This chapter showcases how one might attend simultaneously to the constructions of the centre and the periphery. Chapter 15, by Jennifer Drouin, applies similar methodologies to reveal the dual British and Canadian heritage of the mid-twentieth-century television comedy show, *Wayne & Shuster*. The show, in an era before cable television, played an important role in English Canadian national identity formation. Together, Chapters 15 and 16 shed new light on global concerns within Anglophone traditions.

Serving as a coda to this book is Chapter 16, an interview with Katherine Hennessey that was conducted by Alexa Alice Joubin. It showcases global Shakespeare in practice. This interview focuses on her evolving pedagogies and her students' contrasting reactions to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in China, Kuwait and Yemen.

Conclusion

Globalization 'opens up local, national or regional culture to others' and produces many connected and parallel worlds, according to Jonathan Arac (2002: 35). Artists in different places often hold contrasting views on the meanings of Shakespeare's plays and on Shakespeare's stature in modern culture. What they do have in common is their effort to plant new ideas along well-trodden paths and to blaze new trails through long-abandoned territories. Performance styles borrowed from other cultures can help retool some plays for artistic innovation or social reparative purposes. Therefore, global Shakespeares have been recruited as a trans-historical and intercultural practice to revitalize performance genres,

to be exemplified or resisted as a colonial appendage or rhetoric, or to be admired or critiqued as a centrepiece in an exotic display. As such, the ideological encodings of global Shakespeares have been debated in postcolonial encounters, in the international avant-garde led by Ariane Mnouchkine, Peter Brook, Tadashi Suzuki and others, and in the circuits of international politics and tourism in late capitalist societies. The heterotopias of intercultural theatre and film not only create channels between geographic spaces but also connect different time periods. As part of the heterotopia itself, *Contemporary Readings in Global Performances of Shakespeare* is both a place of stories and a portal to other places. To quote novelist Minae Mizumura, if we walk 'through the doors of other languages' and cultural spaces more often, we will be blessed with 'undreamed-of landscapes' (Mizumura 2015: 203) and a more inclusive vision. Heterotopia and thick description as methodologies help us capture, rather than flatten, cultural spaces and their dynamic interplay.

References

Andrea, Bernadette (2017). *The Lives of Girls and Women from the Islamic World in Early Modern British Literature and Culture*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Arac, Jonathan (2002), 'Anglo-Globalism?', *New Left Review*, 16, July–August: 35–45.

Bennett, Susan (2023), 'Re-thinking Global Shakespeare for Social Justice', in Chris Thurman and Sandra Young (eds), *Global Shakespeare and Social Justice: Towards a Transformative Encounter*, 19–35, London: Bloomsbury.

Bozio, Andrew (2020), *Thinking through Place on the Early Modern English Stage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brokering, Jon M. (2007), 'Ninagawa Yukio's Intercultural *Hamlet*: Parsing Japanese Iconography', *Asian Theatre Journal*, 24 (2) (Fall): 370–96.

Burnett, Mark Thornton (2013), *Shakespeare and World Cinema*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burnett, Mark Thornton (2019), Hamlet *and World Cinema*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corredera, Vanessa I. (2022), *Reanimating Shakespeare's* Othello *in Post-Racial America*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Foucault, Michel (2008 [1967]), 'Of Other Spaces*', trans. Lieven de Cauter and Michiel Dehaene, in Michiel Dehaene and Lieven de

Cauter (eds), *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in Postcivil Society*, 13–20, New York: Routledge, 2008.
Geertz, Clifford (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.
Gillies, John (2019), 'Globe / Theatrum Mundi', in Bruce R. Smith (ed.), *The Cambridge Guide to the Worlds of Shakespeare*, 60–5, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Goodman, Nelson (1978), *Ways of World Making*, New York: Hackett Publishing Company.
Hamlet (2015), [Stage Production], Dir. Yukio Ninagawa, Barbican, London, UK. Japan: Ninagawa Company.
Iyengar, Sujata (2023), *Shakespeare and Adaptation Theory*, London: Bloomsbury.
Joubin, Alexa Alice (2022), 'Local Habitations of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*', *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 40 (3) (Fall): 417–37.
Joubin, Alexa Alice (2023), 'What Makes Global Shakespeares an Exercise in Ethics?', in Chris Thurman and Sandra Young (eds), *Global Shakespeare and Social Justice: Towards a Transformative Encounter*, 58–78, London: Bloomsbury.
King Lear (1970), [Film] Dir. Peter Brook, UK: Athéna Films.
Louie, Kam (2012), 'Popular Culture and Masculinity Ideals in East Asia, with Special Reference to China', *Journal of Asian Studies*, 71 (4) (November): 929–43.
Makibefo (2000), [Film] Dir. Alexander Abela, Madagascar: Blue Eye Films.
McKeown, Maeve (2024), 'Pure, Avoidable, and Deliberate Structural Injustice', in Jude Browne and Maeve McKeown (eds), *What Is Structural Injustice*, 65–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Midsummer Night's Dream, A (2016), [Television] Dir. David Kerr, UK: BBC.
Mizumura, Minae (2015), *The Fall of Language in the Age of English*, trans. Mari Yoshihara and Juliet Winters Carpenter, New York: Columbia University Press.
Ran (1985), [Film] Dir. Akira Kurosawa, Japan: Nippon Herald Films.
Ryle, Gilbert (1971 [2009]). 'The Thinking of Thoughts: What Is Le Penseur Doing?', in *Collected Essays 1929–1968: Collected Papers Volume 2*, London: Routledge.
Sen, Amrita, ed. (2022), *Digital Shakespeares from the Global South*, New York: Palgrave.
Sen, Amrita (2023), 'Don't Ask for Footnotes for Every Single Thing that is Non-White', Facebook, 3 September, https://www.facebook.com/amrita.sen.925, accessed 3 September, quoting with permission.

Tanney, Julia (2009), 'Foreword', in *Collected Essays 1929–1968: Collected Papers Volume 2, Gilbert Ryle*, vii–xix, New York: Routledge.

Tardid (2009), [Film] Dir. Varuzh Karim-Masihi, Iran: Fadak Film.

Tempest, The (2009), [Stage Production] Dir. Janice Honeyman, South Africa and UK: Baxter Theatre Centre and Royal Shakespeare Company.

Thurman, Chris and Sandra Young (2023), 'Introduction: Global Shakespeare and its Confrontation with Social Injustice', in *Global Shakespeare and Social Injustice: Towards a Transformative Encounter*, 1–16, London: Bloomsbury.

Wilson, Jeffrey R. (2020), 'Why Shakespeare? Irony and Liberalism in Canonization', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 81 (1): 33–64.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND TEXTUAL NOTE

In completing this book, I gratefully acknowledge support from the University of Essex International Visiting Fellowship program in the UK, the American Council of Learned Societies Frederick Burkhardt Fellowship program at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC, and George Washington University's Impact Award. Mary Mazzilli, senior lecturer in the Department of Literature Film and Theatre Studies at the University of Essex, and Kathleen Lynch, former executive director of the Folger Institute, have played pivotal roles in helping me finetune the key ideas for the volume. Some of the chapters in this collection have been commissioned to address key topics in global Shakespeare performance studies, while others originated from the Shakespeare Association of Korea conference in 2013, the International Shakespeare Conference in Stratford-upon-Avon in 2014, and, most recently, the Shakespeare Association of America conference in Minneapolis in 2023.

All references to Shakespeare's text are keyed to *The Arden Shakespeare Third Series Complete Works,* ed. Richard Proudfoot, David Scott Kastan, Ann Thompson and Henry Woudhuysen (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2020).

Alexa Alice Joubin

CONTENTS

List of contributors viii
Acknowledgements and Textual Note xiv

'The Great Globe Itself': An introduction to Shakespeare in heterotopia 1
Alexa Alice Joubin

Section I Methodologies and reading strategies

1 Not what Shakespeare wrote: A strategy for reading translation 25
Daniel Gallimore

2 Shakespeare and world cinema: A strategy for reading film 41
Mark Thornton Burnett

3 Shakespeare and multilinguistic affairs: A strategy for reading across borders 58
Michael Saenger

4 Shakespeare in Turkey: A strategy for reading kaleidoscopic modernity 73
Abdulhamit Arvas

Section II Big pictures

5 Shakespeare in Iran, Afghanistan and the Persian-speaking diaspora 91
Shauna O'Brien and Ema Vyroubalová

6 Shakespeare and Southeast Asia 108
Kathy Foley

7 Shakespeare and Latin America 129
Anna Stegh Camati and Maria Clara Versiani Galery

8 Shakespeare and the Arab world 145
Katherine Hennessey

9 Shakespeare and India 162
Thea Buckley

10 Shakespeare and the Slavic world 178
Natalia Khomenko

Section III Case studies

11 *Haider* revisited: Postcoloniality and the reception of Shakespeare adaptations 197
Amrita Sen

12 Korean shamanic ritual: Yang Jung-ung's *Hamlet* and Oh Tae-suk's *The Tempest* 212
Hyon-u Lee

13 Shakespeare as a role-playing game on Zoom: Virtual theatre in Brazil during and after the pandemic 225
Aline de Mello Sanfelici

14 Shakespeare and the UK: 'Brand Britain' and the British Shakespearean repertoire, 1997–2017 237
Stephen Purcell

15 *Wayne & Shuster*'s Shakespearean slapstick on Canadian radio and television 256
Jennifer Drouin

Coda

16 Encountering global Shakespeare in Yemen, Kuwait and China: An interview with Katherine Hennessey 285
Alexa Alice Joubin

Index 295

THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA
29 Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2, Ireland

BLOOMSBURY, THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE and the Arden Shakespeare logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain 2024

Copyright © Alexa Alice Joubin and contributors, 2024

Alexa Alice Joubin has asserted her right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as editor of this work.

For legal purposes the Acknowledgements on p. xiv constitute an extension of this copyright page.

Cover design: Elena Durey
Cover image: Kensuke Sunahara as Player Queen © Vibrant Pictures / Alamy

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc does not have any control over, or responsibility for, any third-party websites referred to or in this book. All internet addresses given in this book were correct at the time of going to press. The author and publisher regret any inconvenience caused if addresses have changed or sites have ceased to exist, but can accept no responsibility for any such changes.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-3504-1081-7
PB: 978-1-3504-1085-5
ePDF: 978-1-3504-1083-1
eBook: 978-1-3504-1082-4

Typeset by Deanta Global Publishing Services, Chennai, India

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com and sign up for our newsletters.