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“Interdisciplinary Shakespeare Beyond Theory”

From Prof. Miye Kim, President of SAK

I am writing to celebrate the International Shakespeare Conference held by the Shakespeare Association of Korea (SAK). The conference is focused on the topic of the interdisciplinary studies on Shakespeare, in which many scholars have shown much interest. Thanks to their participation, this year's conference is expected to heat up.

I'd like to express my gratitude to the guest speakers and other scholars from home and abroad. I'd like to give thanks to Chungbuk National University for providing a good place to share an academic experience.

Autumn is the best season for expanding the scope of our thinking. I hope you all will enjoy 2017 International Shakespeare Conference at Cheongju.

Miye Kim
President
The Shakespeare Association of Korea
Professor
Dongduk Women's University
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“Interdisciplinary Shakespeare Beyond Theory”

From Prof. Hyosik Hwang, Vice President of SAK

I am delighted to welcome you to Chungbuk National University at Cheongju for the Shakespeare Association of Korea’s (SAK) international conference. “Interdisciplinary Shakespeare Beyond Theory” is the theme of our conference that will inspire our discussions within and outside our academic boundaries during the sessions.

I am so happy to welcome each and every one of you. “Isn’t it a pleasure to learn and practice what you have learned?” Thus remarks Confucius, an ancient Chinese philosopher. He continues, “Isn’t it also a pleasure when friends visit from distant places?” These two remarks, I think, are especially meaningful to us here and now. We are ‘here’ together to exchange our interests, concerns, prospects and retrospects through Shakespeare, an enormous source of artistic and academic endeavors. We are ‘now’ together not only to converse on Shakespeare from various academic perspectives but also to enjoy talking to one another about our thoughts, feelings, hopes, plans, explorations, and even small talks on personal levels.

I hope you enjoy every moment of your stay in Cheongju or other places in Korea. As the capital city of Chungbuk province, Cheongju has a long history and culture. It is a well-known city for its education and culture. We are also proud of Jikji, the world’s first book published by using the metal printing method. It was printed at Heungduk Temple, Cheongju in 1377, 78 years ahead of Gutenberg’s printing of the Bible. Happily, we are going to take a brief tour of the Museum, taking up a good part of our daytime schedule. On Friday night we are going to watch a movie version of Shakespeare’s *Pericles* performed in recent years in Korea. It was directed by Jung-ung Yang, whose Korean adaption of *Midsummer Night’s Dream* performed by Yohangza Theatre Company has attained a worldly reputation.

I would like to extend my thanks to the persons whose support has made this conference possible. Prof. Miye Kim, President of SAK, and Prof. Hyun-u Lee, Vice Presidents of SAK helped me from the initial stages of this project. Prof. Diana Henderson is an honored guest for our conference who deserves my special gratitude for her warm favor and faithful commitment to this event. I also would like to express my thanks to the members of the organizing committee including Prof. Yongkwan Lee, Vice President of SAK for their help and encouragement and especially to the international exchange officers, Prof. Dohyun Rim, Prof. Sujin Oh, and Prof. Hyundong Ko without whose sacrifice and dedication I might have been unable to do all the necessary preparations for this event successfully.
Last but not least, I would like to express my sincere appreciation for all the scholars from many different nations – Egypt, Kuwait, Taiwan, Japan, the United States, and Korea. Your participation truly makes this conference global in scope. I hope all of you enjoy a pleasant stay in Cheongju and have a fully rewarding experience throughout this conference.

Hyosik Hwang

Vice President
Shakespeare Association of Korea
Professor
Chungbuk National University
October 27, 2017 (Friday)
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Dethroning Shakespearean Kings: 
Mencius, Machiavelli, and King James I in *Hamlet*

**Hyundong Ko**  
Changwon National University, Korea  
hyundongko@gmail.com

From “King Hûi of Liang” Part II, Chapter VIII

1. The king Hsüan of Ch‘î asked, saying, ‘Was it so, that T’ang banished Chieh, and that king Wû smote Châu?’ Mencius replied, ‘It is so in the records.’

2. The king said, ‘May a minister then put his sovereign to death?’

3. Mencius said, ‘He who outrages the benevolence proper to his nature, is called a robber; he who outrages righteousness, is called a ruffian. The robber and ruffian we call a mere fellow. I have heard of the cutting off of the fellow Châu, but I have not heard of the putting a sovereign to death, in his case.’ (Mencius 167)

I have thought about this topic for a long time, but things have happened coincidently in South Korea recently. Presumably, such controversies are even more familiar to Koreans these days than any other because of the recent political turmoil in this country. During the political turmoil, the nation has witnessed a wide range of reactions to the presidential impeachment, including such an extreme case as bewailing the misfortune of the impeached president by calling her ‘Her Highness.’ Then they have had ample opportunities to ponder upon some questions about a political leader’s morality, competence, and the political and/or ideological causes his/her followers uphold. Like many Asian people, Korean folks are definitely well aware of the traditional value of loyalty or allegiance to a political leader as they have learned from Confucianism. To
some extent, such a value system does not fit entirely into the current polity since South Korea is a republic and democratic country. Nevertheless, interestingly enough, it seems that repercussions of the impeachment continue to reverberate through the nation’s expectations for the incumbent president and his successors, in the wake of the re-evaluation of the lives of former presents of the Republic of Korea. And, as a Shakespearean, I think, just as Shakespeare’s *Measure for Measure* had a resonance during the former US President Bill Clinton’s crisis, so does *Hamlet* for Korean audiences and readers these days.

This paper attempts to explore conflicting notions of kingship Mencius (孟子, 372-298 BC), Machiavelli (1469-1527), and King James I (1567-1625) argued, respectively. As such, despite discrepancies in time and place they belonged to, this paper will discuss not only distinctions but also analogies between these three influential figures’ concept of political authority and the security of the state, which will provide Korean spectators with an imaginary forum for political debate. In Korea and elsewhere, so far, scholars have compared Machiavelli with Han Fei (韓非, c. 280–233 BC)\(^1\) for their realistic approach to kingship and politics. Rather than Machiavellian, Ciceronean precepts on the foundation of political authority sound very like those of Mencius and other followers of Confucianism in their emphases on love rather than fear, force, and fraud. Nonetheless, I have found an ironical analogy between Machiavelli and Mencius in their seemingly radical and even subversive notions of sovereignty. Unlike these two subjects’ standpoint, however, King James had arguable notions of kingship in his obsession to the divinely ordained kingship, which was definitely in conflict with Machiavellian real politics. Presumably, then, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, particularly the

---

\(^1\) A Chinese philosopher of “Chinese Legalist” school during the Warring States period (403–221 BC)
controversial aspects of Claudius’s kingship, provides us an ample ground for discussing such conflicting understanding of sovereignty as mentioned above.

Mencius and Machiavelli both lived in the period of political turmoil. Such an instability engendered various kinds of political discussions, which naturally made rulers or sovereigns much more closely observed by their subjects. Likewise, despite the differences of faith system in kind, the contemporaries of both philosophers believed in sacred kingship or rulership, i.e. a king as a regent of heaven (or a Supreme Being ruling the whole world). Yet they challenged such traditional notions of sovereignty in their own ways.

Their political aims are different: restoring moral righteousness in China and redeeming Italy, respectively. Mencius claimed that human nature is fundamentally good. Hence noble men like Mencius and all the other followers of Confucius (孔子, c. 551-479 BC) have an obligation to restore moral righteousness in China. By contrast, Machiavelli’s realistic view on humanity and politics was based on his own experiences as well as a biblical view on human nature, the evil nature of mankind. To some extent, thus, his political stance permitted a compromise with reality in order to redeem the security of Italy, and tensions between a ruler’s morality and competence can be negotiable for the sake of his own country. But one of the common aspects of them is to give priority to the stability of community or state over that of a ruler. Mencius’s seemingly radical idea for justifying dethronement of a worthless ruler can be regarded as Machiavellian ‘necessity’ for the sake of the security of the state.² From their perspectives, thus, the stability and wellbeing of the commonality outweighed a ruler’s

² For Mencius’s radical justification for dethronement, see “King Hui of Liang” Part II, Chapter VIII I put at the top of this paper. Here Mencius regarded those immoral rulers, Chieh and Chau, as “a robber” and “a ruffian,” the mere fellows not entitled to be considered as sovereigns (The Works of Mencius, translated by James Legge, 167).
sovereignty over his/her people and state. And here we can find an ironical analogy between these two radical philosophers, ironic mostly because of their different perspectives on mankind. Mencius demanded to purge an evil ruler from the good-natured people, whereas Machiavelli granted tolerable evil to a ruler governing evil-natured people, but what they were mostly concerned about was not the ruler but the state and its people.

By contrast, like most princes Mencius and Machiavelli served, King James claimed divinely ordained kingship, a political understanding of monarchy exactly opposite to these two philosopher-subjects’ common viewpoint on politics. Political controversies concerning sovereignty stemmed from two prominent but seemingly incompatible notions of monarchy in the early modern England: political theology based on “the Tudor-Stuart fascination with royal sacrality” (Shuger 59) and Machiavellian principality, an emergent political science based on observation and readings in non-Christian historians and philosophers. Under these circumstances, the ascension of King James on English throne had a significant impact on the issue of royal succession and legitimacy among his subjects. Particularly, the king’s *Trew Law of Free Monarchies* addressed controversies over a monarch’s virtue and competence. According to his argument in this treatise, some kings may be or may become tyrants; while they are bad and likely to be damned, this does not entitle their subjects to rebel (101, 105-106). Yet, the king’s argument concerning the monarch who might commit crimes seems quite incompatible with the idealistic view on a king as “the absent-presentation of Christ” (Shuger 44). The imaginary tyrant King James tried to advocate is neither the moral paragon in his state nor a promise of national security.
Such an ambiguous but ruler-oriented notion raises questions about royal succession and legitimacy as well as justification of deposing a tyrant king, which Shakespeare explores in *Hamlet*. Claudius is elected as King of Denmark, but in fact he usurps power by means of assassination; in result, Hamlet attempts to restore justice and morality in Elsinore by taking vengeance on the usurper for his murdered father. In many respects, then, Claudius’s aspect, an elected usurper, touches upon quite complicated (and so-far-mentioned) political issues in the play. Aside from his transgression, Claudius looks like a good, generous, and intelligent ruler, and his election to the Danish throne instead of Hamlet, the topmost candidate under the rules of primogeniture, confirms his practical competence. Before the beginning of the play, in consultation with his chief subjects, Claudius swiftly patches up the national crisis caused by the unexpected death of Old Hamlet by reestablishing national equilibrium through marriage to Gertrude, “[t]h’imperial jointress of this warlike state” (*Hamlet* 1.2.9). Doubtless to the relief of all his subjects, the king resolves the conflict with Fortinbras triggered by Old Hamlet’s death with exceptional diplomatic finesse. The king manages foreign affairs with a diplomatically nonviolent solution combined with military preparedness. Moreover, Claudius seems a fair and good father-king in his management of domestic affairs, including his relation to his nephew/step-son. Officially and publicly, Claudius proclaims that Hamlet is “the most immediate to” the throne (1.2.109) and his “chiefest courtier, cousin, and … son” (1.2.117), so that his parental concern for Hamlet’s excessive lamentation sounds amiable, effectively eliminating any possible controversy over legitimate succession through primogeniture. As the play proceeds, however,

---

3 It seems an oxymoron, but we, spectators and readers, do witness that Claudius is a usurper as well as an elected king of Denmark in this play.
Claudius increasingly discloses his duplicity, revealing himself to be a politically craft prince, a ruler practically capable but not entirely virtuous. Thus Claudius reflects the Renaissance tension between a sovereign’s morality and his/her competence. To some extent, Claudius is King James’s exemplary tyrant as imagined in the king’s treatise in that the stage monarch is a legitimately elected but morally defective king. As a new king, Claudius follows Machiavellian advice thoroughly: a prince “should appear to be all mercy, all faithfulness, all integrity, all humanity, and all religion [because] ordinary people are always taken in by appearances and by the outcome of an event” (Machiavelli 62). However, as a moral paragon,⁵ Hamlet has ample reasons to dethrone the usurper, which the audiences/readers do know, but the righteous prince needs to find evidences that should be approved in natural and reasonable ways in the play. Thus, at the core of those issues surrounding Claudius’s kingship lies the competing ideas about sovereignty Mencius, Machiavelli, and King James upheld.

So far I have discussed first above-mentioned figures’ political views and then examined them through the lens of Shakespearean stagecraft, focusing mainly on Claudius’s kingship. The political issues in Hamlet is itself highly debatable ones, but the play may draw much attention and interest from Korean audiences/readers as well, when it comes to the justification of deposing a political leader. Indeed, to borrow Hunter’s phrase, Korean audiences/readers may have “a relationship with stories [in Hamlet] [their] own intelligible past [and present] which is different from the relationship to other kinds of stories” (155). To some extent, presumably, Hamlet and the conflicts it represents are what they are experiencing and witnessing now.

⁵ “The courtier’s, soldier’s, scholar’s eye, tongue, and sword, / Th’expectancy and rose of the fair state, / The glass of fashion and the mould of form, / Th’observed of all observers…” (3.1.150-53)
All in all, though it needs a long way to go, I believe, this brief survey of political philosophies in East and West and *Hamlet* is a meaningful stepping stone to my long-term research project to compare Mencius and Machiavelli, which definitely requires further research and thorough peer reviews as well.

Works Cited


It sometimes seems that the movement of Shakespeare beyond theory has also put the status of Shakespeare himself beyond criticism. I am thinking of the recent Anglo-American studies that champion the universality or worldliness of Shakespeare quite apart from the arguments of political criticism of the last century. For example, Richard Wilson has argued recently with eloquence for the superior and tolerant worldliness of Shakespeare that is at striking odds with his own earlier “hermeneutics of suspicion” toward repressive ideology in the works (Worldly Shakespeare). This has also sustained the idea of Shakespeare’s exceptionality in comparison with his literary contemporaries, not least his traditional rival (or collaborator?), Marlowe. According to Wilson again (although reflecting here some conventional wisdom) Shakespeare provides a more sophisticated and self-reflective understanding of rhetoric and dramatic characterization than his brilliant predecessor; whereas it was Marlowe’s innovation from Tamburlaine onwards to present blank verse as a medium for the heroic identification of the author with the subject of power, Shakespeare should be commended for his rejection of this fantasy in favour of a more rounded skepticism, for “by crediting audiences with power to think for themselves, Shakespeare was initiating the age of representation” (“Words of Mercury” 50). In this paper I want to think more about this possible relation of Marlowe’s “mighty line” to Shakespeare, and I am going to consider an example that remains rather awkward for contemporary affirmative readings of Shakespeare, which is
the apparent triumphalism of *Henry V*. I am going to suggest a comparison with Tamburlaine, but I am going to do so by focusing on a particular trait of Shakespeare’s text, which is its “Puissance”. That is the use of the word puissance and puissant as a keyword in the Folio play text, as I think it can point to some underlying problems of language and authority in the play.

“Puissance/ puissant” of course generally means force, strength or might in Shakespeare (Crystal). If the words are used rather sparingly in Shakespeare (twenty recorded uses, virtually all from the 1590s (Spevack, 1023)), it seems significant that the greatest concentration (six uses) is from *Henry V*, as if this play about royal heroism used this term deliberately. Furthermore, in the opening chorus, the audience is urged to imagine a play of force: “Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts. / Into a thousand parts divide one man, / And make imaginary puissance” (1.0.23-25). The use of puissance here to mean the imaginative power of theatrical fantasy connects the Chorus’s martial theme of a “Muse of Fire” (1.0.1) with the metaphor of kindling of the flames of poetic *energeia*, and overall ideas of intellectual labour (later evoked at the play’s conclusion as the “Quick forge and working house of thought” (5.0.23)) to introduce the forthcoming theatrical spectacle of war. If *Henry V* is thus introduced as a particularly puissant entertainment, it also invites us to consider what other connotations the word might have had for the audience.

It is probably just a happy coincidence that, according to the OED, the Middle French word “puissance” first entered English usage at the time of the historical King Henry V as a term for power, and was so used by Henry’s poet, John Lydgate. By the mid-sixteenth century however, we can trace the word as implying ideas of strength as both individual prowess and a more collective description of strength. Thus, for Edmund
Spenser (a copious poet of puissance, in fact) The Red Crosse Knight sets out to “To proue his puissance in battle braue” (1.1.3.7). Yet in George Peele’s Locrine (1595), it is a “troupes of soldiers/ Such as might force Bellona to retire / And make her tremble at their puissance” (V.1.33-5) that is the subject of the noun. In Holinshed’s Chronicles, the phrase “puissance against puissance” is used repeatedly as a figure of speech for a battle of two armies (e.g. Vol. V, chp. 6). Jean Bodin uses the word to imply the legal concept of sovereignty in his Les Six livres de la République, and the English translator Richard Knolles retained it his English version of 1606: “Commonweale is a lawfull government of many families, and of that which unto them in common belongeth, with a puissant souereaignty” (1). In 2 Henry IV, Mowbray’s critical comment “upon the power and puissance of the king” (1.03.09) also implies some distinction of power and authority to describe the royal presence. Henry V also connotes different meanings to the term that arguably warrant closer attention. In some cases, it refers to the strength of the king, be that physical strength or regal authority, as when the bishop urges Henry to war:

Awake remembrance of these valiant dead,

And with your puissant arm renew their feats.

You are their heir, you sit upon the throne.

The blood and courage that renowned them

Runs in your veins, and my thrice-puissant liege

Is in the very May-morn of his youth,

Ripe for exploits and mighty enterprises. (1.2. 115-121)

You will recall that the bishops’ motives here are flattery and manipulation, so the appeal to Henry’s puissant manhood, youth and regal right may seem entirely calculated;
it succeeds, as Henry will later propose invasion as “let us deliver / Our puissance into the hand of God” (2.2.184-5). Moreover, later in the play Katherine will also acknowledge the royal prestige of Henry as “Excusez-moi, je voussupplie, mon très puissant seigneur” (5.2.230-1), which may also be intended to flatter the English conqueror, even as it shows the Francophone origin of the word. Yet elsewhere, the word is associated with a more collective idea of strength or military force. In addition to the prologue, the Chorus also notes the people of England who remain at home, “guarded with grandsires, babies, and old women, / Either past or not arrived to pith or puissance” (3.0.20-21). In addition, if it is the case that Pistol is the demotic counterpart of Henry throughout the play—an adverse figure of a fiery temperament to contrast with the war leader—then it is especially appropriate that when the two men meet on the evening of the battle, Pistol asks the disguised King “Trail’st thou the puissant pike?” (4.1.40): the meanings of individual and collective strengths brought together through Pistol’s misrecognition. If the play therefore uses at least the two senses of puissance or puissant to describe both individual prowess and multitudinous strength, it could also be understood as a figure of admiration or praise, and a certain sense of potency and potential power (which is retained in the word’s modern French usage), something that shows promise before it is actualized in battle. After all, this is encapsulated in the iconic Agincourt address that promises to commemorate “the band of brothers”(4.3.60) as an actualized body.

We have grown used to reading a doubleness to Henry V: of dramatic irony of characters contradicting each other, a dialectic of telling by Chorus and showing by stage action, or even Norman Rabkin’s gestalt rabbit and duck. I would suggest that the puissance adds another form of ambivalence to a reading of the play: a mixture of de
jure authority and de facto strength, of the body of the King and the bodies of his army. This recalls very familiar arguments about the Kings Two Bodies in the history plays, but today I want to explore a link back to Marlowe. I wonder if we could approach Henry V in this instance not so much in the terms of a Tudor history play, or as a reworking of the anonymous The Famous Victories of Henry V, but as a response to the contemporary behemoth of Elizabethan theatre that was apparently Marlowe’s play. Tamburlaine’s original title page describes the Scythian shepherd as one “who by his rare and wonderfull conquests, became a most puissant and myghtye Monarque”, and the play (especially in its dazzling and initially stand-alone first part) also provided a fantasy (to “View but his picture in this tragic glasse” (Prologue 6)) of leadership and military might, albeit much more estranged and stateless from English history: “So from the East unto the furthest West / Shall Tamburlaine extend his puissant arm” (3.3.246-7). Although plays may both end in premature death of the protagonist, they nevertheless flout expectations of any de Casibus plot. Tamburlaine also invites the audience to contemplate a figure of puissance as the charismatic presence of the stage character as well as his vast army (with all battles taking place off stage), and it is worth considering in what ways Shakespeare’s play might be read as a reflection in Marlowe’s tragic glass.

The challenge for modern audiences of Marlowe’s loquacious play is, as John Gillies suggests, the suspicion that there is in fact no Shakespearean irony intended and that we are expected to cheer on Tamburlaine all the way (47). The drama’s verse form conveys the heroic flight and triumphant march of Tamburlaine’s company as they effortlessly conquer everything in their way, in a manner that could be understood as a personification of an early-modern sublime: the play evokes a heroic conquest that is almost beyond belief. Tamburlaine himself famously describes his own sense of self in
love as an experience that exceeds poetry, “Wherein as in a mirror we perceive / The highest reaches of human wit” (5.3. 104-5). Whereas the Chorus in Henry V emphasizes grandeur by repeatedly asking the audience to imaginatively step beyond what is theatrically presentable (to “Work! Work your thoughts!”(3.0.25)), and thus to mentally multiply on-stage actors into an army, Marlowe stages desire and martial power through the unrelenting high style of the “mighty line”. We would expect as much from modern criticism of Marlowe as “overerreacher”; what seems distinctive about Tamburlaine’s strength is the blurring of individual charisma of the person and his multitudinous off-stage armies in the idea of power. At some points this is captured by the same synecdoche as used in Shakespeare of the “puissant arm”:

Those walled garrisons will I subdue
And write myself great lord of Africa.
So from the east unto the furthest West
Shall Tamburlaine extend his puissant arm. (3.2.244-47)

Marlowe presented his first audiences with the scandalous possibility of identifying with Tamburlaine’s charisma so as to partake of the drama’s fantasy of an alternative form of group life: another “band of brothers”, so to speak, but one unanchored in the expectations of English history: “Is not passing brave to be a king / And ride in triumph through Persepolis?” (2.5.54-5). What continues to make Tamburlaine such an uncomfortable play is the escalation of that violence.

This can be demonstrated with a common point of comparison between the two plays: the representation of the sieges of Damascus and Harfleur, in which both leaders make dire threats to the civilians of both cities, although only Tamburlaine carries out a massacre. This is one of the most disturbing sequences in Marlowe’s play, again
because Tamburlaine’s motives and the precise audience response to them can seem so unclear. In their plea to Tamburlaine for mercy, the Virgins of Damascus also use the same synecdoche: “To think thy puissant never-stayèd arm / Will part their bodies and prevent their souls / From heavens of comfort yet their age might bear” (5.2.25-27). Tamburlaine insists on his irrevocable rules of conduct (“That which mine honour swears shall be performed” (5.2.44)) and pronounces a sinister figure of death which is both a personification (befitting emblematic art) and a description of his multitudinous army:

   For there sits Death, there sits imperious Death,
   Keeping his circuit by the slicing edge.
   But I am pleased you shall not see him there.
   He now is seated on my horsemen’s spears,
   And on their points his fleshless body feeds.  (5.2.48-52)

It seems that Marlowe is conscious here of a dichotomy to the category of puissance, whereby selfhood is also multitude. This incident might also demonstrate (as Wilson argues) his tendency to cross over sensationalism into sadism (“Words of Mercury” 45). Therefore, it might then seem that Shakespeare’s decision to add the scene of Henry threat to the citizens of Harfleur (“The gates of mercy shall all be shut up” (3.4.10)) may have been a case of evoking Tamburlaine in order to refute it:

   What is it then to me if impious war,
   Arrayed in flames like to the prince of fiends,
   Do with his besmirched complexion all fell feats
   Enlinked to waste and desolation?.  (3.4.14-17)

Henry’s threat can be read as using the potential of violence as an act of brinkmanship,
or as a display of his Machiavellian cunning. Perhaps this also shows (as Wilson claims) Shakespeare’s artistic strategy to foreground ambiguity instead of the spectacle of Marlovian drama and so let audiences think for themselves (50). The fact that Shakespeare did not take this incident from Holinshed might also suggest it is deliberate complicity of the story. However, a better source for this scene is arguably Edward Hall’s *Union*, which, in an extract missing from Holinshed, describes Henry’s threatening speech during the later siege of Rouen, which is in fact closer to the play.

The goddesse of warre called *Bellona* (whiche is the correctrice of princes for right withholdying or injuredoying, and the plague of God for euilliuying and vntrue demeanor amongst subjectes) hath these iii, handmaideseuer of necessitieattendyng on her, bloud, fyre, and famine, whichethredamosels be of that force & strength that euery one of them alone is able and sufficient to torment and afflict a proud prince: and they all ioyned together are of *puissance to destroy* the most populous countrey and most richest region of the world. (Hall 85: underlining mine)

Listeners will recognize this triple violence as similar to the prologue of Henry V where the three dogs of “famine. sword and fire / Crouch for employment” (1.0.7-8), while “puissance to destroy” provides an additional sense of the word I have been tracing in the play. While Tamburlaine promises to uphold the law and Henry threatens to suspend it, Shakespeare’s history play is closest to *Tamburlaine* when it imagines sovereign puissance as just this potential, or right to decide, destructive violence.

In the end, how should we feel about making imaginary puissance in *Henry V*? Literary criticism in this century has turned to ideas of experience and affect as way to go beyond linguistic theory, and this study of puissance as strength would certainly
imply an idea of the body and physicality. Mary Floyd-Wilson has written persuasively of *Henry V* as a work deploying early-modern “geohumoralism” which seeks to rekindle the climatic body heat and psychic “mettle” of English audiences. There is a similar idea of the humoral body and climate present in *Tamburlaine*(e.g. 2 Tam 5.1.201-7). While puissance certainly implies pith and the body, I’ve tried to show that there is also a set of more abstract idea of power as political sovereignty, namely the potentiality and actuality of violence. This also suggests how to read puissance as both a form of lexis and of affect: it is a form of compliment or admiration but one that can imply a dangerous threat. For this reason I remain undecided as to how to exactly relate the vocabulary of the drama to a condition of affect, which is why my question of how should we feel about *Henry V* is not merely rhetorical. We know that Shakespeare’s contemporaries regarded heroic history plays as topics for emulation (Chambers 251). Postwar, democratic, liberal criticism has often found *Henry V* uncomfortable not simply out of pacifism, but because triumphalism and heroism does not suit the self-questioning ambiguity expected from serious literature. The turn to ideas of the carnivalesque and the Utopian in recent political criticism seem an attempt to recover some sense of possibility, or even universalism, from Shakespearean drama but can seem strained in the case of this text, where the May morn is ripe for invasion and the green world is a battlefield.I have suggested that the disquiet about power in Shakespeare’s play is partly a legacy of Marlowe, and Marlowe’s association of drama and fantasy with a form of excess and violence. Moreover, there is a perhaps a political ontology implied by the idea of puissance in that deserves more attention, a way in which a late medieval vocabulary continues to inform early-modern subjectivities and those after.
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Translation studies is a notoriously fractured discipline, but among numerous available theories my own research over the last twenty years has been driven by three basic assumptions, namely that while the goal of so-called ‘natural’ equivalence between a translation and its source is held to be illusory and unattainable, Shakespeare translation is a highly creative activity and translators’ interpretive output worth examining. This leads to a third assumption, which is that target cultures and audiences play a normative role in determining the acceptability of a translation in its time and place.

Theories such as that of ‘directional equivalence’ support a view of the continuity of Shakespeare’s rhetoric, in other words that the rhetorical processes of a translation may be ‘similar’ to Shakespeare’s (Pym, 26-7), even if there can be no ideal translation. Prosody is one type of rhetoric, supporting other rhetorical tropes such as metaphor, and in my initial research I was interested in three types of prosody, namely rhythm, rhyme, and the range of phonic devices that include assonance and puns. This kind of analysis can yield a considerable amount of valuable information, but such information does need to be tested against whatever is known of the norms of the target culture, for example in the way that word play is relatively easy in Japanese but excessive punning thought to be in ‘bad taste’. In my paper, I will focus briefly on what may the most controversial type of prosody, accentual rhythm. Shakespeare’s metrical prosody relies
on the regular distribution of stressed syllables across the phrase and line, most typically the iambic pentameter, whereas Japanese is not a stressed language and relies instead on changes in pitch from low to high to low pitch and so on: what is called pitch accent.

The precise features of Japanese pitch accent are exceedingly complex, not least because of the dialectal differences between standard Tokyo Japanese (hyōjungo) and the accents heard in the western Kansai region and other parts of Japan, and I would leave these features to the phonologists. Nevertheless, a number of basic points can be made. The first is that, although Japanese translators often use dialect for regional and comic characters such as the mechanicals in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, the language of Shakespeare translation in Japan is a literary version of Tokyo Japanese, and with allowances made for regional actors, the accentual system heard in Shakespeare productions is usually that of Tokyo Japanese as well.

The accents on individual words can be checked in accent dictionaries, according to which a high proportion of nouns (including proper nouns, such as people’s names) are accented, but verbs less frequently and particles very seldom. Moreover, these accents can be transcribed, as I have done in the examples I will be quoting, with an oblique stroke indicating a slight rise in pitch in the first mora of some words and the accented morae of words numbered 1, 2, 3 and so on. The accents noted in my transcription are only the dictionary accents, since accentuation is generally influenced by the overall structure of the phrase and sentence. In Tokyo Japanese, the pitch rises on the second mora of the phrase, is intensified on accented morae, and then falls away over the rest of the phrase, so that ‘within a single phrase, the basic accentual contours of individual words are smoothed into a single contour.’ (Backhouse, 35)

Japanese pitch accentuation is a habitual process that is learnt in childhood, and is
therefore subtly different from the stresses heard in Shakespeare’s blank verse. With blank verse, readers and actors recognize the stresses as a shared literary convention, but whether the Japanese translator is instructing the reader and actor to shape the line in a certain way is far more ambiguous. Through my research into Japanese translations of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, I have ventured to suggest that the distribution of pitch accents might be correlated with logical semantic patterns, and might in that sense have an interpretive function, but I would ‘stress’ that this is not a literary feature recognized as such within the norms of Japanese poetics and Shakespeare translation. What can be said with more certainty is that pitch accent, along with lexical choice and sentence structure, contribute to the distinctive rhythms and styles of individual translators.

Let us look at two translations of Theseus’ opening speech from the play to see how pitch accent might work in practice:

Now, fair Hippolyta, our nuptial hour

Draws on apace; four happy days bring in

Another moon: but O, methinks, how slow

This old moon wanes! She lingers my desires,

Like to a step-dame or a dowager

Long withering out a young man’s revenue. (1.1.1-6)

A lyrical opening to a lyrical play, that demands to make sense and to be spoken well. This is how Odashima Yūshi in the mid-1970s and Matsuoka Kazuko twenty years later translated the speech. First Odashima, with a total 156 syllables and a possible 25 accents (Odashima, 8):

| / 3 4 2 / / 2 |
|---|---|---|
| Tokorode, utsukushii Hiporita, wareware no konrei no tokimo |
majikanisematta. Tanoshiihibi wo atoyokkasugoseba
shingetsu no yoi to naru. Daganantomokashiikotoka,
konofuruitsuki no kaketeiku no ga. Watashi no nozomi wo nakanaka
kanaesasetewakurenu, tsugihahayamiboujingaitsumademo
ikinagarasetewakamononiyuzurubekizaian wo kuchisaseru you ni.

Next is Matsuoka, with 142 syllables and a possible 24 pitch accents (Matsuoka, 9):

Saa, utsukushii Hiporita, watashitachi no konrei no tokimo
chikazuita. Shiawasenahibigayokkatateba
shingetsu da. Daga, aa, furuitsukigakakeru no ga
nantoonsokuomoerukotoka! Tsukiwawatashi no yokubounimatta wo kakeru.
Marudetsugihahayamiboujinganagaikishi
wakaiatotsuginiyuzuruzaian wo suriherasu you na mono da.

In both translations, the accents fall on key lexical items, such as ‘beautiful’,

It was Odashima in the 1970s who standardized the use of the free verse line in
Japanese Shakespeare translation. In free verse translation, each line is of about 25
syllables in length, which is said to be the most that an actor can utter in a single breath,
and in the example I have quoted, Odashima makes striking use of this metrical
structure through the enjambments that occur between four out of the five line breaks.
These, in turn, support a rather Shakespearean sense of rise and fall across the speech
that may in turn be supported by the accent distribution, for example ‘Tanoshiihibi wo
atoyokkasugoseba / shingetsu no yoi to naru’ (‘four happy days bring in / Another
moon’). Matsuoka’s seems more abrupt and ‘masculine’; her Theseus is the successful
general who does not waste his words and is in command of his wife-to-be: ‘Shiawasenahbigayokkatateba / shingetsu da’.

My way of reading the translations is intended as a logical extension of the rules of Japanese prosody that I was able to test by recording a native Japanese speaker recite one of the translations and subjecting the recording to a computer analysis (Gallimore, 161-7); the analysis revealed that significant changes in pitch more or less corresponded to my predictions. Yet my accentual approach does not conform to conventional Japanese poetics, whose prosody is syllabic rather than accentual in structure, most famously the five-seven-five of haiku poetry. The successive grouping of five and seven syllable units generate powerful rhythmic sequences that support the semantic and metaphorical layers of poetic expression, and in the case of traditional kabuki drama of narrative as well.

Japanese Shakespeare translation is treated as a genre of modern Japanese drama, which is usually written in modern colloquial Japanese, and for that reason avoids traditional syllabic meter (shichigochō) unless its use is justified in context. As one example, my colleague KuwayamaTomonari of the University of Kyoto has recently made an experimental translation of A Midsummer Night’s Dream that is entirely in shichigochō, and has been produced by a Tokyo-based company; Kuwayama’s rationale is that the meter is easily recognized by Japanese audiences and conveys the play’s poetic qualities. Syllabic meter is not necessarily archaic but it is associated with certain literary and dramatic traditions that are now marginal to mainstream Japanese culture, so that its use is likely to be more ornamental than regular. Thus we can find numerous occasional examples of shichigochō in modern and contemporary translations, for example Nakano Yoshio’s translation of the opening chorus of Romeo and Juliet (1948)
and Kawai Shōichirō’s of the lovers’ sonnet in the same play (2005). These are both cases of heightened emotion demanding a more formal register than ordinary prose.

The difficulties of shichigochō translation are obviously those of finding the words to fit the syllabic structure and of justifying its purpose to a contemporary readership. Yet it is an example of familiarization, or Japanisation, that stands at the opposite extreme from the occasional attempts in modern Japan to conform Japanese poetics to Western, primarily English prosody. In the late 19th century, the writer Yamada Bimyō, having coopted English grammatical structures in a successful campaign to amalgamate the colloquial and literary styles of Japanese (the genbunicchimovement), faced rather tougher opposition to his serious proposal that Japanese poets adopt regular stressed meters such as Shakespeare’s iambic pentameter, and so vary the pitch of individual words as the flow of the line demanded it with complete disregard for the rules of Japanese pitch accent. As Kawamoto Kōji explains,

Bimyō’s metrical innovations [were] undermined by a serious internal paradox – namely, should one follow the imposed metrical pattern where reading out loud, the result is bizarre Japanese, but should one then read ‘naturally’, all sense of meter swiftly disappears and the work reverts to mere prose. (Kawamoto, 189)

Bimyō was attempting to establish new metrical rules, whereas (as I argue) pitch accent may already be functioning covertly in translation to shape interpretation, and when combined with other features such as syllabic meter may even have a poetic function. One wonders why Bimyō bothered, and presumably the reason why he did so was because he believed in those early days of language reform that unnatural pitch variations might gradually be tolerated and accepted by Japanese people. Moreover, as
Kawamoto suggests, Bimyō’s proposal touches on a tension between the mechanical and meaningful dimensions of prosody that is fundamental to any discussion of Japanese Shakespeare translation. Accentual prosody is ‘mechanical’ in the sense that accentuation is meaningless in itself, and yet is used ‘meaningfully’ to communicate meaning and enhance the flow of the text. Syllabic meter is also meaningless in itself, but creates considerable cultural capital not to mention rhythms that have a rhetorical purpose.

As a closing thought, we might even consider the prosody of Japanese Shakespeare translation as a cultural field in Bourdieu’s sociological theory, with its own inner dynamics and boundaries, which Sameh Hanna describes as

the outcome of a continuous struggle between two groups of culture producers: those who believe in the autonomy of the field and that the cultural products of the field are not meant to conform to any laws other than the laws of the field itself, and those who maintain that these products serve economic, political and social purposes. (Hanna, 22)

The prosody of Japanese Shakespeare translation is one example of an ongoing debate or ‘struggle’ between those who seek by whatever means to create capital out of Shakespeare in modern Japan (in the commercial theatre, for example) and those who insist on the autonomous standards of their interpretive community (the reading of Shakespeare’s prosody by Japanese academics, for example). This is a subtle difference that I cannot illustrate at length here, but at a subjective level one can make a start by comparing the rhythms of Shakespeare translation on page and stage to the rhythms of spoken Japanese in the various social and professional spheres to which one belongs and in the wider world. Either way, translation is a means of reproduction that takes us
both back to and away from Shakespeare’s texts.
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Shakespeare’s *double entendres* or bawdy puns are a significant feature of his dramatic language. Apart from the abstruse final song sung by Feste, more than a few of the Clown’s wordplays have long posed great challenges to *Twelfth Night’s* Chinese translators, whose translations have shaped generations of Chinese readers’ understanding and perceptions of both the comedy and this self-styled Olivia’s “corrupter of words” (3.1.31). Feste the wise fool not only plays a crucial part in connecting three strands of the play’s story, but also excels in dallying with words as well as with various characters’ status, including his own. In Act 1, Scene 5, he pokes fun, especially, at wooing and marriage: In response to Maria’s warning that Lady Olivia will hang him for his absence, he utters such ambiguous but interesting lines as “Let her hang me. He that is well hanged in this world / needs to fear no colours” (1.5.4-5); and “Many a good hanging prevents a bad marriage”(1.5.17). The present paper thus will look into and compare different images of Feste, as shown not only in the First Folio text of *Twelfth Night*, first published in 1623, but also in the play’s three renowned 20th-century Chinese translations, done, respectively, by three well-known Chinese translators: Liang Shih-chiu, Chu Sheng-hao, and Fang Ping.
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Shakespeare’s *double entendre* or bawdy puns are a significant feature of his dramatic language. Apart from the abstruse final song—“When that I was a little tiny boy” (5.1)—sung by Feste, more than a few of the Clown’s wordplays in the play have long posed great challenges to *Twelfth Night*’s Chinese translators,

In Act 1, Scene 5, for instance, as Feste the Clown comes back to Olivia’s household, Maria seeks to know where he went and warns him of the potential risk and/or punishment of being executed because of his absence:

Nay, either tell me where thou hast been or I will not open my lips so wide as a bristle may enter in way of thy excuse. My lady will hang thee for thy absence. (1.5.1-3)

Undaunted by her threatening remarks, the Clown naughtily replies: “Let her hang me. He that is well hanged in this world / needs to fear no colors” (1.5.4-5). Twelve lines down, he keeps on the topic again, saying: “Many a good hanging prevents a bad marriage” (1.5.17). Without the help of annotations, what he says, as double entendre, might seem intriguing, if not difficult, to understand even for most readers nowadays. Nonetheless, it is still a great surprise to find that the sexual innuendos of both of the Clown’s remarks disappear entirely in all three Chinese translations below:

1. 讓她吊死我吧！好好吊死的人，在這世上可以不怕敵人。
   
   (Chu, trans., *Twelfth Night* 1996: 24)

2. 好好兒的吊死常常可以防免壞的婚姻；

   (Chu, trans., *Twelfth Night* 1996: 24)

1. 讓她絞殺我罷：在這世間被好好的絞殺的人就不怕敵人。

   (Liang, trans., *Twelfth Night* 1999: 33)

2. 許多好的絞殺防止了壞的婚姻；

   (Liang, trans., *Twelfth Night* 1999: 35)
1. 讓她吊死我好了，吊死了只有好，從此我天不怕地不怕了。
   (Fang, trans., Twelfth Night 2001: 39)

2. 活活地給吊死，倒也可以逃過了那害死人的婚姻；
   (Fang, trans., Twelfth Night 2001: 40)

All the three translations cited above tended to translate the dialogue literally. Inevitably, they seem odd and against common sense to Chinese readers. Moreover, the translations above do not reveal at all any witticism registered in their English originals. By which I mean, as the Clown’s initial remarks when he first comes onto the stage, these renditions in Chinese neither help shaping, nor contribute to, the image of Feste as a proverbially wise fool of Shakespeare as we know it.⁶

Feste’s “Let her hang me” contains his hidden transgressive fantasy, which is rarely detected and discussed by Shakespearean scholars. Even nowadays, the word “hang,” as a verb, can mean “cling to,” which does suggest very close and intimate physical, and thus sexual, contact.

In my view, this fantasy of Feste the Clown does invite a comparison with Malvolio’s in that both Feste and Malvolio are servants in Countess Olivia’s household; and both of them have a transgressive fantasy, if not eroticism⁷ deep down in their minds. The major difference lies in the fact that Feste the Clown has his fantasy wrapped up safely

---

⁶Liang Shih-chiu was the first Chinese translator who, after spending 37 years in translating Shakespeare, finished translating The Complete Works of Shakespeare all by himself. Liang sought to help his Chinese readers by adding notes to his Chinese translation. But from the notes he added, we can see clearly that it never occurred to him both of Feste’s remarks in their English originals are double entendres. Liang’s notes thus prove useless to the Chinese readers. Once we are aware of the double entendres of these remarks, however, we can translate them as follows:

1. 就讓她吊我好了！吊好的人在世上是沒在怕的。
2. 好好吊個好幾回，壞婚姻就可挽回；

For a detailed discussion, please read my essay “Sexual Innuendos and Chinese Translations of Shakespeare’s Double Entendre: the Cases of Liang Shih-chiu, Chu Sheng-hao, and Fang Ping.” (Lin 45-56).

⁷Maurice Charney, for instance, tried to make a distinction between sexual fantasy and erotic one. He holds that “Malvolio is closed off to any erotic cues, and this is what makes him so inauthentic as a potential lover” (78).
in his double entendres. Malvolio the steward, on the other hand, has become so wrapped up explicitly in his daydreaming about becoming “Count Malvolio” (2.5.30) after “Having been three months married to her” (2.5.39) that he is enticed by Maria’s forged letter and tricked by it.

The fantasies of Feste and Malvolio remind us that we are reading a play set in an early modern hierarchical society, where stratification touches almost every part of the characters’ daily life. In Countess Olivia’s household, for example, though in her mourning for the death of her brother, Olivia is, nonetheless, aware of what happens in her household. Aside from Maria’s dialogue with Feste discussed above, we also detect this from Act 1, Scene 3, where Maria asks Sir Toby to confine himself “within the modest / limits of order” (1.3.6-7), warning him that Olivia knew what he has been doing and up to:

Maria. That quaffing and drinking will undo you: I heard my lady talk of it yesterday, and of a foolish knight that you brought in one night here to be her wooer. (1.3.11-173; emphasis mine)

From what Maria says to Feste and Sir Toby, we know not only is Olivia aware of the people and situations in her household, but she is also fully in charge. This is demonstrated in Act 4, Scene 1, in which Sir Toby is attacking Sebastian, whom Olivia takes for Cesario:

Olivia. Hold, Toby, on thy life I charge thee hold.

Sir Toby. Madam.

Olivia. Will it be ever thus? Ungracious wretch, Fit for the mountains and the barbarous caves, Where manners ne’er were preached—out of my sight!
Be not offended, dear Cesario.

[To SIR TOBY] Rudesby, be gone. (4.1.41-47)

Here, despite being Sir Toby’s niece, Countess Olivia is unmistakably in charge. Even Sir Toby has no choice but to follow her command. Even though she does mistake Sebastian for Cesario, Olivia demonstrates she is the one really in charge!

The fantasies of Feste and Malvolio also point to a fascinating, if not necessarily transgressive, relationship between servants and their master/mistress in the play. Viola, landing on Illyria after shipwreck, for another instance, opts to serve Duke Orsino in the disguise of a eunuch as she learns from the Captain the Duke is still “a bachelor” (1.2.25-26). Having won Duke Orsino’s trust, she, as Cesario, is sent to woo Olivia and realizes soon, to her surprise, the Countess seems to dote on her as a male messenger:

I left no ring with her. What means this lady?

Fortune forbid my outside have not charmed her.

[...]

She loves me, sure. The cunning of her passion

Invites me in this churlish messenger. (2.2.15-16; 2.2.20-21)

Viola cannot help but wonder how the whole thing will turn out, and finds herself tied by “too hard a knot” only time can untangle:

How will this fadge? My master loves her dearly;

And I, poor monster, fond as much on him;

And she, mistaken, seems to dote on me.

What will become of this? As I am a man,

My state is desperate for my master’s love;

As I a woman, now alas the day!—
What thriftless sighs shall poor Olivia breathe!

O time! Thou must untangle this, not I;

It is too hard a knot for me to untie! (2.2.)

Michael Shapiro is surely right when he observes in Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage: Boy Heroines and Female Pages, as the story unfolds, this “double nature” of Cesario “is underscored farcically by his terror of dueling but more interestingly by his appearance in highly charged duet scenes both with the man he serves and has come to love and with a woman who has fallen in love with him” (143). And yet, for me, this “frightening dilemma” (Evans 141) of Cesario/Viola in the love triangle gives us one more interesting example of servant-and-master/mistress relationship in this play.

Feste, however, is a wise fool. He knows the boundary between fantasy and reality, between thought and deed, which makes him a reflective clown, who does not find himself in a knot too hard to untie, like Cesario/Viola, nor does he become “an overweening rogue” (2.5.29) like the transgressive steward Malvolio, trapped in a dark prison. Being wise and reflective, the licensed fool knows very well his role and place in Countess Olivia’s household. And he knows precisely how to cope with a punishment that is going to befall him: His witty catechism as demonstrated in Act 1, Scene 5, for instance, proves to be effectively amuse and please Olivia and change her mood. And in spite of his hidden behaviors and transgressive fantasy, he is wise enough to position himself not as Olivia’s fool “but her corruptor of words” (3.1.31):

   VIOLA   Art not thou the Lady Olivia’s fool?
   CLOWN  No indeed, sir, the Lady Olivia has no folly. She will
       Keep no fool, sir, till she be married, and fools are as like hus-
Bands as pilchers are to herrings—the husband’s the bigger.

I am indeed not notfool, but her corruptor of words. (3.1.28-31)

From what he says to Cesario/Viola, we can understand that Feste the Clown could be verbally witty, even very naughty, but he probably would not take liberty unduly!

Being observant, witty, and flexible, Feste excels in dallying with words, as well as with various characters’ status, including his own. “Foolery,” as Feste says, “does walk about the orb like the sun, it shines everywhere” (3.1.33-34), which underscores the failures of several characters in the play to know themselves and their general lack of self-awareness. Sir Toby Belch, for instance, in Feste’s view, though “like a drowned man, a fool, and a madman” (1.5.115), can nevertheless be mended. Malvolio, who daydreams to become “Count Malvolio” (2.5.30), to “have greatness thrust upon” him (3.4.42), on the other hand, is in Feste’s view a “lunatic” (4.2.19-20), fit to be exorcised by Sir Topas, who is actually Feste himself in disguise. Cesario/Viola, the youthful messenger at the center of the play’s confusion, according to the Clown’s keen observation, would need “a beard” in God’s “next commodity of hair” (3.1.39-40).

Indeed, as Cesario/Viola aptly describes him right after he leaves:

This fellow is wise enough to play the fool
And to do that well craves a kind of wit.
He must observe their mood on whom he jests,
The quality of persons, and the time,
And, like the haggard, check at every feather
That comes before his eye. This is a practice
As full of labor as a wise man’s art. (3.1.53-59)

And, unlike Malvolio, who is overweening, overambitious, and, according to Olivia,
“sick of self love” (1.5.82), “and taste with / a distempered appetite” (1.5.82-83), Feste the Clown is indeed wise enough to make himself favorable, especially in front of Lady Olivia, his “mistress”\(^8\).

Lady Olivia, in Feste’s joking fantasy is his “mistress” in both senses of the word. And yet, Feste knows very well Olivia keeps no fool as she is not foolish at all. Olivia also turns out to be in absolute control of her household even in her presumed mourning for the death of her brother.

Feste thrives by his wit and wisdom. And yet, he is also a musical fool, capable of providing entertainment by singing. His songs in the comedy thus also provide comments on the character for whom he sings. In Act 2, Scene 4, for instance, Duke Orsino requests Feste to sing “dallies with the innocence of love / Like the old age” (2.4.46-47). Feste, nonetheless, chooses to sing instead “Come Away, Come Away Death” (2.4.50-65). Apparently, it differs considerably from the unsophisticated ditty usually sung by maids while making bobbin lace. It is, rather, a song marked by the feeling of melancholy and pain accompanying love, hinting at Orsino’s romantic melancholic mood.

Thus, we can see that the better we grasp Feste’s dally with words, the better we understand the play; as well, the greater we perceive the contrast between the image of him in Shakespeare’s play and those in the three translations in question.

Shakespeare's double entendres or bawdy puns are ubiquitous in his plays. In studying Chinese translations of the bard’s plays, the translation of double entendres or

\(^8\) Incidentally, given the Clown’s habitual tendency to play on words, it is very interesting to hear Feste sing “O, mistress mine” in front of Duke Orsino and Viola, as the word “mistress” here in the context can evoke very different meanings and associations in this play. A very similar case occurs again in Act 5, Scene 1 of the comedy, when Duke Orsino at last asks Viola to “Give me thy hand” (5.1.262) and tells her: “Here is my hand. You shall from this time be / Your master’s mistress” (5.1.312-13).
bawdy puns thus becomes a touchstone in translating his texts. In rendering Shakespeare’s plays into Chinese, it is a great challenge a translator cannot sidestep (Lin 45-56). All the three Chinese translations of *Twelfth Night* discussed above show their limitations once we examine the double entendres in the text. And as I have analyzed above, because of the limitations, not only are Feste’s double entendres, and his image at stake, the translated texts in each individual Chinese editions also risk being incomprehensible!
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Abstract

The paper applies the cognitive theory of conceptual integration to the dramatic composition of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* in which the abstract and the concrete as well as the supernatural and the natural are blended in the mind of the audience to generate a novel conceptual outcome bearing a remarkable significance. The paper argues that an understanding of the mechanism of conceptual blending is indispensable to the recognition of the thematic content of the play. The paper concludes that what makes the play memorable is Shakespeare's creative capacity of blending irreconcilable concepts and contradictory elements conceptually in an insightful and coherent whole.

**Keywords:** Conceptual blending; cognitive capacity; workspaces; the supernatural

The paper argues that conceptual integration lies at the core of Shakespeare's creativity, adopting a cognitive approach to the appreciation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. The integration of cognitive science in literary criticism gives an insight into how the mind functions in response to the literary experience, offering new readings of classic texts and tackling them form a different perspective. The paper analyzes some dramatic situations from *Macbeth* in which the ultimate message and dramatic effect depend on a creative conceptual integration of input data belonging to two conceptually different domains of knowledge and leading to a novel, merged output. Thus, blending produces an emergent thematic significance or output which can go beyond the limited meaning of the available, individual inputs. Blending is like weaving two threads into a new
fabric which constitutes a totally different shape. Most of the studies of conceptual integration in literature are linguistically oriented, but this paper expands the theoretical dimension of this theory by applying it to the amalgamation of the dramatic elements. The essence of the operation is to construct a partial match between two inputs and project data or features selectively from those input spaces into a novel 'blended' mental space, which then dynamically develops a new "emergent structure through composition, completion, and elaboration in the blend" (Fauconnier and Turner, Way 89). Blending or conceptual integration is a cognitive theory developed by Mark Turner and Gilles Fauconnier who analyze the nature of this capacity and regard it as "a basic mental operation in language, art … and the simplest mental events in everyday life" (15). In "Mechanism of creativity", Turner and Fauconnier indicate that blending "is indispensable to the poetics of literature because it is fundamental to the poetics of mind" (417). Turner devotes much of The Literary Mind to developing the concept of blending which grows out of his previous work with Fauconnier. He explains that a blend marks the convergence zone of two mental spaces, constituting a distinct third space that generates properties that can be found in neither of the input spaces. Thus, the blended output "can contain emergent properties not available in the input spaces" (Cook, Introduction 88). Turner points out: "Meanings are not mental objects bounded in conceptual places but rather complex operations of projection, binding, linking, blending, and integration over multiple spaces" (Literary 57). Therefore, he regards blending as "the origin of ideas" (Origin 2).

According to this theory, elements from diverse domains or fields of experience are blended in an unconscious process which is assumed to be convenient to everyday thought and language. "Most blending is covert and undetectable except on analysis"
(Turner, *Literary* 64). Turner confirms that "essentially all blending is invisible to consciousness" (*Origin* 9). However, the paper argues that the conscious practice of this cognitive operation, especially in early literary experience, improves the reader's perception of the overall structure and understanding of how literary elements work interdependently in order to contribute to the ultimate message. Thus, blending is crucial to the reader's capacity of relating different literary elements to each other and connecting concepts from different areas of cognition in order to form one coherent whole. The form should be associated with the content. In text-play, the reader should make a connection between movement and gestures as stated in the stage directions and ideas aroused by the dialogic content, and all must be considered in accordance with sound and light effects. Blending can also merge the abstract and the concrete, the symbolic and the explicit, coexisting in one literary work. Therefore, Bruce MacConachie regards blending as "the cognitive basis of spectating" (18). Clifford Werier notes that blending "sheds light on how meanings are structured" (27). Monika Fludernik explains that this capacity reinforces larger intermental processes that "allow humans to manipulate frames and become creative, discovering new perspectives, combinations, and alternative solutions … blending provides us with … the intellectual capacities of invention and analytical thinking" (161). The capacity of conceptual blending is analyzed scientifically in terms of integrating mental networks.

In its most basic form, a conceptual integration network consists of four connected mental spaces: two partially matched input spaces, a generic space constituted by structure common to the inputs, and the blended space. The blended space is constructed through selective projection from the inputs, pattern completion, and dynamic elaboration. The blend has
emergent dynamics. (Fauconnier and Turner, Conceptual 60)

The emergent structure can push the audience forward to explore further meanings which may be completely different from the significance of the independent inputs of the blend, "allowing for interpretations that are genuinely insightful" (Fludernik 161). According to this theory, the blends, emergent in such projections, are not mere associative combinations of separate elements but essentially novel "imaginative achievements" (Fauconnier and Turner, Way 19). Therefore, blending "is at the heart of imagination" (89). M. Freeman also argues that the complex blends of a literary work suggest one way the architecture of literary creativity might be constructed (115). Nicholas Moschovakis indicates that "the theory of blends emphasizes the innovative aspect of all cognitive activity" (128). These reciprocal relations between cognitive capacities, such as blending and creativity, reflect the organic nature of the mind in which several capacities function simultaneously in a mutual coordination.

Reading the scenes of the Witches' meeting with Macbeth in the light of conceptual integration theory provides the reader with a deeper insight into the dramatic effect and purpose of the playwright. Shakespeare "saw particular artistic challenges in supernatural material in itself", as well as in integrating it functionally within the dramatic context and in accordance with his contemporary "conventions for
representing it" (Gibbons 274). Stanely Wells argues that the episodes of the supernatural are "fully integrated", and their conjuring into the life of humans "compel[s] the audience’s heightened attention, arousing expectation even beyond that which the stage can provide" (277). The integration of the supernatural agencies into the human life appeals to the culture of the people in the Elizabethan era, believing that their interference into the human world signals disorder in the cosmic structure and unpredictable danger. Kristen Poole explores a series of cultural spaces that draws attention to interactions between the human and the demonic, pointing out that Macbeth "stages the spatial confusion that results from the irreconcilable presence of different models of the cosmos" manifesting "a symptom of a world out of tune" (157-58). "The opening of the play sets the stage for a disordered space-time" (140). The Captain notes: “Shipwracking storms and direful thunders break,/So from that spring, whence comfort seem’d to come,/Discomfort swells” (I.ii.25–8). Macbeth indicates the confusion in heaven and earth; “the frame of things disjoint, both the worlds suffer” (III.ii.16). In the reading of Macbeth, both the embodied and situated cognitions are co-activated and interrelated revealing how efficient cognition emerges from the interplay between brain, body and cultural environment. Situated cognition, activated by the surrounding culture and environment, gives way to the stimulation of embodied cognition in which the processing of mental workspaces is related to the sensory perception of the neural system, brain circuits and firing of neurons. Thus, the audience must attempt to meaningfully "combine the conflicting personal [conscious], suprapersonal [cultural], and subpersonal [unconscious] aspects" of the text (Morgan). The dramatic situation of the confrontation between the witches and Macbeth represents the generic space which encompasses the two major components of the blend, the
supernatural agencies and the human beings, generating a reaction in the audience's mind and stimulating his cognitive capacity of conceptual integration in order to translate their communication into a meaningful blended structure. The scenario of the supernatural world of the three witches wreaking vengeance on the sailor's wife for refusing to give one of them chestnuts is juxtaposed with world of humanity represented by Macbeth and Banquo. Here, the first input space calls attention to the dreadful power of the witches as they are capable of blowing winds and controlling waves. Announcing their intention to meet Macbeth upon the heath, the audience automatically projects the story of witches and the sailor onto the second input space, Macbeth's life, anticipating disastrous consequences due to the interference of the mischievous witches into the human life. In conceptual integration, the two input spaces undergo a process of mapping detected through Macbeth's irresistible attraction to the witches' temptation and the concordance between the malevolent nature of the supernatural agencies and the evil desires concealed within Macbeth's mind. Mapping between the two mental input spaces leads to the projection of data from both into a third space, the blend. The emergent output space represents the expected tragic catastrophes and chaos suggested in the mind of the audience due to this creative blend. It reflects Shakespeare's ability to forge conceptual integration network out of conflicting inputs in order to create a novel significance in the blend.
The opening chant "fair is foul and foul is fair" emphasizes this conceptual blend and suggests that "the foul", representing the demonic interference and evil influence of the supernatural agencies, and "the fair", indicating the good side of human nature, are both blurred and mixed up, generating the tragic outcome of the play (I. i. 11). The foul haunts and inhabits the fair. The tragedy here resides in the confrontation and mapping between the two contradictory input spaces of the blend echoed by Banquo's speech; "That look not like th' inhabitants o' the earth, / And yet are on 't?" (I. iii. 41-42). The witches do not look like ordinary human beings, yet they walk in a physical contour like humans. Here, the first input space represented by the witches is brought in contact with the second input space, the humans, when the supernatural is firstly transfigured and integrated into a corporal entity, seen by humans' eyes walking on earth. Then, the two schematic frames are brought on the same ground in the confrontation between the witches and Macbeth from which the major issues of the play generate. The blend implies the conflict between the evil and the good and the interaction between the imaginary and the real or the abstract and the concrete. The blend is also confirmed by Macbeth's speech after the witches vanish. "Into the air, and what seem'd corporal melted,/ As breath into the wind" (I. iii. 81-82). Here, one of the input spaces dissolves, but the output of the blend retains a far-reaching influence on the mind of the hero and the development of events. The blend shifts to Macbeth's inner mind when he confuses the prophesies with his real life. Charles Lamb indicates this ominous intermingling: "From the moment that their eyes first meet with Macbeth's, he is spell bound. That meeting sways his destiny"
Wells also notes the fall of wall between the two worlds: "apparitions appear at Macbeth’s behest", and "the boundaries between the human and the spirit world are less clear" (277). He is caught in the capricious aura resulting from the blend.

The creativity of Shakespeare also lies in his ability to use diverse dramatic and theatrical elements to involve the audience in the blend. The presence of the witches is accompanied by thunder and lightning. The meeting between the two schematic frames of knowledge, the supernatural and the natural takes place on a desolate heath, so the setting interfuses well with sound and light effects, creating an emergent atmosphere of horror and impending danger. Even their appearance signals another blend within the blend as they are dressed like women but have beards. Thus, their physical features combine both feminine and masculine attributes, so they look sexless and weird.

In the blend, the second input space represented by the humans receives prophecies from the first input space, the supernatural; as such data is projected from one into the other reinforcing mapping between them. One prophecy is instantly fulfilled when Ross enters to announce the new title which Duncan has bestowed on Macbeth. Although the witches, one of the input spaces, have physically disappeared from the scene, their psychological influence is retained. Ross's message brings the blend once more to the scene because one of the prophecies comes true, so it is reintegrated within the development of the actual life of the play, and the imaginary is once more intermingled with the real. Consequently, Macbeth is thunderstruck, and horrible thoughts arise into his mind as a result. The blend is emphasized by the conversation between Macbeth and Banquo in a response to Ross's message. Banquo wonders "What! Can the devil speak true?" (I. iii. 108); then, he answers: "oftentimes, to win us to our harm,/ The instruments of darkness tell us truths" (I. iii. 123-26). The "devil" and "instruments of
darkness" are a metaphorical transfiguration of the supernatural input space that is mapped with the "true" and "truths" which represent the second input space of actual human life. Macbeth ignores Banquo's warning and indulges in meditations upon the prophesies. This points out the fact that the consequence of the conceptual integration has overwhelmingly infiltrated Macbeth's mind to the extent that he can no longer differentiate between reality and fantasy. His mind has struggled to repress the thoughts of being a king, but the prophecies make these horrid thoughts reemerge into his consciousness. Thus, a blend develops within Macbeth's mind drawing ties between the unreal (witches' prophesy) and his secret yearnings. The prophecies appeal to what lies hidden in his mind, so he is caught off guard and shaken deeply as a result. His guilty start and absorption in the witches' insinuations indicate his readiness to submit to their temptation. When they vanish, he exclaims "would they had stay'd!" (I. iii. 82). He wonders:

If good, why I yield to that suggestion
Whose horrid image doth unfix my hair
And make my seated heart Knock at my ribs,
Against the use of nature? (I. iii. 134-40)

The mapping between the two input spaces [the messages of the supernatural agencies and Macbeth's buried desires] determines almost all his coming actions as he mistakes the unreal for the real. The blend imposes one input space on the other and brings about the downfall of the tragic hero as he comes to perceive his destiny as an integrated product of the dictates of the supernatural as well as his consequent decisions. Moreover, the blend supplies the proper soil for the seeds of his ambition, lying under the surface, to thrive. This blend is elaborated farther and sustained with the witches'
apparitions in Act IV. Their rituals and witchcraft around the cauldron proves that they are agents of the devil, attached to a demonic cult and sent to interfere in the human life and seduce people to their doom. Hecate, their mistress, calls herself: "The close contriver of all harms" (III. v. 7). The apparitions which are themselves a manipulative blend of truth and falsity are taken for granted by Macbeth whose later actions are molded with his mistaken trust in them.

Accordingly, the conceptual integration between the supernatural world and the actual human life of the play has significant dramatic functions. First, it sets the tragic atmosphere of horror and disorder because of the incompatibility of the two blended input spaces. Second, it constitutes the major driving force of action which pushes the plot forward and brings about the tragic end, so it is central to the scheme of this play. Third, the play highlights the juxtaposition of discordant scenarios, the supernatural and the human. The two input spaces are compressed and conflated through integration to overcome the spatial and temporal separation between the two diverse domains, naturalizing the oddity of the interaction and rendering it convincing. Thus, the blend makes the impossible possible by granting the supernatural and the abstract a concrete representation and allowing them to intermingle with the actual world of the human, so it is necessary for perceiving the intended dramatic effect. Fourth, the blend has a far-reaching impact on the psychological state of the protagonist. The integration between the diabolic prophecies and their connotations on the one hand and Macbeth's inner desires on the other as revealed through his soliloquies brings the content of his unconsciousness to the surface, leading to the emergent blend space which represents the image of the tragic hero with his inner conflict and overbearing hamartia. Thus, the development of the image of the tragic hero is due to the blend resulting from merging
the external factors represented by the supernatural agency and internal factors embodied in Macbeth's character. Fifth, it generates an emotional reaction in the audience's mind, arousing pity and fear. Sixth, the blend raises the issue of fate versus freewill revealed through the sailor's and Macbeth's stories. The witches are represented as an element of fate as they can delude and tempt Macbeth toward his doom, but they can neither alter destiny nor control the character's conduct unless he chooses to submit to their insinuation. They push Macbeth toward his downfall only because he is psychologically ready to listen to them. Last, literary examples of creative blending are often impressive and memorable because mapped input spaces become more durable in the memory. It is the integration between the supernatural and the human that makes *Macbeth* unforgettable and allows the mind to develop memory connections.
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I. ChanggeukRomeo and Juliet, a beginning

The 15th of August, 2010 was a momentous day in the history of Korea. It was not only the National Liberation Day, on which Korea commemorated the regaining of its independence from Japanese rule in 1945, but also signified that exactly 100 years had passed since the country’s annexation to Japan in 1910. At 8:00 pm on that particular day, a Korean performance of Romeo and Juliet was put on stage at the Daloreum(Moon-rise) Hall of the National Theater of Korea. It was not just one of any seasonal performances, but one special performance of ChanggeukRomeo and Juliet, brought on stage in order to celebrate the 19th Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association (ACLA) which was to happen in Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Korea, during the following week. Since the changgeuk performance was part of the Congress’ opening ceremonials, over 500 seats of the theatre were filled with the literary scholars from all over the world, and when the “two hours’ traffic” of the play was over, all the audience exalted and gave it unanimous standing ovation. Once withdrawn to the back stage, then, the performers—the members of the National Changgeuk Company of Korea—burst into tears for this ‘unexpected,’ soaring reception of their performance. They shed in tears, as I was told later by the Artistic Director of the company, for two reasons: first, it was the very “first” unanimous standing ovation they had ever received since its debut on stage in February 2009; and secondly, the
applause was from, not any group of the general Korean audiences, but from an international audience of professional knowledge, i.e., those with critical views and high tastes in arts and culture. Upon hearing this, then, I was immediately struck by a question: if the NCCK’s Changgeuk Romeo and Juliet was a performance of such theatrical excellence as to receive unanimous standing ovation from an international audience to whom a changgeuk play was foreign, why was it, then, that it hadn’t drawn before the same hearty reception from its domestic audience? Might it be because their performance was exceptionally of high quality on that particular night, or simply because its foreign audience was generous enough to pay homage as a courtesy to their hosting (Korean) culture, given the night’s atmosphere and the circumstance of the ICLA Congress held in Korea? It might be, and many other answers—be they cultural, theatrical, or artistic—are also possible, to be sure. But seen from a perspective of a comparative scholar in the areas of Shakespeare drama and Korean Pansori such as myself, the answer is rather self-evident: changgeuk, ‘Korean Traditional Opera’ so is generally known to the foreigners, owes pansori so much for its origin, its dramatic structure, its performative principles, and its theatrical features that any inter- or trans-cultural attempt to bring its work and a work of Shakespeare together on stage would hardly go wrong. Or, put differently, since there exist so many affinities between English Renaissance drama (represented by Shakespeare) and pansori (the indigenous theatre of Korea flourished during the period of the so-called “Korean Renaissance”) in terms of their generic, cultural, and historical characteristics that any transcultural or global endeavor attempting to make Korean changgeuk known to the world would be greatly benefited and best accomplished, if the adaptation is made through Shakespeare plays, more than any other western works of theatrical genres. In effect, while the
production of *Changgeuk Romeo and Juliet* was the very first adaptation of a western work that the National Changgeuk Company of Korea attempted in their efforts to establish changgeuk as the ‘national’ brand of traditional Korean theatre, it still remains the best and the most successful of its kind done so far. The rest of the this paper argues, then, how these two theatrical genres—English Renaissance drama and Korean pansori—came to develop similar generic affinities, despite they belong to such remote societies of vast cultural, historical, and geographical differences as Elizabethan England and nineteenth century Korea.

II. The Arts of Social Integration:

**English Renaissance Drama and 19th Century Korean Pansori**

Whether eastern or western, ancient or modern, the societies based on class hierarchy are hardly homogeneous in their cultural disposition. Different modes of life, different systems, and different institutions are produced and developed to serve morals and ethics of different classes, and different art forms originate to represent the particular interests and aesthetic tastes that members of each class have. Interactions between classes, especially the flow from lower to higher, are not only rare but also unallowable. Thus, it is not common that class-oriented cultures can develop modes of expression—arts, music, dance, or literature—which commonly address different classes.

Occasionally, however, we found art forms which function diversely to assemble

---

9 Following the premier success of *Changgeuk Romeo and Juliet* in 2009, the NCCK has continued to present other western works in changgeuk form, such as *Medea, Orpheus, Trojan Women*, and even Dante’s *Divine Comedy*. However, the experience of watching all of these productions—multiple times of each—has confirmed my belief that Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* was the most brilliant choice that the NCCK has ever made in their attempt to borrow a world-renowned western repertoire to promote changgeuk globally. Thanks to the generic affinities that exist between English Renaissance drama and Korean pansori, Shakespeare’s famous love story comfortably sits in for a changgeuk play without ever losing its dramatic gist of being comic and tragic, erotic and spiritual, funny and serious, and vulgar and noble.
different classes together, although they originated in class-ordered societies. English Renaissance drama and nineteenth-century Korean Pansori are, for instance, two of the rare examples. In the histories of England and Korea, these periods were a significant watershed between the medieval and the modern periods, as both societies went through many notable changes in political institutions, economic structures, ethical system, and religious doctrines. There were intense conflicts between the aristocratic and the popular cultures, and the dominating culture struggled hard to keep its authority over the dominated. Nevertheless, the class barriers were slowly crumbling along with other social and economic upheavals. Out of such cultural confusion emerged English Renaissance drama and Korean pansori in their respective societies to be loved by all sorts of people regardless of class, age, and gender. As they harmoniously embodied the paradoxical natures of their societies, there arts eventually established themselves as the arts of social integration to ease the pains and tensions of such conflicting moments of history. In this sense, the generic comparison I attempt here deals with the social functions that these art forms had in common, rather than their external features of form and structure.

1) English Renaissance Drama

“As the most social of the arts,” M.C. Bradbrook writes, “drama was an integrative force in the reigns of Elizabeth and James” (The Living Monuments, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, p. 7). It was an art which created national solidarity among English people, regardless of class, age, and gender, by uniting them in one festive form of life called "theatre." In theatre they found characters of different types and classes on the same stage, from the king to the clown, each presenting values and
ideas of his own. Sometimes, conflicts and problems were raised between classes, gender, and ages; but more often, they were resolved in light of love, friendship, and loyalty. It was a public channel through which both social criticism and royal propaganda could be heard simultaneously.

Having an audience as stratified and diversified as the Elizabethan and Jacobean ones, drama in Renaissance England developed various ways to cope with the problem of the multiple demands made on it. One was to borrow its dramatic materials from almost everywhere—from the medieval tradition, historical events, folk ballads and legends, contemporary ideas, the issues of everyday life—so that anybody from any cultural background could find his or her interest satisfied by the diversity of themes, plots, and styles. Another was to present these materials in such diverse forms and structures as to attract different people of varied artistic tastes. This impetus towards theatrical variety eventually bred out of the drama several sub-dramatic genres, such as "tragedy," "comedy," "history play," "romance," and "masque."

One of the most significant events in the history of English drama was the establishment of the public and private theatres at the end of the sixteenth century. As an ultimate expression of public interest in drama, this development not only indicates the drama's growing popularity in the nation. It also means that official society—especially, the Elizabethan government—came to realize the social value of drama as a public medium, and felt a strong need to regulate its growing force by officially recognizing it as a social institution. As the theatre became a part of late-sixteenth century society, the state, acutely aware of the theatre's economic, social, political and ideological significance, began to interfere with its public performance through various legal regulations such as patronage, licensing, and censorship. This absolutist drive of
the state was another force from outside which helped English Renaissance drama become the art of nation.

The establishment of the theatres enabled acting to stop being a form of folk festivity, as it was in the Middle Ages, and to evolve as a profession. As the common players, who had been strollers and had no fixed place in the previous society, began to emerge as a new class of men, they successfully managed to acquire the condition of citizens and merchants by means of constructing professional acting companies. In consequence, a significant change in audience-actor relations occurred. As theatre-going began to involve matters of money and fashion, the "customary relationship" between the medieval actors and audience was changed into a "contractual" one: “the actors' rôle became increasingly interpretative, that of the audience differentiated, while in certain kinds of play the author acquired independent status” (Bradbrook 13). Fully commercialized and professionally incorporated by the player-merchants, the theatre in Renaissance England became an enterprise, whose success was chiefly dependent upon the playwright's ability to handle the various demands of a mixed audience. No wonder Shakespeare's company enjoyed the dominant position in this Elizabethan theatre business; his sophisticated treatment of the conventional and the popular, his ingenious handling of multiple plots and themes, his insightful revision of history, and his complicated representation of life—all of these combined to attract the Elizabethan audience.

Out of all these forces of economic, social, and political change emerged the drama as an art of social integration in Renaissance England. As Elizabethan English society was rapidly changing from medieval to modern, the drama also had to learn how to cope with the varied problems of this transitional period. Searching for an artistic institution
to encourage a newly rising spirit of nationalism, the state wanted the theatre to be the channel through which public support for the crown would be produced among its people and thereby national solidarity achieved. Looking for an evening's pleasure, the people, whether noble or common, also went to the theatre in the expectation of seeing things they would be pleased with.

Accordingly, always sensitive to the interests of its mixed audience, English Renaissance drama gradually acquired a great variety in themes, plots, styles, and structures. By means of presenting various aspects of life altogether on stage—the traditional and the radical, the noble and the vulgar, the serious and the farcical, the learned and the vernacular—it helped the people of different classes and different traditions understand each other, and opened a way for them to negotiate their antagonistic relations to each other. As aristocrats and the larger public came to share in the theatre the same experience of human folly and dignity, drama in Renaissance England found its firm place in its society as "the" popular art of the nation.

2) Korean Pansori

If drama was an art of "social integration" in Renaissance England, pansori played the same role in nineteenth century Korea. Widely performed throughout the whole nation, pansori was loved by all sorts of people, from the King on top to the lowest people in the streets. Pansori owed its nation-wide popularity not only to its diverse origins, but also to the generic flexibility with which it responded to the variety of the demands that its mixed audience made. In its shell pansori generally comprises themes emphasizing Confucian morality such as filial duty, chastity, and loyalty. But it delivers its ethical teaching in such sarcastic and ironical ways that even the lowest-class people would
find something amusing and satisfying to their taste, while the yangban audience would enjoy the conservative ideas the work directly presents.

Therefore, in a pansori work, there always exists a voice of subversive undercurrent which counterbalances the moralistic voice of the work's superficial theme. Often involved in sub-plots, the underlying theme is disclosed through vulgar language, frank and erotic descriptions, satirical passages, and political puns and parody, so that it appeals more to the common audience than to the noble one. Antagonistic and incompatible to each other, neither of these two voices, the conservative and the radical, can be dispensed with in a pansori work. Rather, creating the beauty of dramatic paradox, they stand together to complete pansori as what it is, making it the most social of the arts of nineteenth century Korea.

As in the case of English Renaissance drama, the thematic complexity and stylistic diversity that pansori displays resulted from the multiple composition of its audience. In the late seventeenth century when the major portion of the audience was from the lower classes, pansori was regarded merely as a folk play, something that was vulgar, unethical, provocative, and without artistic and didactic value. Lacking the social and moral support of the educated class, pansori in this period had no need to adapt Confucian ethics to insure its existence. Freely celebrating the spirit of the people, folktale plots and native myths dominated the festive world of late seventeenth century pansori. Entering into the eighteenth century, however, the yangban class gradually came to realize pansori's theatrical value and enjoy it as a new form of entertainment. It even became a fashion among the nobles to give a big pansori performance at a party celebrating one's passing the national civil service examination (‘Gwageo’). As a result, the gwangdae, aware of the demand for intellectuality and professional artistry coming
from the learned audience, began to refine pansori's vernacular attributes by adapting passages from classic Chinese literature and by representing aristocratic values and ethics. However, since the art form was still supported largely by the common folk, pansori in this period did not have much difficulty keeping its vitality as an art of the people.

It was during the nineteenth century that pansori began to struggle hard to solve the dilemma of having the yangban and seomin in the same audience. In this period of cultural transition in Korean history, pansori also went through tremendous changes in its generic nature and social function. Along with the rapid growth of capitalistic enterprises there emerged a new middle class of wealthy merchants and independent farmers; soon, they began to control the course of pansori's development, for they formed an important group of patrons who supported pansorigwangdae in this period. The most powerful support for nineteenth century pansori came from the court, however. Not only did King Cheol-jong and King Gojong, the last two kings of Joseon, love pansori, but Daewongun, the King’s father and de facto regent during the reign of King Gojong, did so, too, and these royal fans obviously provided a means for the low-born pansorigwangdae to enter a superior world, superior politically, economically, and socially, if he proved himself good enough to catch their eyes. Indeed, by the end of the nineteenth century, some gwangdae managed to accumulate wealth and sometimes earned titles through their artistry and the help of their noble and royal patrons.

Consequently, as people of political and economic power became the major part of the pansori audience, pansori was pressed to go beyond its earlier form as a vernacular folk performance, and it was gradually transformed into one of the most highly applauded art of aristocratic culture. In this process, a significant number of pansoritexts
were neglected and gradually disappeared from the favored repertoire of the gwangdae, for they either failed to represent Confucian morality or contained ideas and descriptions too radical, vulgar, and provocative. Only those texts which emphasized—at least outwardly, if not completely so in depth—yangban morals and Confucian orthodoxy were able to satisfy the demand of the yangban dominated-audience of nineteenth century pansori.

However, it would not be fair to say that nineteenth century pansori was monopolized by the yangban audience. It was still being performed widely throughout the country, whether in the court, in the halls of the nobility, in market places, or in streets. The common people still went to see pansori performances, looking for a world of fantasy in which their oppressed and cruel reality would be relieved through laughter, puns, satire, and celebration of the physical. However, in a naive manner, they also believed in the Confucian morals and traditional values which the heroes and heroines of pansori struggle to uphold. Similarly, the learned and educated people loved pansori for its versatility in style and ideas, admired the pansori virtuoso for his outstanding singing technique and marvelous dramatic performance, and were pleased with the noble deeds of a faithful wife who keeps chastity for her beloved, or an obedient, loving daughter who dies for her blind father. Unconsciously, however, the yangban audience might also have enjoyed the frank and vital expressions of life pansori offers; the joy and happiness the nobles might have experienced in the festive world of pansori, they could never have had in their very decorous public world. As in English Renaissance drama, in pansori the yangban and the seomin came to share their different ways of life and thought with each other, to understand each other's pain and joy, and to live together in the same theatrical world. As the cultural conflict between the yangban and
seominclasses was lightened and reconciled in the fantasy of a world upside down, pansori truly represents the "popular" art of nineteenth century Korea.

To summarize, as the most social of the arts produced in these periods of historical transition, English Renaissance drama and Korean pansori reflect their societies' paradoxical natures extensively. In order to deal with the dilemma of having nobles and commoners in the same audience, they both evolved styles and structures that would satisfy both aristocrats and the larger public. The double treatment of themes and characters, the multiple use of materials from both the learned and popular traditions, the mixed style of the fantastic and the realistic, and the combined mood of the serious and the comic—these are the generic features that both English Renaissance drama and nineteenth century Korean pansori developed in order to cope with the complex, conflicted nature of their societies. Through this generic complexity, then, these arts could synthesize the cultural, social, and political conflicts of their time: as the conflicts between official and popular cultures were harmoniously resolved in these arts, they served the function of being cultural safety valves in their respective societies.

IV. Toward the glocalization of Korean Traditional Theatre, an ending

These days, how to preserve indigenous traditions amid the flooding force of globalization is a task to fulfill, and how to promote an interest in the traditional (synonymous as old) cultures among the young generation growing in an IT environment is also a mission to perform for humanist and classicist teachers like us. Provided that English Renaissance drama and pansori are well matched like two peas in a pod in their generic features and cultural functions, the pairing of Shakespeare drama and changgeuk can help to solve problems we often encounter in both Shakespeare and
Pansori classrooms and on their global stages. In effect, Korean students are now more familiar with Shakespeare plays than with their traditional theatre works such as pansori and changgeuk, and therefore, taking advantage of a globalized cultural property such as Shakespeare drama is a good way to facilitate them to understand their traditional theatre better. Reversely, when the foreigners wish to experience and know better of Korean theatre, their knowledge of Shakespeare can also help: it will not only ease their difficulties in following the story and contents presented in the Korean language, but also improve their abilities to observe the performance’s artistic merits and theatrical features better, if the work is matched with a Shakespeare play. And this may answer the question I raised earlier in this paper: why the domestic audience of Changgeuk Romeo and Juliet applauded it with less enthusiasm than their international audience of August 15, 2010 did. As I may say more convincingly now, it is because the general Korean audience, having been less exposed to Shakespeare than their scholarly counterpart, realized less of the profound implication that Changgeuk Romeo and Juliet bears in both theatrical and trans-cultural senses.

Having discussed so far of Changgeuk Romeo and Juliet’s interactive global potency in the world theatre markets, let me conclude by giving you an enlightening example of promoting both inter- and intra-cultural communication by joining Shakespeare and local theatres. The world famous Taiwanese actor Wu Hsing-kuo’s King Lear shows how well Shakespeare can be utilized as cultural capital upon which we invest our traditional arts and literatures for both purposes of localization and globalization. His

10 By saying this, I do not mean that the Korean audience failed to appreciate Changgeuk Romeo and Juliet. On the contrary, when I took my students to its premiere performance in February 2009, they—as well as other general audience there—were so amazed at the world of changgeuk they had never known before that they constantly laughed, cried, cheered, and exalted at every moment of joy and sorrow throughout the performance.
solo performance of *King Lear* in the traditional style of Peking Opera not only revived the ‘local’ interest in their traditional theatre, but also enlightened the ‘global’ audience—both within and outside China—of the art of Peking opera, through numerous local performances, world tours, and, most importantly, via You-Tube. It is encouraging, then, that we also have *Changguek Romeo and Juliet* to perform the same “glocal” roles in carrying the theatrical legacies of pansori and changgeuk into the west-oriented contemporary cultures both within and outside Korea.
This is a tale of two summers. In July 2016, I was a participant-observer in Venice, conducting interviews and videotaping a project that epitomized the best of the Shakespeare 400 commemorations: the first ever performance of an innovative international *Merchant of Venice* in the first Jewish Ghetto on the occasion of its 500th anniversary. [SLIDE 2] When I responded to the language of this conference’s call, I imagined I would be speaking primarily about new ways of accessing Shakespeare online, and the new skills and sets of pedagogical practices such sites allow. Adapting my work on live performance to these new realities has occupied much of my past two years, the result being an online module focused on *The Merchant of Venice*—to which I’d be pleased to provide you access. While that work will factor here, the intervening year has taken me, and the world, in some unimagined directions. Most consequentially, the US Presidential election seemed for some of us to transform the best of times into the worst of times, and more specifically, this past June that political discourse collided with the role of Shakespeare in America, [SLIDE 3] in a national furore over the New York Public Theater’s free production of *Julius Caesar* in Central Park, in which the title character resembled the newly elected US President. On a more local note, my teaching this autumn has made ever more evident to me that alongside the multimedia potential of online tools, at least the young people I teach are
ever more estranged from hearing, in the sense of conscious listening, and thus from one of the richest dimensions of Shakespearean performance.

And so, with all this in mind, I begin by asking us to listen together, to a ghost’s voice, recorded exactly 50 years ago. [SLIDE 4; PLAY AUDIO]

We are now faced with the fact, my friends, that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time. Life often leaves us standing bare, naked, and dejected with a lost opportunity. The tide in the affairs of men does not remain at flood—it ebbs. We may cry out desperately for time to pause in her passage, but time is adamant to every plea and rushes on. Over the bleached bones and jumbled residues of numerous civilizations are written the pathetic words, “Too late.” There is an invisible book of life that faithfully records our vigilance or our neglect. Omar Khayyam is right: “The moving finger writes, and having writ moves on.”

We still have a choice today: nonviolent coexistence or violent coannihilation. We must move past indecision to action...

[SLIDE 5]

In this speech, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. announced his opposition to the war in Vietnam and linked it with domestic policy. Delivered at New York City’s Riverside Church, the “Beyond Vietnam” address was rich in insights. Unfortunately, many of them still ring true today, as when he opines, “When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights, are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, extreme materialism, and militarism are incapable of being
conquered.” And thus, it is not only because of King’s use of quotations that I call special attention to this speech and its resonant phrase, “the fierce urgency of now.” But in thinking about our topic of Interdisciplinary Shakespeare Beyond Theory and how we learn through theatrical performance, I was also drawn back to those words because King had coined them four years earlier, in his more famous 1963 “I have a dream” speech. As he now moved to connect domestic racism with the need to oppose geopolitical violence, he re-cited his own words, acknowledging in the process the temporal connection between past and present in the “fierce urgency of [a new] now.” Recitation across time, and more specifically re-citation through stage performance that reanimates Shakespeare as both past and urgently present, will be my central theme today.

In 2013, Cary DiPietro and Hugh Grady introduced their collection *Shakespeare and the Urgency of Now* (they omitting that keyword “fierce” during those comparatively halcyon days of the Obama presidency); there they focused on others’ uses, rather than King’s own re-citation, of his phrase: “Far from becoming a cliché [they wrote,]…the repeated appropriation of King’s coinage exemplifies how the recontextualization of words spoken in different places and times can retain the force of their original utterance…even while they are translated into new and ever-shifting contexts. As such, the legacy of King’s words demonstrates through analogy a fundamental principle [applicable to] Shakespeare’s plays […] the significance of texts is never static or ‘timeless,’ but rather involves a … constant renegotiation between horizons of interpretation and an ever-shifting present, from which we view the past with new understandings…”

While agreeing with the gist of their argument, I find it perhaps a bit too optimistic
both about translation and new understandings—if by that we mean automatically learning from the past. After all, exactly one year to the day after giving the speech you heard, King was assassinated, and the inner cities of the United States burned. The other unmarked allusion I’ve highlighted here refers to an earlier civil war, as you may recognize. [SLIDE 6] Doctor King’s allusion to Julius Caesar linking postcolonial racial and state violence has received far less attention than Nelson Mandela’s Robben Island marking of Caesar’s “Cowards die many times before their deaths,” and probably for good reason: after all, Brutus’s argument here for fighting at Philippi goes horribly wrong, being yet another of his mistaken tactical judgments. It is all too tempting, however, for Shakespeare scholars to call out such ironies of decontextualized re-citation, and stop; so I cite this cautionary example in order to press beyond either that “gotcha” moment or, conversely, the simple celebration of Shakespeare’s persistent global presence, as I anatomize some consequential repeated patterns in his works, both aural and embodied. These examples serve as reminders of Shakespeare’s awareness of the complexities in creating human empathy, and the work left for us to do.

The two recent productions I began by mentioning, as well as the two Shakespeare plays they reimagined, have become emblematic of larger forces, at least where I live: just as The Merchant in 2016 seemed ubiquitous, so is Julius Caesar everywhere in 2017. The temporal juxtaposition of these two texts and their particular stagings also began to complicate my linear description of moving from the best to worst of times, from comedy to tragedy, in this fierce present.

[SLIDE 7] Director Karen Coonrod’s Compagnia di Colombari production was “Shylock’s Unheimlich return” to Venice, using location but also commedia dell’arte techniques mixed with multiple languages and modern twists, in order to
complicate as well as conjure the idea of a return to origins.\textsuperscript{11}

[SLIDE 8] Probably the most discussed dimension, beyond its location, was the casting of five Shylocks to perform sequentially across each evening. The five character aspects she identified were Shylock the businessman, the father, the mother, the widower, and the killer; she wanted to avoid excessive attention to a single actor’s performance or an historically false sense of authentic “recovery” of a Jewish man who never existed. The fragmentation accorded well with Venetian scholar Shaul Bassi’s sense of the Ghetto as itself a palimpsest, recalling many layers of irretrievable lives yet a place with the potential to come alive anew.

At only two moments did all five Shylocks appear together as such, this being the first: unlike Laurence Olivier’s famous offstage cry after exiting the trial scene in Jonathan Miller’s 1970s production, this Howl occurred in the play’s middle, expressing the moment, undramatized by Shakespeare, when Shylock discovers that Jessica has eloped with a Christian. [SLIDE 9] The second, and to me even more powerful appearance of the Shylocks \textit{en masse} occurred at the play’s conclusion, cutting through Shakespeare’s “happy ending” to re-cite a speech from the trial scene that has received far less attention than the “Hath not a Jew eyes?” passage which followed that howl...though after this production and based on my interviews, I know it will now gain more currency, at the very least in actors’ auditions.

Many have called attention to the play’s formal structure as comic, and certainly

\textsuperscript{11} See my forthcoming article with this title in \textit{Multicultural Shakespeares: Translation, Appropriation and Performance 13:29}, ed. Varsha Panjwani and Robert Sawyer, 2017. This was nota “purist” production, but an intercultural one: Francesca Sarah Toich as Lancillotto Gobbo was instructed to combine her \textit{commedia dell’arte} training with Mick Jagger poses; her prologue from Ruzante followed a carnivalesque entrance by the full company singing dismissively of romantic love, “Amore arri?”, all before we heard a word of Shakespeare’s English, and the show’s smatterings of Judeo-Venetian, Ladino, Yiddish and other tongues both recalled the polyglot place and disoriented any audience members professing to be master of the text.
Shakespeare’s words move from Antonio’s unrooted sadness to Gratiano’s ribald gaiety. Performing in the first Jewish Ghetto, this felt all wrong. And so Coonrod reworked the conclusion to allow a second gathering of Shylocks getting the last words, or rather, a re-citation of his description of other people’s idiosyncratic “humors” as analogous to his own refusal to explain his relentless demand for his murderous bond, drowning out Portia’s last words. In this modified ending, the performance most forcefully defied the presumption of our finding communal understanding. Again, let’s listen. [PLAY VIDEO]

We were filming at an oblique angle, quite different from the full-on confrontation experienced by most audience members (as is often the case with videos of “live” performance). Despite projecting the word “Mercy” in Hebrew, Italian and English on the Ghetto’s synagogue walls, this production resisted giving its audiences a complacent resting point or closure. Moving from merry song to resistance, the words gave voice to a multiplicity of “others” at a time of rising anti-immigrant and religious divisiveness, and indeed terrorism. Nonetheless, it was not a howl but a question, a challenge that requires thought and action, not just affect, to address.

By giving Shylock these re-cited last words, the production emphasized the unfinished, present-day work to be done in facing the inequities and estrangements within cultures and states. It took the audience back to the trial they had witnessed, and to Shylock’s refusal to be assimilated. In doing so, it also sent me back to the visual and verbal emphases of that scene. [SLIDE 10]

And to one moment in particular: one that has become even more resonant over the year past—quite literally, with elements echoing in Julius Caesar. Here I am throwing you into the trial’s climax in act 4. [PLAY VIDEO, first part] I want to call out what the
tableau, with its held pose and diverse physical bodies, does. In rehearsal, there was some questioning from the actors about holding the pose so long as being unrealistic; but the knife to the breast crucially offsets the relentlessness of Portia’s words, reinforcing that this is indeed Shylock the killer, with all the anti-Semitic overtones that carries, being dramatized—though in this case certainly not to endorse any more than to evade them. Early modern religious debates about the “threatened circumcision of the heart”, as well as myths of Jewish ritual murders, are physically embodied here. This trial scene makes vivid the hypocrisies and the traditions that refuse to allow a Jew to be an insider, but does not shy away from the damaged revenger’s fierceness either.

[SLIDE 11] As you could hear, in the trial scene this Portia was far from the romanticized, even sentimental heroine of 19th-century productions and my upbringing, doing “good deeds in a naughty world” and supposedly modeling “The quality of mercy.” [SLIDE 12] Or even from the semi-anime, semi-sexualized image packaged and sold at the Globe in 2016. Letting go of past heroines, or just complicating a tradition, can be emotionally difficult for some Shakespeareans, even as it feels liberating for others. Of course, that is part of what contemporary performances can help us work through.

[SLIDE 13] This performance led me to think more about the hearts that are so focal here, both in tableau and in words, including Antonio’s ugly anti-Semitism in the same scene. It sent me back to Lear’s famous line with its desire to anatomize his unfeeling daughter Regan, and how one might comprehend such “hard hearts.”

But, seeking solace and recalling that Shakespeare’s text of Merchant remains after all a formal comedy, I looked for “kind hearts” as well as hard ones. Using the Folger and Internet Shakespeare digital tools for even proximate instances, I found only two
“kind hearted” citations in the entire Shakespearean dramatic canon, and one in the sonnets. For a writer called honey-tongued, sweet and gentle, writing a form of comedy often seen as festive or romantic, it is remarkable how infrequently kind hearts appear in his words—despite the presence of Henry Chettle’s *Kind-Heart’s Dream* at the formation of his shadowy writer’s life.

Maybe for such a poet-actor, the reason was initially sonic, those echoing consonants and vowels in “hard hearts”—which of course is also more than “just” sound, but a way meanings are imprinted into our memories, perceived and then performed by our bodies.

[SLIDE 14] So, when I attended the closing night performance of *Julius Caesar*, I was especially attuned to its “hard hearts.” And thus hearing across as well as within generic expectations, I noticed new patterns. So too with “Many a time and oft”, leading back to Shylock’s more famous use of the phrase [SLIDE 15] –in his first major speech of confrontation with Antonio, remembering past abuse and tables turned in a different direction. [PLAY VIDEO].

[SLIDE 16] The passage re-citing Shylock’s phrase in *Caesar* contrasts memory and forgetting, recalling the crowd’s once “universal shout” that made the river tremble “To hear the replication of your sounds/Made in her concave shores.” Here, as would Martin Luther King centuries later, Shakespeare replicated his own sounds for a new context. Significantly, in Central Park the words were spoken by an African-American actress, in a show that linked the Black Lives Matter and Occupy movements as forms of resistance under a new and oppressive regime.

[SLIDE 17] More generally in Anglo-American theater right now, this is a moment of resistance movements as well as the usual gathering and dispersing of companies, creating temporary communities, and sometimes new, more enduring networks (such as
the one I am now part of, linking performers and academia around *The Merchant in Venice*). There are also always theatrical “insiders” and audience “outsiders”—and beyond that, a “surround” of other outsiders, creating political landscapes that intersect with stage embodiments and past legacies. So when Coonrod transplanted her *Merchant* from Europe to the US last month, she did so not only with the memory of the play, the Ghetto, and her own production, but also of *Julius Caesar* in the Park. When the third Shylock was no longer Welsh but an African-American woman speaking in Donald Trump’s America, the effect of the howl echoed differently, as did Shylock’s line about speaking in a “bondman’s key”—with no less force, although—primarily because of the new indoor location—with a bit less sense of danger.

For there was another shared experience linking these two summers of outdoor theater: the presence of sniffer dogs, barricades, and heavily armed guards doing the security checks. In the Ghetto, the location itself inspired such caution, only increased by recent religion-based acts of terrorism in Europe and the show’s own incendiary content. More surprising was what happened in Central Park. [SLIDE 18] Representing Trump as Caesar was what the right-wing press seized upon, despite similarly topical past uses of Obama, Boss Tweed, and even Abraham Lincoln, who really was assassinated by someone putatively quoting Brutus. One may decry the director’s literalism in satirizing Trump, or conversely mock the media’s facile reading of the play’s politics, but the lasting worry remains the chilling effect of Delta Airlines’ sponsor withdrawal. [SLIDE 19] The knock-on effects included death threats against other outdoor Shakespeare groups, in Texas and elsewhere...and indeed against any outdoor theatre company, with some troupes denying their association. The prospect of directors and companies becoming cautious in their artistic choices, or even silenced,
still looms large.

[SLIDE 20] Some theater directors took a leading role in counterprotests---and I give greater credit to their side for ingenuity, including the historical sense to choose Astor Place\textsuperscript{12} on the Ides of June to speak out, the site of the bloodiest anti-European theatrical protest in US history. But with the polarization I call “Delta versus Democracy” also came a too-swift conflation of spheres—as if just going to see the show were in itself a political act.

[SLIDE 21] Against which, another, more viscerally disturbing type of protest against this Caesar emerged. (This is not a slide for reading, but just to show that the coverage crossed the Atlantic.) On the final nights of the run, protesters charged onto the stage screaming against “liberal hate,” which was especially uncanny given that actors playing unruly Romans, crying out from the audience and rushing up the aisles, were already scripted into this production’s opening and Act 3’s famous funeral orations. The art/life boundaries were gone.

[SLIDE 22] When I attended that last night, the first interruption came early, and the stage manager ingeniously resumed at, “It is no matter”, which drew audience cheers. But a second protestor rushing into the assassination scene was hard to recover from…and eerie.

Given these actions and the press coverage, it is understandable that even Literature Professor David Bromwich in the London Review of Books saw the production as emblematic of too much attention on Trump the man, and not enough on the real

\textsuperscript{12} Astor Place is now the home of the Public Theater, but the Macready/Forrest dueling Macbeth productions led to the 1849 riots in which “the Republic’s own soldiers ‘shot point blank at American citizens’,” killing 34. See John Hartley, “‘The pit has often laid down the law for the boxes’: Terence Hawkes, Alexis de Tocqueville, and Shakespearian Class Struggle.” Shakespeare Studies vol. XLIV, ed. James R. Siemon and Diana E Henderson (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2016, 75-90) 83.
political issues at stake—a sentiment with which I agree as regards the media, but which repeats the mistake in failing to describe this performance’s larger frame, and especially its later acts. And in this, I see an important role for scholarly responses to this, and other, productions, attending to a gap in journalistic coverage and giving more attention to particular theatrical choices in context.

[SLIDE 23] Because the decontextualization happened on both sides of the public debate. The writers’ organization PEN America posted this defense of the show as freedom of speech: but what the production shot actually represents is Elizabeth Marvel’s Marc Antony closing free speech down, becoming the demagogue who as a member of the triumvirate orders state killings—here, via onstage firing squads that execute, among others, Cinna the poet (who is beaten not by the mob but by the police). All sides in the social media “surround” were losing the specificity of the show’s representation, its actual politics.

[SLIDE 24] Discounting the later acts of *Julius Caesar* is a fairly common pattern in theatre history and scholarship as well, at least since the early 19th-century, when the act 4 Brutus-Cassius argument was regarded as central. In this production, the brother-in-laws’ relationship stood out partly because of its casting, though without doubt my attention was increased by the juxtaposition with Colombari’s *Merchant*; for here again, we have an act 4 tableau of a man offering his breast to another man’s dagger. Which the First Folio’s capitalizations of Dagger, Heart, and Gold help punch, too.

[SLIDE 25] The black actor John Douglas Thompson brought great intensity to these lines by Cassius. He first entered the play with a “Resist” banner, in scenes where Shakespeare’s thunderstorms became the noise of police helicopters. And in an era of slavery reparations debates, his act 4 anger at being checked like a “bondman”
resonated even more strongly with Shylock’s use of that word.

[SLIDE 26] As embodied by Jewish New Yorker Corey Stoll, Brutus’s reply that he sheathe his dagger and his profession to exchange hearts with hands became a performance of interracial brotherhood as well. [SLIDE 27] Even in a context doomed not only by history and Shakespeare’s text, but also fighting the forces of an increasing police state in which they never stood a chance, the moment was moving. And not only as a dignified alternative to the actual US President’s notorious “diplomatic” handshakes: it was a powerful reconciliation in a production where race mattered.

The contrasting act 4 tableaux of men’s hearts and daggers in Merchant and here reinforced the interweaving of comedy and tragedy across genres, the mixing of satire and pathos. [SLIDE 28] Stoller said that every night, performing became itself an act of “resistance.” For me it prompted further reflections on where the danger is, for us as well as the easy targets. I recalled King’s speech—in which he advocates for more serious forms of love, as being necessary…[SLIDE 29] And I ask too, where we who study texts with care can be in the conversational “surround”? What can we do to avoid the dustbins of history?

[SLIDE 30] Our historical and contextual scholarship has much to offer—after all, Cinna the poet is not the only Roman who shares another’s name, and those who have read their Thomas Lodge know—as Elizabethan theatre audiences before Shakespeare knew—that Antony had an orator grandfather, and Caesar a predecessor in being named Dictator after civil war. Knowing the patterns and repetitions matters. There are many ways to share this knowledge with artistic producers as well as other scholars. [I haven’t had time to share with you our role in bringing some authentic 16th-century props, {SLIDE 31} including this letter, from MIT to be part of the two Merchant productions,
though I’d be happy to say more about that.]

But it is not only about knowing the historical specifics and recovering forgotten texts, but comprehending their ability to become repurposed, to serve as substitutes in a tradition or in a political moment that matters. [SLIDE 32] There is also still the dream of addressing the audience as community, offsetting tragedy, as Polish Nobel Laureate Wisława Szymborska’s poem “Theatre Impressions” captures so well: there is tenacity as well as liberal humanist hope in looking to “the” audience—[SLIDE 33] Especially so, if we acknowledge, as does Kwame Kwei-Armah, newly appointed director of London’s forward-looking Young Vic Theatre, that “the” audience itself is not uniform but fragmented.

[SLIDE 34] And thus it is that I end not with blithe celebration of cross-media echoing but with more questions and an invitation to dialogue, using all the resources of our scholarly and theatrical communities, as we decide when to share our knowledge and when to resist larger cultural forces. To repurpose just a few more of the eloquent words of that assassinated but not silenced King who spoke 50 years ago, “Now let us rededicate ourselves to the long and bitter, but beautiful, struggle for a new world….But still a world that holds on to the value of reciting Shakespeare, in all his, and its, complexity, as one route to new understandings.
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*Hamlet*. For murder, though it has no tongue, will speak

With most miraculous organ. I’ll have these players

Play something like the murder of my father

Before mine uncle. I’ll observe his looks,

I’ll tent him to the quick. If ’a do blench,

I know my course.

. . . . . . . The play’s the thing

Wherein I’ll catch the conscience of the king. (Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* 2.2.605-17)

*William*. I will tell the story of *Hamlet* to entertain the king. (*Tamra*)

*Ophelia*. I do not know, my lord, what I should think. (*Hamlet* 1.3.104)

*Vegin*. I do know what I want…I want to find what I want and who I am, not what you want me to be

or what society expects me to be. I want to live a life to be true to myself.  

(*Tamra*)

Shakespeare’s protagonist Hamlet, desperate to find out the truth behind the sudden and unexpected death of his father--the benevolent and loving king of Denmark--makes a deliberate plan to put to test the troubling story of the apparition of his recently
deceased father. The Ghost urges Hamlet to avenge his tragic murder committed by Claudius, his own brother and Hamlet’s uncle, who *unlawfully* usurped his throne and married the widowed queen Gertrude. Determined to verify the Ghost’s story, Hamlet decides to use “the play within a play” (titled *The Murder of Gonzago*) to “catch the conscience of the king.” It turns out his play reveals what he might have been running away from, and he gets the grim truth out of the secret darkness.

On the other side of the world, William J. Spencer, in *Tamra, the Island*, tells a story similar to Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* (1602?) as entertainment for the court of King Injo (1623-1649) in Korea. Like Hamlet, William’s theatrical rendition of *Hamlet* “much offended” the King and his court, which leads to the King’s determination to get rid of the innocent William.

There is a Korean female protagonist in *Tamra*. Unlike Ophelia in *Hamlet* who appears to be a symbolic representation of the idealized female passivity as women’s virtue in early modern England—at least until act four when she becomes deranged and eventually expresses her own pain and loss—, the Korean female protagonist (nicknamed “Vegin”) in *Tamra* refuses to accept the strict gender role and unfair class system prescribed by early modern Korean society.

*Tamra, the Island*—the modern romantic comedy historically set in the seventeenth century Korea during the reign of King Injo (1623-1649), the sixteenth King of the Joseon dynasty— is one of the most popular 2009 South Korean television series. It explores several themes, such as political intrigue and rivalry, gender and class inequality, xenophobia, and European aspiration for colonial expansion in the Far East.

---

Tamra creates a riveting world replete with rivalry, greed, and betrayal, but eventually shows an idealized comic world filled with hope, forgiveness, and faith in the goodness of mankind. More like Shakespearean romantic comedies such as *Twelfth Night* and late romances such as *All's Well That Ends Well*, the Korean romantic comedy ends with hope, reconciliation, and an unlikely marriage between the low-born poor Vegin and the high-born aristocrat Park Gyu, just like the poor Helena who manages to marry the wealthy smug aristocrat Bertram in *All's Well*.

It has been a cliché to say that “Shakespeare belongs to the world” in the age of globalization (31). For example, recent Asian adaptations of Shakespearean theatrical works have enjoyed a great deal of artistic and commercial success. Plenty of research on global Shakespeare has been devoted to the political meanings of staging Shakespeare’s plays on foreign soil. For example, André Lefevere argues for the legitimacy and necessity of the political use of literature as a way of effective struggle against Western ideology. On the other hand, Xiaomei Chen argues that there is a meaningful relationship between Shakespeare and China’s theatre in the post-Mao era. Harold Bloom creates the idea of literary universalism, applies the theory of universalism to Shakespeare, and explains the very reason for Shakespeare’s uncanny longevity. In a counter movement, scholars, such as Huang, departed from politicized, institutionalized Shakespeare to more personalized adaptations of Shakespeare, claiming the significance of “individual engagements or re-framings of Shakespeare's

15 Ibid. 31-33.
plays that reaffirm local reading positions" (33).19 Martin Orkin also brings our attention to a more personal and localized understanding of Shakespeare in his book titled Local Shakespeares.20

**Hamlet and William**

For a long time, it appeared that Shakespeare remained unknown in the Korean peninsula but in 1906“the name of Shakespeare appeared for the first time” in a magazine titled Joyangbo, where the famous Bard’s name was not written as Shakespeare, but as “Saygusbeea”—an indication of the heavy influence of Japanese colonization (Kim 38).21 Given the fact that Shakespeare appears to have been unknown to the general public until the early twentieth century, it is quite intriguing to see Tamra’s dramatic representation of perhaps the first possible encounter—at least at the court--between King Injoalong with his high officials and Shakespeare’s Hamlet during the seventeenth century.

Koreans might not have known Shakespeare before 1906, but they did know about Western world and its unique culture as early as the middle of the sixteenth century (Seth 217).22 For example, around 1627, a group of Dutch sailors were captured and ended up living in Korea for about a decade. Hendrick Hamel (1630 –1692) was the

---

22 Read Michael J. Seth’s A concise History of Korea: From the Neolithic Period to the Nineteenth Century (USA: Roman and Littlefield, 2006). Seth argues that the first known Westerner to visit Korea was Gregorio de Cespedes, a Jesuit priest that accompanied the Japanese during the Japanese invasions in 1597. The Koreans’ first personal interactions with Westerners would not actually occur in Korea, but in China and Japan since they opened their doors to Westerners first. For Example, one Korean named Antonio Corea was baptized in Japan and eventually made his way to Italy and lived where he met Matteo Ricci, a Jesuit priest that was living in China, met a Korean scholar named Yi Su-kwang. From Ricci, Yi learned about western technology and maps and later published what he learned in his own encyclopedia”).
first Westerner to write his first-hand experience of living in Korea during the Joseon dynasty era. Hamel wrote a diary based on his life experiences, which are known as “the earliest report in a western language on the land, people and customs of Korea” (Underwood ix).\textsuperscript{23} His book, titled *Hamel's Journal and a Description of the Kingdom of Korea, 1653-1666*, was eventually published after his return to his homeland, the Netherlands. Hamel describes in his journal of “what happened to the surviving officers and sailors of the ship Sperwer (Sparrow Hawk) from the time this ship was lost on August 16, 1653 on the island Quelpaert (belonging to the King of Korea) until 14 September 1666, when eight of the crew escaped to Nagasaki in Japan, and what happened in the Kingdom of Korea” (1).\textsuperscript{24}

*Tamra*’s dramatic portrayal of its fictional character, William, and his unexpected arrival at Tamra (now called “Jeju Island”) has many surprising similarities with Hamel’s historical account of his equally unexpected visit to Jeju island, and his forced stay in Korea during the period from 1653 to 1666. Both Hamel and William found themselves shipwrecked ashore on Jeju Island off the southern coast of Korea and captured by its inhabitants. After that, they both were sent away to the King to be investigated about the purpose of their visits, since the Joseon dynasty operated under a strict foreign policy that prohibited any trade with Westerners, eventually earning it the nickname “the hermit kingdom.” Eventually both Hamel and William managed to escape to Japan after years of several escape attempts in vain.

In *Tamra*, William is portrayed as a young British aristocrat living in the 1640s with a fascination for East Asian arts and culture. Initially he left for Japan; however, on his

\textsuperscript{23}Read *Hamel's Journal And A Description Of The Kingdom Of Korea 1653-1666* (Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch; 3rd Revised edition, 2011) by Hendrick Hamel (Author) and Jean-Paul Buys (Translator).

\textsuperscript{24}Read *Hamel's Journal*. 
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way to Japan, he suffered a shipwreck off the coast of Jeju island, captured and sent to the court of King Injo for interrogation. At the court, the captured, desperate William uses a pivotal scene from Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*—“the play within a play”—to please the King and his court so that he could survive in captivity. His theatrical attempt to please the King reflects his growing desperation to leave Korea and continue his interrupted journey to Nagasaki, Japan, his original destination, to “pave the road between East Asia and England” (*Tamra*). Another reason for his travel to the East was that he wanted to escape his domineering mother and an arranged marriage forced by his family upon him. However, his royal entertainment efforts backfire since the play *Hamlet* he reenacts resonates with all the terrible things King Injo has done in the past and desperately wants to put behind him. The things he did in the past continue to haunt him and his court, reminding them of his relentless political ambition, his usurpation of King Kwanghae, his own brother, and later his murder for the sake of his new kingdom. However, William unknowingly brings these tragic events to light.

The drama moves swiftly from the chaotic political scene of the Joseon dynasty to a more personal account of the lowly born, uneducated, poor young female heroine Beo-jin (or “Vegin”). The story follows her determined search for “true” love and her own identity through her personal journey. It is surprising to see the lowly born, poor young woman appears as a central figure in the drama given the fact that a woman was only valued as a caretaker of a family, such as a wife, a daughter, or a mother during the Joseon dynasty. However, her personal journey to find her own identity on her own terms succeeds not in relation to her familiar duties, but through her surprising friendship with the unwelcomed British visitor William—despite a deep seated sense of

---

cultural fears, fear of foreigners or xenophobia--and later her romantic involvement with the well-educated handsome aristocrat Pak Hyun.

**Vegin**

The Korean drama *Tamra* subverts many of the traditionally held Confucian values represented during the Joseon dynasty. First, it employs a strong-willed female as its protagonist. Women did not have strong presence in ancient Korean history and literature due to the long held influence of Confucianism, which viewed women as weak and incapable.\(^{26}\) The principles of Confucianism, therefore, highlighted the significance of women’s submission to men (as men’s property) and female chastity.\(^{27}\) However, the drama *Tamra*, based upon the seventeenth century Joseon dynasty, defies society’s prescribed and predetermined strict gender roles by allowing the heroine actively to find her own true identity. It was considered untraditional for early modern Korean society to witness women consciously making choices for themselves; however, she refuses to see herself as “passive, silent, and victimized objects” and bravely takes life-threatening risks to participate in the process of shaping her own destiny.\(^{28}\) It would be highly idealistic to have a lowly born poor young female to overcome the oppressive cultural environment of the Joseon dynasty. Jahyun Kim Haboush argues in “Versions and Subversions: Patriarchy and Polygamy in Korean Narratives”: “The modern view of premodern women as helpless victims devoid of agency who could write only to


\(^{27}\)Ibid, 155.

express their victimhood…Korean thinkers of the early modern era portrayed traditional Korean women as an oppressed lot without autonomy or agency” (Haboush 282).\(^29\)

However, Tamra creates an unlikely heroine who defies the hierarchical class system and gender roles, and who argues that she is as autonomous as her male counterparts and determined to create her own destiny. Tamra’s portrayal of Vegin is the anti-embodiment of the idealized womanhood created by the Confucian Korean society of the time period.

During the Joseon dynasty era, most of books and pamphlets that were written, published, and widely read highly emphasized the significance of moral values and social norms. Elementary Learning was one of the “required” books, compiled by the Chinese philosopher Zhu Xi in 1189, and it became a major textbook of the Chinese New-Confucian education for children in Korea. Elementary Learning was brought to Korea probably in the early fourteenth century and it quickly became “compulsory reading for beginners in 1407” (Deuchler 145).\(^30\) The book, Illustrated Guide to the Three Bonds (SamgangHaengsilto), probably written in 1432, was brought to the attention of the public in 1434 by King Sejong, who was determined to teach “the book’s basic message to all members of society regardless of social status” (Deuchler 146).\(^31\) Illustrated Guide served as one of the most popular moral guidelines during the Joseon dynasty. These books, originally written in Chinese, were later translated into Korean in order to provide accessibility to a wider audience, including the less


\(^{30}\) read Martina Deuchler’s “Propagating Female Virtues in Choson Korea” in Women and Confucian Cultures in Premodern China, Korea, and Japan (Berkely and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2003), 142-169.

\(^{31}\) Ibid., p. 146.
educated, the socially deprived lower class, and women. It helped inculcate conservative, traditional values of Confucianism to maintain the social and cultural norms. In particular, the Joseon dynasty of this time period was concerned about women and their “proper” roles in society, defined as limited to the domestic sphere away from the public eye. During the late Joseon dynasty, more progressive Confucian scholars such as Yi Sangjoung actively advocated for education regardless of gender, social or economic class: “Moral principles are rooted in a person’s heart; whether they are fully or poorly developed does not depend on being high or low in status, or male or female. Thus, without instruction of books and practice, or without the guidance of teachers and friends, it is not possible to develop innate nature.”

However, it was clear that educational opportunities for women were more readily available to the elite women of higher social status, who were born and raised in the scholarly ambience of their parents’ households.

There were several books on moral guidelines exclusively for women, such as *Instruction for Women* compiled by Queen Consort Sohye, Lady Han, the mother of the King Songjoung in 1475. Unlike most of the conservative books, Lady Han argued for the necessity of women’s education: “All human beings were born with the spirit of Heaven and Earth, and all are endowed with the virtues of the Five Relationships…there is no difference between jade and stone, yet whether. . . an orchid or a bitter smelling shrub depends entirely on the method of self-cultivation. . . The rise or fall of the political order, although connected with the husband’s character, also depends on the wife’s goodness. She therefore must be educated.”

Though she advocated for women’s education, her argument was limited in a sense that it would be

only valuable if it lies in line with domestic duties, such as those of a wife, mother, and daughter.

Unlike the depressing social milieu of the early modern Joseon dynasty, the modern Korean drama *Tamra* creates a surprisingly positive, passionate, and strong-willed female heroin who, despite mounting private and public obstacles, refuses to see herself as a poor, vulnerable, compliant, socially isolated victim and makes enormous efforts to create her new identity. She cries out that she is valuable and she proves that she can be tough and independent.

Vegin is from the lower-class background, and her “lowly” social status makes it much more difficult to navigate: “the inequalities imposed on women and their offspring by Confucian ideology, thus, were much more pronounced than in China. The Confucian social system as it emerged in Korea tightened the native criteria of aristocratic status and reached its fullest elaboration in the second half of the dynasty. Despite important economic developments in late Joseon that gave rise to a degree of social diversification, Korean society remained highly stratified and never had the fluidity and mobility of late imperial China” (Deuchler 144). Depressingly harsh social immobility in the Confucian class system coupled with patriarchal propaganda, forced lower class Koreans—in particular, poor women--to conform to those values and find their socially approved and “appropriate” places in society with contentment.

In addition, Vegin and her mother, Choi Jang-nyeo, are “Haenye” (or called “Jam-Nyo” in the drama). The women divers called “Jam-Nyo in Jeju Island were oftentimes frowned upon by Korean society since the sea women, or women divers, (famous in Jeju island) were the main breadwinners in their households and provocatively represented the *sort of* the matriarchal family structure in the deeply patriarchal Joseon
society. Their independent spirit and strong-willed nature must have raised eyebrows of the conservative male-dominated Korean society. However, there was a reason for their independent spirit.

Since sea related products were the main sources of their income and basis of their livelihood in Jeju Island, the roles of these female fishers became significant and subsequently challenged the gender dynamic. Therefore, the reversal of gender roles in Jeju island might have collided with Joseon’s rigid binary gender and social hierarchy, which was deeply rooted in Confucian culture in which women were considered to be inferior to men and thus expected to be compliant, obedient, and submissive to every needs of their male counterparts and their in-laws, similar to the way the Yangban (the ruling upper class) were expected to be “masters” to the sangnom (the lower class of the society). The self-sufficient and financially independent female divers might have been perceived as a grave threat to the social norm.

Tamra represents the reversed gender-roles through Vegin and her family. Vegin’s mother plays the role of a strong matriarch, a respected leader of the “haenyes” in the community. Vegin herself is encouraged and expected to follow in her mother’s footsteps to continue family tradition of “haenye.” Due to this expectation, Vegin becomes a frequent target of harsh punishments both verbally and sometimes physically by her mother—not by her father—when she fails to do what has been expected of her. Her father plays the role of a married woman, responsible for taking care of the household in a passive and silent manner. During this time period, harsh punishments were often times reserved for male children. However, the mother’s desperate desire to have her daughter well-trained shows how much she “values” independence.

By the seventeenth century, there emerged a new spirit of progressive thinking
regarding women and their right to pursue individual happiness. For example, in “Treatise on Virtuous Wives,” the famous scholar Chong Yagyong boldly denounced strict social conventions unfairly placed upon women. His philosophy came from a new idea of humanism that valued individuality, instead of a collective social mindset that demanded “sacrifice” upon women for the sake of family and society.
A Shakespeare play can be a pre-text, in the sense of template, for another play or work of literature, either in English, or a variety of English, or in translation. Such a work adapts an authorised text (there can be several) for a new audience, emphasising the novelty of the enterprise rather than the originality, while retaining most, if not all, of the original plot, characters, scenes, themes, etc.

The Shakespeare play can also provide a pretext, in the sense of providing a reason (that may not be the real reason), for another play or work in English or translation. The new play can re-write the original, while retaining its plot, either to put a new spin on the play’s themes or to attract an audience unfamiliar with the language, characters and settings of the original. The work doesn’t aim to channel Shakespeare so much as to use the name, or the plot, or the characters, or the themes, or an element of either, or some other element of the original, as a starting-point, a background, a counter-point, a context, an ultimate brand-reference, a validation, or a stalking-horse for the new work.

Shakespeare as pre-textual excuse may be divided into two constituents: the name and the play itself. The name Shakespeare has an aura that survives reproduction and repetition, an authority and authenticity always preceding new literary works, dramatic or otherwise. Just to mention the name does more than conjure a domed forehead, passionate love poetry, searing tragedies and language of an exalted and profound kind: it invokes a tradition of great literature, a treasure trove of meaning, a cultural capital, a
summit and a bedrock of taste, feeling, expression and thought. To cite Shakespeare in a new work of literature, directly or not, is to claim some kind of transcendent stamp of approval. The same applies to a Shakespeare play. Citing *Hamlet*’s characters or plot or other elements in a new work, augments its value, adding authority, lustre or significance. It also recalls the industry that has grown up around the name and work, an industry that is not just a matter of craft beers, t-shirts and souvenir fridge magnets but also includes film and film production, theatre, theatre companies, university courses, scholarly books and commentary. All Shakespearean adaptations must be understood in relation to that larger referential field.

The Kuwaiti playwright Sulayman Al Bassam writes of his *Arab Shakespeare Trilogy* (2014) of plays that it was a product of ‘the tension between what the Shakespearean plays tells’ and what ‘[he] felt needed to be told’ in a contemporary Arab environment (xviii). The use of the word ‘tension’ is significant. It is part of the rhetoric of literary theory and is thus an immediate indicator of Al Bassam’s intimate and productive relationship with academia. At one level, this implies intellectual sanction and investment; at another, it returns us to questions about literary theory’s engagement with intention and reception. Should Al Bassam’s work be seen as symptomatizing an anxiety of influence, or is it as an index of two signifying systems running up against one another? Should it be seen as performing the complexities of intercultural dialogue, or as mimicry of a canonical master, with all that implies in postcolonial terms? Does his work reflect the uneven dynamics of translingual and transcultural literary production, where one party in the exchange always has historical and cultural priority, or is it to be seen, more optimistically, as an uncomplicated marker of intercultural
fusion? Al Bassam, himself, describes Shakespeare as ‘co-conspirator and alibi’ (2005 Guardian). I shall come back to those claims later.

The Trilogy is adapted from Hamlet, Richard III and Twelfth Night. It takes elements of the storylines—the conflict between the individual and the state (in Hamlet), the ruthless despotism of a ruler (in Richard III), Malvolio’s Puritanical displeasure and Orsino’s romantic idealism (in Twelfth Night)—and places or re-territorializes them in other historical and geographical contexts. In Al Bassam’s Al-Hamlet Summit, for example, Claudius is a corrupt Middle East ruler, worshipping the petro-dollar, while Hamlet is a vengeful jihadist and Ophelia a suicide-bomber. Fortinbras represents West-backed forces of law and order, whose aim is not so much to return the unnamed Arab state to its rightful rulers but to restore and protect the oil pipe-lines; the West itself is represented by the sinister figure of the Arms-Dealer. The play has been criticised for avoiding specificity and thus reinforcing Western stereotypes of the Arab world. Al-Bassam’s response is to claim that his plays draw in the audience by using their preconceptions and then ‘ambushes’ them with the complex realities of life in the Middle East (2011).

All three plays are avowedly and demonstrably political. Al-Bassam appropriates Shakespeare in order to make political points that are intended to effect change in audience preconceptions, whether Arab or Western. He wants Western audiences to reevaluate their perceptions and Arab ones to become more engaged with the contradictions and tensions of their own political and public lives. But while Al-Bassam appropriates Shakespeare, Shakespeare and the Shakespeare industry seem to have appropriated him. He is often invited to speak at university campuses, both in and outside Kuwait; his work is frequently cited in critical studies and conferences; the
second part of his *Arab Trilogy, Richard III, An Arab Tragedy*. owes its genesis to a commission by the Royal Shakespeare Company in England in 2007; he incorporates critics’ ideas and suggestions; he has worked closely with the English Shakespearean scholar Graham Holderness; and his work has been extensively extracted or published both online and in print. As a coda to these relationships, he has studied for a PhD under the supervision of Professor Holderness.

Each of Al-Bassam’s Shakespeare plays is heavily mediated or framed, not just by mutually beneficial academic appropriations, but also by multiple program notes, online commentary and video extracts, photographs and articles, hypertexts and hyperlinks. Framing, in the Derridean sense, has the function of recontextualising the text, of directing the viewer (or reader) to what is outside or surrounding the text (1978). Framing, as Jonathan Culler understands it, also involves ‘rigging’ the text or imposing an external viewpoint upon it, by which the work becomes knowable (1988). Opposed to the frame, in Culler’s sense, is context, meaning the surrounding space of the work in which it was produced. Culler suggests that focusing on that space, rather than theorising or deterritorialising after the fact, is a more situated and historically accurate way of understanding and valuing the text. This involves seeing the text both as an imaginative construct and a physical artefact, the product of multiple intentions, not just an author’s, and complex social practices (Kastan 38).

Al-Bassam is the son of a Kuwaiti father and a British mother. He was raised and educated in the United Kingdom. He is bilingual, speaking both English and Arabic fluently but writing only in English; others translate his works into Arabic, with his participation. He says he feels more comfortable writing creatively in English (2014 xx). His plays are performed in English in the Arab world (Cairo, Tunis, Damascus and
Kuwait), with Arabic suspended and superadded, either as surtitles or in interpolative snatches, and sometimes wholly in Arabic in other parts of the world. He is the founder of the London-based Zaoum Theatre Company (1996-2001) and its Kuwaiti partner Sulayman Al-Bassam Theatre, also known as Sabab Theatre (2002). The latter is a touring troupe that seeks to ‘work across national and cultural boundaries’ (Sabab.org 2017). Accordingly, Al-Bassam’s plays and productions have appeared all over the world, from Japan, Singapore and Korea to North Africa, the Netherlands, France, the UK and the USA, winning plaudits and prizes as they go.

A quick glance at the troupe’s index of works and performances reveals the range of its cosmopolitan engagements: ‘Everyman (Dreaming in Carparks),’ performed at the Edinburgh Festival in 1996, the English medieval morality play as pretext for a mediatised exploration of death; ‘The Sixty Watt Macbeth,’ performed at the Zaoum Theatre, London, in 1999, the Shakespeare play as pretext for what might happen to the characters when subtracted from the play; ‘Ur,’ performed in Kuwait and Paris in 2015, the Sumerian text *Lamentation for the Destruction of the City of Ur* as pretext for a commentary on the destruction of art and culture in Iraq; ‘In the Eruptive Mode,’ performed in Sydney, Kuwait, Tunis and Beirut in 2016, a series of short scenes featuring ordinary people responding to recent events in the Middle East. The works are always works in progress, responding to criticisms, suggestions, and developments in the world they reflect. With the exception of *The Arab Shakespeare Trilogy*, which is now carved in the stone of publication, they are always evolutionary and provisional.

The last play in Al-Bassam’s Trilogy was *The Speaker’s Progress* first performed in 2010-11, and first published in 2014 in *The Arab Shakespeare Trilogy*. Adapted from *Twelfth Night*, it satirises repression and censorship in the Arab world and attempts to
articulate resistance to both and suggest the potential for something else. As a response to the events of the so-called ‘Arab Spring’ of the first part of this decade, it turns a playfully ambivalent moment in English Renaissance culture into a call for artistic and political freedoms in the modern Arab world. The play picks up on Malvolio’s Puritan characteristics (as extra-textual attacks on the theatre in seventeenth-century England), his disapproval of anything smacking of levity, making this stand for the generic Arab government’s suppression of the arts in general and the theatre in particular.

A group of government representatives stage a scientific reconstruction of an earlier 1963 Arab production of *Twelfth Night* (they wear lab coats and perform in a criminal forensics laboratory), with the aim of exposing the moral bankruptcy and decadence that produced it. It uses Brechtian techniques, such as narration and direct address, music, song, signs and placards, on-stage black-and-white film-and-sound projection, stereotypical characters and stylised ‘gestus’ acting—all to encourage debate beyond the theatre. The audience, or spectators (as Brecht might have it), watch the reconstruction of the 1963 production, both on a back projector and in selected re-enactments by the government representatives (called Envoys), while a narrator (called the Speaker) points out the immoral and distasteful features of the reconstructed play. But then the characters in the reconstruction, as well as the Speaker, take on a life of their own, gradually forgetting their lines or improvising new ones, becoming drunk, mawkish, obscene, angry and disorderly, ironically rehearsing what was supposed to be wrong with the 1963 production, and any moral lesson (or the Brechtian open ending) is forgotten. *Twelfth Night*, while always pre-textual, slides away under another more compelling signifier: that of the promise of the Arab Spring.
The Speaker's Progress is a long step away from Twelfth Night. It is the only Al-Bassam play not to allude to Shakespeare in its title. It uses certain elements of Twelfth Night—Malvolio’s Puritan aspect, Sir Toby Belch’s drunkenness, Orsino’s idealised love for Olivia, Olivia’s attractions to Cesario, the jokes, the music references, the theme of mistaken identity and the love imbroglio—and adds to these a tradition of Arab literary, popular cultural, religious and political discourse, a contemporary Arab setting, a Western feminist perspective and an Arabic para-text. Sebastien, the Sea Captains, Fabian and Orsino’s courtiers are erased. The imbroglio, the Viola/Cesario/Orsino/Olivia complication, which is central to Twelfth Night, serves only to illustrate what the state wants to repress, from public expressions of love to cross-dressing and the advancement of women. While censorship or the disciplining of artistic expression in the theatre is the thematic centrepiece of Al Bassam’s play, other forms of state interference in public life are alluded to throughout. The play’s subtitle is ‘A Play in the Shadow of Revolution.’ The ‘Revolution’ refers to the Arab Spring of 2011, and the reconstructed play refers to a production from the 1960s, a period of moral and liberal irreverence. For the new play, the Speaker’s commentary, in tandem with the state’s increasingly desperate attempts, through its envoys, to critique the older production, falls apart because, we must infer, the people want their older freedoms back. The last scene of the play has a female envoy imagine wearing a new-found freedom like a new spring dress, while her companion, an actress from the original production, says she has a song forming in her head.

Other than Shakespeare (and Brecht), the play’s intertext includes the Quran (quoted several times in English translation), local political discourse, which includes Western-style liberal democratic values and conservative traditional or customary Arab ones.
(women dressing modestly, the avoidance of oaths and blasphemous language, respect for the ruler, family values, condemnation of homosexuality, among others), popular song in the Arab tradition (Um Kalthoum), and styles of address (declamatory, lyrical, vulgar, censorious, scriptural). In this context, Linda Hutcheon describes adaptations as ‘palimpsestuous… haunted at all times by their adapted texts’ (2006, 6). She notes that all texts are adaptations in one way or another (Shakespeare adapted his plays from earlier plays texts), and not just of one text—they are intertextual, after all. We can note, in turn, that Hutcheon’s own use of palimpsestuous is also an adaptation, from another critic’s use, which, in turn, adapts the term from a Scottish poet. We might also note that the term itself adapts (through conflation) two words, palimpsest and incestuous, both of which derive from other etymologies (palimpsest, for instance, deriving from the Greek for erasure, which recalls Derrida and palaeonymy, and Freud and his writing-pad) which suggests that ultimately, perhaps, there is little point in seeking out just one originary moment. Which is also to say that Al-Bassam’s play can refer to multiple points of origin and thus to multiple termini, without necessarily being considered just another version of Twelfth Night or a play about freedom of expression.

Al-Bassam has claimed that Shakespeare is his ‘co-conspirator and alibi’ for dissent, enabling him to examine the concerns of his people and the world at large: ‘because the texts are old, established, revered pieces of High Art that carry within them the stamp of global accreditation, of a global institution, of a global industry, the radical theatre maker has, vis-à-vis the censor, not merely a mask but a bullet-proof face’ (2005). He can, he says, always hide behind Shakespeare when critiquing the forces of repression in his own world. While this might seem a worthy aim from the view-point of liberation politics, it also plays into the hands of those who see such claims as signs of Western
appropriations, realizable only in Western or Westernized contexts. But such arguments
miss the other effect the play, indeed all Al-Bassam’s work, has had on the
communicative arts in other regions of the world, in Egypt, for example, or Tunisia,
Korea and Japan.

Al-Bassam’s work has been disseminated widely, and not just in English. His
Richard III was performed in Arabic for the Royal Shakespeare Company in Stratford.
His work uses multimedia not only in performance but also in publicising itself. The
Internet has been the platform, as it has been for most media-savvy art over the last two
decades or so, both for passing on information and enlarging the scope and extending
the performance life of the work itself. The Speaker’s Progress is much more than an
adaptation of Twelfth Night. It is a bricolage—to use an old but still useful term—
patched together out of Shakespeare and the Shakespeare industry, Brechtian epic
theatre, Anglophone scholarship, types of video and commentary, recorded voices and
music, interviews, online articles and news pieces, as well as contemporary Arab social
life and political comment, Quranic discourse, an Arabic paratext, Arab popular culture
and recent Middle East history. Bricolage is the method of intercultural dialogue or
cross-cultural interplay, in the virtual world, language and register necessarily pursuing
a step-by-step approach, a tinkering with potentialities, a constant revaluation and
evolution. Such a process is always transparent and imperishable. For nothing can be
swept under the carpet in hyperspace; whatever has been written is always already there,
available to anyone with a USB device and a particular set of skills, a productive
violence of the letter.

In conclusion, I want to mention another Shakespeare adaptation, this time of
Macbeth, by the Thai filmmaker IngKanjanavanit (or Ing K): ‘Shakespeare Tong Tai’ or
‘Shakespeare Must Die’ (produced in 2012). I can say very little about the film, itself, as it has been withdrawn from cinemas and shops and, it seems, from any other from of distribution. It is not available either in torrents or as a bootleg copy. Online, only a trailer, a few images and a few newspaper articles circulate. Yet this is enough to foster interest and encourage searches online and elsewhere, even among those with little interest in Shakespeare or Thai film. Censoring the arts, as John Milton knew, 400 years ago, can lead to the very fascination and criminal activity it seeks to prevent. ‘Shakespeare Must Die,’ by its very absence, becomes a viral sensation.

The Thailand’s Board of Censors banned the film in 2012 on the grounds that it contained ‘content that divides the people’ (2014). An appeal heard in August this year resulted in the ban staying in place (2017). The film is said to interleave its Thai language adaptation of Shakespeare’s play with imagery related to events in modern-day Thailand, particularly as they relate to a seemingly irreconcilable Red Shirt / Yellow Shirt political and social opposition, the Reds being comprised largely of a majority rural poor, the Yellows a minority urban wealthy middle class the aforementioned political and social opposition (2014). The film’s version of the Macbeth figure is said to be modelled on Red Shirt icon and sometime leader Thaksin Shinawatra (2014).

Both Sulayman Al-Bassam and the Thai Board of Censors use Shakespeare as an alibi for dissent. Al-Bassam’s version of dissent calls for freedom of expression both in the arts and civil life generally, whereas the Thai Board of Censors’ version calls for the curbing of such expression, in line with the government’s stated aim of protecting and upholding the monarchy and maintaining national unity (2009).
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