

The Lure of Intercultural Shakespeare

Yeeyon Im (Yonsei University)

The cover illustration of the second edition of *Looking at Shakespeare* (2001), an influential book by Dennis Kennedy, features Yukio Ninagawa's 1987 Tokyo production of *The Tempest*. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Stage* (2002), edited by Stanley Wells and Sarah Stanton, also displays a *huangmeixi*-style *Much Ado About Nothing* along with a Royal Shakespeare Company production of *2 Henry IV* for the front cover. Publications on local and international Shakespeare proliferate.¹⁾ The swelling

1) Such publications include: *Foreign Shakespeare*, a collection of essays edited by Dennis Kennedy (Cambridge UP, 1996); *Shakespeare East and West* edited by Minoru Fujita and Leonard Pronko (Japan Library, 1996); *Shakespeare in South Africa* by David Johnson (1996); *Shakespeare and the Japanese Stage* edited by Takashi Sasayama, Ronnie Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge UP, 1998); *New Sites for Shakespeare: Theatre, the Audience and Asia* by John Russell Brown

number of theatre works of, and academic criticisms on, non-Western Shakespeare at the turn of the millennium indicates the central status of the so-called interculturalism in the field of Shakespeare and theatre. However, the question if interculturalism is indeed a step forward from the ignominious cultural imperialism remains to be answered. The problematic relationship of Shakespeare and interculturalism is yet to be explored. If the combination of Shakespeare and interculturalism is a paradox, as I would argue, what is the logic behind that makes this alliance prosper? These are the questions I attempt to address in this essay.

Intercultural Debates

Interculturalism is one of new scenographic modes dominant in the late twentieth century, as Patrice Pavis's rather exaggerated statement suggests: "Never before has the western stage contemplated and manipulated the various cultures of the world to such a degree, but never before has it been at such a loss as to what to make of their inexhaustible babble, their explosive mix, the inextricable collage of their languages" (*Crossroads* 1). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Theatre and Performance*, published recently in 2003, allocates three full pages for the entry on interculturalism, which opens with a statement similar to Pavis's: "Interculturalism and performance is perhaps the most talked

(Routledge, 1999); *Performing Shakespeare in Japan* edited by Ryuta Minami, Ian Carruthers and John Gillies (Cambridge UP, 2001); *Shakespeare in China* by Murray J. Levith (2004); *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation, and Performance* edited by Poonam Trivedi and Dennis Bartholomeusz (2004); *Shashibiya: Staging Shakespeare in China* by Ruru Li (Hong Kong UP, 2004); *World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performance*, edited by Sonia Massai (Routledge, 2005). The list is not exhaustive.

about and controversial cultural practice of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, characterized at best by a sharing and mutual borrowing of the manifestation of one theatre practice by another” (Singleton 628). The spread of the term without sufficient theorization is problematic, as the boundary between interculturalism and cultural imperialism can be easily blurred. Thus, the issue of cultural equality and authenticity comes to the fore in the intercultural debates.

Apparently, the prefix “inter” seems to promise an equal relationship between cultures,²⁾ and intercultural theorists attempted to define interculturalism as such. Intercultural theatre, for Pavis, “creates hybrid forms drawing upon a more or less conscious and voluntary mixing of performance traditions traceable to distinct cultural areas” and “seeks to draw a mutual enrichment” (*Crossroads* 9). Rustom Bharucha compares the reciprocity of ideal intercultural exchange to “the swing of a pendulum” (*Theatre* 241). However, most theatre practices that pass for intercultural performance do not satisfy the qualification. Pavis’s optimistic denial through self-scrutiny that interculturalism is *not yet* a new version of orientalism (*Intercultural* 4) is poignantly undermined by Bharucha’s critique of Western intercultural practitioners including Antonin Artaud, Gordon Craig, Jerzy Grotowsky, Eugenio Barba, Richard Schechner and Peter Brook for their misrepresentation and appropriations of non-Western (particularly Indian) performance traditions and culture (*Theatre* 13-41). “If interculturalism in the theatre is to be more than a vision, there has to be a fairer exchange between theatrical traditions in the East and the West” (38).

2) See Pavis’s terminological elaboration that differentiates “intercultural,” “intracultural,” “transcultural,” “ultracultural,” “pre-cultural,” “post-cultural,” and “metacultural” (*Crossroads* 5-9).

Along with cultural equality, the authenticity of cultural representation is another important issue in the intercultural debates. Western intercultural theorists like Pavis claim that intercultural theatre is “concerned with the cultural identities of the forms it utilizes” (*Crossroads* 9); it is doubtful if the authenticity of source culture has any significance to many Western intercultural theatre directors including Ariane Mnouchkine who makes free use of the “Orient” from Japanese *kabuki* to Indian *kathakali* to create distant and exotic otherness, Peter Brook who explores Asian and African myths and theatre traditions “like a quarry” for his transcendental vision of universal theatre, and Richard Schechner who plays with rituals of Asian cultures in postmodern *jouissance*. Cultural elements are decontextualized and dehistoricized for the director’s vision. Appropriation of Eastern cultural traditions for exotic visuals is a typical case of Orientalism; putting Eastern and Western theatre traditions together in a gesture of creating universal human vision is an imposition of the traditional Western value of universalism and thus a new cultural imperialism of West over East. As Marvin Carlson points out, the universal can be “a dangerous and self-deceptive vision, denying the voice of the Other in an attempt to transcend it” (91).

With such moot points, intercultural discourse has centered around the use of non-Western subject matter and theatrical traditions by Western theatre directors. For instance, one of the most discussed intercultural productions, *The Mahabharata* directed by Peter Brook (1985), was severely criticized for his decontextualization of the Hindu epic out of its Indian traditional culture, raising the question of “whether the ‘story’ of the Mahabharata makes much sense outside of the conventions of story-telling to which it belongs” (Bharucha, *Theatre* 76). Brook’s intercultural Shakespeare productions such as *La Tempête* (1990) and *Hamlet* (2000) were suspected of Orientalism for his free

appropriations of non-Western cultural traditions without authentic representation; so were Ariane Mnouchkine's Shakespeare Cycle (1982), *Richard II*, *1 Henry IV* and *Twelfth Night* for her outright Orientalism. Curiously, Shakespeare, an active participant/catalyst in the so-called intercultural theatre, has attracted little attention from intercultural theorists and critics. This holds true even in the case of productions of non-Western theatre directors, whose use of other culture (Shakespeare) would be equivalent to Brook's in *The Mahabharata* or Mnouchkine's in *L'Indiade*. For example, critics accuse Yukio Ninagawa of his inauthentic use of traditional Japanese theatre style in his Shakespeare productions catered for the Western audience, rather than his appropriation of the Elizabethan dramatist: "a *japonisme* made by a Japanese" (Kennedy, *Looking* 319). Tadashi Suzuki receives similar responses from critics; he is commended for his authentic incorporation of Japanese *noh* tradition in his Shakespeare productions, notwithstanding his massive deconstruction of the dramatic text (Mulryne 83-84). Considering the significant number of Shakespearean productions in practice, the neglect of Shakespeare in intercultural discourse deserves a close analysis, which shall expose the liaison between interculturalism and cultural imperialism.

Intercultural Shakespeare Theatre: A Paradox

Non-Western Shakespeare productions often advertize themselves as intercultural, although what the term signifies is still fiercely debated. Studies in intercultural Shakespeare have developed in two directions: either focusing on the part of non-Western cultural elements in the cultural exchange, or relating Shakespeare to the phenomenon of globalization. The most common types of

studies in the first approach are the comparison of traditional Japanese/Asian theatre and Elizabethan stage practice and the surprising discovery of similarities between them.³⁾ Other studies of Shakespeare as an international phenomenon appear in *Shakespeare Survey* 48 on the topic of “Shakespeare and Cultural Exchange” (1995), and *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* 138 on the theme of “World Theatre” addressing the phenomenon of global Shakespeare (2002). Both approaches do not address Shakespeare as specific cultural product of his own time, thus unwittingly contributing to mystification of Shakespeare as universal performative force. Admitting Shakespeare’s historicity and balancing the two ends of the “pendulum” of cultural exchange, one faces the fact that intercultural Shakespeare is an oxymoron.

Most notable, but often overlooked, is the imbalance between the verbal and the visual in theatre, or in Jean Alter’s terms, verbal signs and performing signs (76). Contemporary “performance” claims to be more than a mere realization of dramatic text; however, the predominance of verbal signs over performing signs such as actors, lighting, settings and costumes is still persistent and dies hard. The case is even worse with Shakespeare, whose performance has been judged by his “authentic” meaning embodied in the printed text, as W. B. Worthen gives a long list of theatre critics with the text/performance dichotomy including Wilson Knight, John Styan, Anthony Dawson, J. L. Halio, Robert Hapgood, John Russell Brown among others (*Authenticity* 151-91). In most intercultural Shakespeare productions, the basic formula has been the combination of the content by Shakespeare and the form by non-Western theatrical traditions. In

3) Along with *Shakespeare East and West*, edited by Fujita and Pronko (1996), *New Sites for Shakespeare: Theatre, the Audience and Asia* by John Russell Brown (1999) is an exemplary case, so are his essays “Shakespeare’s International Currency” in *Shakespeare Survey* 51 (1998): 193-203 and “Asian Theatres and European Shakespeares” in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* 138 (2002): 11-22.

many cases, even the form is dominated by Western realist theatre, with foreign theatrical elements employed merely to decorate and embellish it. Interculturalism, if defined as equal cultural exchange, is untenable in such theatre works. While most intercultural debates have centered on the authenticity of foreign cultures employed in performance (on how they are detached from their original context), little attention has been given to such bias in the division of theatrical signs that East and West assume in intercultural Shakespeare performance.

Admittedly, there have been other types of collaborations between Western and Eastern cultures in some Shakespearean productions also labelled as intercultural, in which Shakespeare does not “dominate” over other cultural elements. Shakespeare productions by Tadashi Suzuki, Robert Wilson and Ong Ken Sen would be good examples. With these directors, a Shakespeare play seldom sustains its entire structure. For instance, Suzuki cuts, rearranges, and mixes the Shakespearean text with fragments from other classics and his own writings, openly avowing that the director’s responsibility is to present the aspects that he is interested in (197). Likewise, for Wilson, a “text is just the surface” and each should “come into its own, hearing and seeing” (103). In Wilson’s theatre, the visual does not necessarily correspond to the verbal. As Erika Fischer-Lichte points out in her study of Wilson’s *Lear*, in which the title role was performed by Marianne Hoppe, an actress (1990), “the process of uncoupling [of gesture and word] denies the dominance of language over the body and directs the relationship between them towards absolute mutual indifference” (95). In such postmodern theatre, Shakespearean text is just one element that participates in the performance alongside other foreign cultural traditions. Putting a Shakespearean story entirely in an indigenous theatre form would be another possibility for equal cultural encounter between Shakespeare

and Eastern theatre. *kathakali Lear*, *kunju Macbeth*, and *zulu Macbeth* among others provide ample examples of such encounters. In these productions the Shakespeare text becomes secondary to other theatre signs such as coded gestures, movements, singing and dancing; Shakespeare's language is translated, silenced, adapted and cut to fit the theatrical form.

This kind of deconstructed Shakespeare productions needs to be differentiated from "straight" Shakespeare performance that employs other cultural traditions within the framework of the original text. Carl Weber's classification of two interculturalisms would elucidate the differences of the two groups with clarity (27-37). Weber explains interculturalism by contrasting two terms, "acculturation" and "transculturation":

The latter [transculturation] would signify a genuine effort to "transculturaturate" (as in "transcend" and "transform") both the foreign and indigenous tradition, or specific elements of them, the former an effort to "acculturate" (as in "acquire" and "acclimate") a foreign culture or aspects of it. (31)

Transculturation is "the deconstruction of a text/code and its wrenching displacement to a historically and socially different situation," acculturation "the inscription of a preserved foreign code in a native structure, which implies that an ideology is inscribed with it" (35). Criticizing acculturation as superficial interculturalism, like using alien culture as "a spicy sauce to make some old familiar gruel palatable again," Weber advocates transculturation as genuine interculturalism, which brings about deconstruction and displacement of the original culture (30).

Western performance history is full of examples of successful transculturation, notes Weber: Plautus and Terence adopting the New Comedy

from the Greek traditions for their own social concerns; the Renaissance playwrights' use of the Roman theatre; the introduction of the Italian stage technology in the Jacobean theatre; Shakespeare's influence on German playwrights such as Goethe and Schiller; and Brecht's cultural absorption ranging from the Elizabethan, classic Indian and Japanese *noh* theatre, motifs and structures from Villon, Kipling, Synge, the content from American stories and Russian novels and the performance modes from early Hollywood films and techniques of classic Chinese opera (31-32). Although not specified in Weber's long list, Shakespeare's formation of new plays from various sources including Greek and Roman heritage like Ovid and Plutarch, French and Italian *novelle*, Danish and English chronicles, and even other contemporary playwrights' plays makes an excellent case of successful transculturation.

Weber's preference for transculturation over acculturation escapes the risk of superficial use of foreign cultures as exoticism; it is questionable whether transculturation can be regarded as *interculturalism*, if the elements of the source culture are dissolved and lost into "a new text or technique, which gains its own identity of form and of content" (34). Clearly, transculturated Shakespeare productions such as *kunju Macbeth* or Suzuki's *The Chronicle of Macbeth* operate on a level different from "straight" and faithful representation of Shakespeare's texts like Ninagawa *Macbeth*, for instance. "Transcultured" Shakespeare performances, even if they may satisfy the criterion of being intercultural, are difficult to define as authentic Shakespeare. Bharucha is almost singular among critics in posing the question of Shakespearean authenticity in Eastern intercultural productions: "Are these forms (such as Kathakali, Noh, and Chinese opera) prepared to take on the conceptual and ideational complexities of Shakespeare's texts, and, more specifically, his language?" ("Foreign" 16). Once Shakespeare has been transformed and transculturated, such productions

could pass without a Shakespearean tag, as, for instance, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is independent from Saxo Grammaticus or Belleforest. The advertizing of the Bard's big name even with the slightest association reveals the power of the Shakespearean currency in the international theatre market, a point I will return to at a later stage.

Both intercultural approaches to Shakespeare, acculturation and transculturation, have their own dilemmas. As long as the verbal hegemony persists in the theatre, acculturated Shakespeare productions are likely to subordinate other cultures to the prison of Shakespearean words, and thus run the risk of reviving cultural imperialism. Transcultured Shakespeare easily falls into a director's theatre, making foreign cultural elements as well as Shakespeare secondary to his or her vision. Such a "Shakespeare" production would decontextualize and dehistoricize the Elizabethan drama out of its original cultural context, in the same way Brook did with the Sanskrit epic *Mahabharata*. "Could [Interculturalism] . . . have better commerce than with [Shakespeare]?" one might ask (*Hamlet* 3.1.108-9).⁴ The power of Shakespeare is such that "it will sooner transform" other cultures "into his likeness." Or, Shakespeare, deconstructed, would cease to be Shakespeare. To quote Hamlet, "This was sometime a paradox, but now the time gives it proof" (*Hamlet* 3.1.113-14).

The Lure of Intercultural Shakespeare

Theatre critics castigate Brook for his misappropriation and dehistoricization

4) Line references are to Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed., Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

of *The Mahabharata*, while they use a different yardstick for Shakespeare. Admittedly, *The Mahabharata* is different from Shakespeare's plays; it is "not merely a great narrative poem" but "the fundamental source of knowledge of [Indian] literature, dance, painting, sculpture, theology, statecraft, sociology, economy—in short, [Indian] *history* in all its detail and density," notes Bharucha (*Theatre* 69). Apart from such differences, Shakespeare has a long history of decontextualization that allows and even welcomes its appropriations.

The stage history of Shakespeare in England has been a long process of cultural translation, both in terms of form and content. The text has been adapted to fit the time's interest and needs, with its scenographic representation always subject to the time's material conditions and aesthetics. Shakespeare survived endless transformations, but the question remains: what is the essence that makes a production Shakespeare even after metamorphosis? This essence would explain the putative universality that is often attributed to Shakespeare. A good point in contrast would be Japanese *noh* theatre, which is over two centuries older than Shakespeare, but has kept its form and acting convention unchanged. The fact that Shakespeare has been regarded as universal despite constant changes in theatrical representations is a telling example of Western logocentrism, which disregards outward materiality and puts value in ideas only.

What is retained of Shakespeare throughout the change was his language. Shakespearean logocentrism manifests itself best in the adoration of the text. Changes were allowed for visuals, acting and stage business, but not for words. The idolatry of the Shakespearean language reached its climax in the modernist tradition of the early twentieth century, despite the certain unintelligibility that four-hundred-year-old archaic language entailed (or was it because of the mysteriousness resulting from linguistic opacity?). Small wonder if "post"-modernist scholars welcome the truncations and transformations that the

Shakespeare text is subject to in radical productions. The demystification of the Bard through the deconstruction of his sacred language certainly gives gratification to the postmodern scholars armed with contemporary cultural theory.

Ronnie Mulryne's approval of Suzuki's Shakespeare productions as model intercultural theatre "both culturally inclusive and culturally specific" can be understood in such a context (93). Discussing Suzuki's *Tale of Lear*, Mulryne commends the "paradoxes of Suzuki's theatre art":

Suzuki transformed Shakespeare's text into a legendary art characteristic of the Noh. . . . But Suzuki has also maintained for a contemporary audience the disturbing oddity of Shakespeare's vision, and made it ours, by the pervasive techniques of his style—a transcultural achievement of notable significance. (93)

Mulryne's approval partly comes from Suzuki's iconoclastic treatment of the Shakespeare text: "Western, or indeed Japanese, bardolatry is appropriately quenched by this high-spirited eclecticism" (89). Thus, Suzuki's strategic deconstruction of Shakespeare contributes to equal cultural exchange, by diminishing Shakespeare's dominance to a harmonious level with other cultural traditions. However, even these iconoclastic academics are not entirely free from Western logocentrism. Once having deprived Shakespeare of his original theatrical form and even of his poetic language, critics resort to Shakespearean "spirit" to claim for authenticity. Even a most theory-conscious scholar such as Ronnie Mulryne evokes "Shakespeare's vision" to fathom Suzuki's intercultural practice. When Jan Kott approved Akira Kurosawa's Shakespearean film adaptations as authentic, denouncing Mnouchkine's straight theatre works "as fake Japanese and fake Shakespeare," he also based his judgment on how the

Shakespearean spirit is realized to the modern audience (Elsom 16). Ironically in the postmodern age, the touchstone for a “true” Shakespearean production turns out to be a logocentric one, however open a possible interpretation is.

Such logocentrist authentication of Shakespeare occurs in most intercultural productions, even when the connection to Shakespeare is the slightest. In adapting Shakespeare’s plays into foreign traditional theatre forms, a certain amount of “distortion” is inevitable and allowed, as long as it does not contradict the “spirit” of Shakespearean plays. Zha Peide and Tian Jia conclude in their study of Shakespeare in Chinese opera:

All one can say is that the success of an adaptation lies in keeping the Shakespearean spirit (the humanistic ideal and the vivid characterisations) in the original scripts on the one hand and bringing out the flavor of typical Chinese operas on the other. (211)

Such a statement implies the logocentric idea that of foremost importance in a Shakespeare play is the humanistic and universal theme it supposedly conveys, transcending all the boundaries of time and space. It presupposes the problematic hypothesis that there are meanings prescribed in the text that would authenticate true Shakespeare. Granted that there exist such fixed meanings that wait to be found, and were indeed found and realized in the adaptations, they would be at best half Shakespeare, as they lift the so-called Shakespearean “spirit” out of its original form and context of the Elizabethan theatre.

Over four hundred years of expansion across the world, Shakespeare is not so much an Elizabethan product as a world phenomenon. To be more precise, it is the specter of once Elizabethan Shakespeare (deprived of its physical presence) that haunts the theatre over the globe. Universalizing Shakespeare has

been a process of spiritualizing it, and abstract ideas cross cultural boundaries more freely than material forms. Understandably, Shakespeare is never regarded as a part of specific culture of early modern England, as other cultural traditions are or demand to be. Shakespeare's "universality" offers the basis for many intercultural productions, guaranteeing their access to diverse audiences. Alongside Brook who asserts Shakespeare's neutral universality ("What he wrote is not interpretation: it is the thing itself": 76), Lepage claims Shakespeare as everybody's ("[Shakespeare is] so basic, with such universal themes . . . so am I really doing someone else's work?": Delgado and Heritage 150). Ninagawa also bases his production on the universal aspects of Shakespeare ("The part of Shakespeare's work that reaches us after overcoming all those hurdles is what I take to be the essence of the work. My job is to capture this essence and bring it to life on stage—it is this part that addresses universal themes of humanity": "Interview"). Even an iconoclastic director as Suzuki turns to Shakespeare because of its universality ("Well, if I use Shakespeare or Euripides, for example, I don't feel I'm using a foreign text, rather the heritage of the human race": Carruthers 217). Shakespeare takes part in intercultural encounter, not as Elizabethan culture, but as governing agent that guarantees the delivery of universal themes.

Alongside Shakespeare's "universality," another reason that directors return to Shakespeare over and again is his international currency. Presenting Shakespeare as powerful cultural token, Alan Sinfield even compares Shakespeare to Jesus' garment, only touching the hem of which will cure the sick people (133). The "force" of Shakespeare in contemporary theatre is aptly summarized in W. B. Worthen's statement: "Shakespeare is an unusually prominent element of globalized theatre, at once the vehicle of an international theatrical avant-garde . . . , of intercultural exchange . . . , of global tourism.

. . . , and of postcolonial critique (*Force* 117-18).” Bharucha is less positive about Shakespearean performativity than Worthen: Shakespeare is reduced to “a narrative agency” and “mobilized as a catalyst” in Asian intercultural productions, working as “the pretext for dramatizing different cultural productions and difference across Asia” (“Foreign” 1-13). Shakespeare, deprived of Elizabethan/Jacobean historicity, operates like a “universal solvent” in the international theatre circuit, to borrow Frederick Turner’s words, along with other globalizing forces such as the international finance market and multinational corporations (257). The base structure underneath Shakespeare’s “universality” is global capitalism, which creates the illusion of universal Shakespeare in the form of international theatre festivals and world tours. Intercultural Shakespeare phenomenon offers a ready example to Fredric Jameson’s warning of “the becoming cultural of the economic, and the becoming economic of the cultural” in the postmodern time (60). The ever-growing Shakespeare tourist industry, in a variety of festivals, heritages, theme parks and so forth, is just one telling example of Jameson’s poignant statement about commodification of cultures in the postmodern world.⁵⁾

Promoting a production as intercultural Shakespeare, even when it is not intercultural, or not Shakespeare, or neither, reveals a desire similar to that of McDonald’s aggressive expansion over the globe or HSBC’s localizing strategy to reach the remotest part of the world. Brian Singleton singles out the logic of global capitalism as the prime mover in intercultural theatre practices: “Instantly recognizable and mythologized intercultural icons are being used in popular culture for transnational communication, in order to ensure the greatest

5) For further discussion on cultural tourism, see Dennis Kennedy, “Shakespeare and Cultural Tourism,” in *Shakespeare and his Contemporaries in Performance*, ed. Edward J. Esche (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 3-20.

coverage to the biggest possible market” (629). Although Singleton tends to overestimate the economic factor in intercultural theatre, there exists an undeniable symbiosis between interculturalism and globalization. The use of the Western canon like Shakespeare adds a tinge of high art to an intercultural production as well as guarantees easy circulation in the countries that were and are under Western influence. For such reasons productions advertize themselves as intercultural and Shakespearean, creating an illusion of utopian cultural pluralism. Unwary acceptance of intercultural Shakespeare as such may beguile us into thinking that the time of Western cultural imperialism is now behind us. The ubiquity of Shakespeare may lead us to believe in his universality. To quote Pierre Bourdieu, “the producer of a work of art is not the artist but the field of production as a universe of belief which produces the value of the work of art as a fetish” (229). The proliferation of the so-called intercultural Shakespeare projects a wistful thinking for cultural equality, while close analysis reveals the gap between what is and what should be.

주제어: 셰익스피어, 문화상호주의, 연극, 정통성, 세계화, 보편성

Works Cited

- Alter, Jean. “Decoding Mnouchkine’s Shakespeare (A Grammar of Stage Signs).” *Performing Texts*. Ed. Michael Issacharoff and Robin Jones. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1988. 132-48.

- Bharucha, Rustom. *Theatre and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- . "Foreign Asia / Foreign Shakespeare." *Theatre Journal* 56.1 (2004): 1-28.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995.
- Brook, Peter. *The Shifting Point: Forty Years of Theatrical Exploration 1946-1987*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Carlson, Marvin. "Brook and Mnouchkine: Passages to India?" *The Intercultural Performance Reader*. Ed. Pavis (1996). 79-92.
- Carruthers, Ian. "The Chronical of Macbeth: Suzuki Tadashi's Transformation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*." *Shakespeare: World View*. Ed. Kerr et al (1996). 214-36.
- Delgado, Maria, and Paul Heritage, eds. *In Contact with the Gods? Directors Talk Theatre*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996.
- Elsom, John. *Is Shakespeare Still Our Contemporary?* London: Routledge, 1989.
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika. "Between Difference and Indifference: Marianne Hoppe in Robert Wilson's *Lear*." *Gender in Performance: the Presentation of Difference in the Performing Arts*. Ed. Laurence Senelick. Hanover: U of New England P, 1992. 86-98.
- Jameson, Fredric. "Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue." *The Culture of Globalization*. Ed. Jameson and Miyoshi (1998). 54-77.
- Kennedy, Dennis. *Looking at Shakespeare: A Visual History of Twentieth-Century Performance*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- , ed. *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

- , ed. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Theatre & Performance*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Marranca, Bonnie, and Gautam Dasgupta, eds. *Interculturalism and Performance*. New York: PAJ Publications, 1991.
- Mulryne, Ronnie. "The Perils and Profits of Interculturalism and the Theatre Art of Tadashi Suzuki." *Shakespeare and the Japanese Stage*. Ed. Sasayama et al (1998). 71-94.
- Ninagawa, Yukio. Interview by Ryoko Maria Nakamura. *The Japan Times*. Online. 6 October 2002.
- Pavis, Patrice. *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. Trans. Loren Kruger. London: Routledge, 1992.
- , ed. *The Intercultural Performance Reader*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Sasayama, Takashi, Ronnie Mulryne and Margaret Shewring, eds. *Shakespeare and the Japanese Stage*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Ed. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.
- Sinfield, Alan. "Making Space: Appropriation and Confrontation in Recent British Plays." *The Shakespeare Myth*. Ed. Holderness. 128-44.
- Singleton, Brian. "Interculturalism." *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Theatre & Performance*. Ed. Kennedy (2003). 628-30
- Suzuki, Tadashi. Interview with Yasunari Takahashi, Tetsuo Anzai, Kazuko Matsuoka, Ted Motohashi and James Brandon. 6 April 1995. *Performing Shakespeare in Japan*. Ed. Mimami et al (1998). 196-207.
- Turner, Frederick. "The Universal Solvent: Meditations on the Marriage of World Cultures." *Interculturalism and Performance*. Ed. Marranca and Dasgupta (1991). 257-80.
- Weber, Carl. "AC/TC: Currents of Theatrical Exchange." *Interculturalism and*

- Performance*. Ed. Marranca and Dasgupta (1991). 27-37.
- Wilson, Robert. Interview with *Der Spiegel*. "Hear, See, Act." *The Intercultural Performance Reader*. Ed. Pavis (1996). 99-104.
- Worthen, W. B. *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- . *Shakespeare and the Force of Modern Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Zha, Peide, and Jia Tian. "Shakespeare in Traditional Chinese Operas." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39.2 (1988): 204-11.

The Lure of Intercultural Shakespeare

Abstract

Yeeyon Im

Shakespeare is unarguably a most active participant in the so-called intercultural theatre, but has attracted little attention from intercultural theorists and critics. This essay locates Shakespeare within intercultural debates, the two most significant issues of which are cultural equality and authenticity. In most intercultural Shakespeare productions, non-Western cultural elements are no more than scenographic embellishments to the framework of Shakespearean plot, character and theme. Despite the increasing emphasis on performance in contemporary theatre, the continuing hegemony of verbal signs over performing signs makes an “intercultural” Shakespeare theatre of this kind mainly a Shakespearean event. While deconstructionist and indigenized Shakespeare productions deliver cultural equality, they lose claims for Shakespearean authenticity. Intercultural Shakespeare turns out to be a paradox.

Despite such dilemmas, productions dubbed as intercultural Shakespeare abound. The way to the universal Bard was paved through the long stage history that approved any theatrical changes as long as Shakespearean “spirit” was retained: a telling example of Western logocentrism that disregards outward materiality and puts value in ideas only. Shakespeare, deprived of Elizabethan/Jacobean historicity, operates like a “universal solvent” in the international theatre circuit under the logic of global capitalism. The use of the Western canon like Shakespeare adds a tinge of high art to an intercultural production as well as guarantees easy circulation in the countries that were and are under Western influence. For such reasons productions advertize themselves

as intercultural and Shakespearean, creating an illusion of utopian cultural pluralism; a close analysis of intercultural Shakespeare only exposes the liaison between interculturalism and cultural imperialism.

Key Words

Shakespeare, interculturalism, theatre, authenticity, globalization, universality