Re-Presenting the Other:

Cleopatra and Othello in Shakespeare Intertexts, 1678-2016

By Sunghee Pak

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Theatre and Drama)

At the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2020

Date of final oral examination: 06/24/2020

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Aparna Dharwadker, Professor, English and Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies

Karen Britland, Professor, English

Michael Peterson, Professor, Art and Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies

Mary Trotter, Associate Professor, English and Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies

Mike Vanden Heuvel, Professor, Theatre and Drama and Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies

Copyright © 2018 by Sunghee Pak

All Rights Reserved

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ii

Abstract iv

Chapter One
The Other in Shakespeare's Plays: A Global Perspective 1

Chapter Two
Female Characters' Agency and Blame in Restoration Theatre 32

Chapter Three
Adapting Characters into National Representatives 74

Chapter Four
Postcolonial Staging and the Form of Metadrama 117

Chapter Five
The Audience as an Agent of Social Critique 144

Conclusion 173

Appendix
Line Count of *The Death of Cleopatra* 181

Works Cited 183

Acknowledgements

To begin with, I must thank my advisor, Aparna Dharwadker. Since our first meeting via Skype before my arrival to Madison until the completion of my doctoral degree, she has offered me guidance and support not only in her classrooms and in writing this dissertation, but also in my challenging journey as an international student pursuing a Ph.D degree. She patiently waited for me as I wandered through several potential topics for my dissertation project, then showed incredible dedication to my final topic, advising me to improve my writing in both content and style. Eventually, what she taught me through her classes on Restoration theatre, world theatre, and postcolonial theatre became the basis of this dissertation. Aparna also kindly helped me to navigate my career as a Ph.D student in Madison, providing me with full support as I applied for various positions, grants, and fellowships. For her support and dedication, I am greatly indebted. I should also mention that she has shown kindness and understanding personally, which meant a lot to me as I pursued my degree so far away from home.

I also want to express my gratitude to my committee members. I deeply appreciate Karen Britland, Mike Vanden Heuvel, Michael Peterson, and Mary Trotter for the inspiration and encouragement they have provided, which made the completion of this project possible. From the time I joined her seminar, Karen has always encouraged me both academically and emotionally, giving suggestions and insights, which enabled me to overcome the frustrations during challenging times. Mike introduced me to new styles of theatre and guided me with productive conversations. Michael, who helped me to have a successful start in the doctoral program in my first year, generously provided me with his fresh perspectives and solid suggestions until my final stage in the program. Mary, who was also my supervisor, not only supported me with her academic expertise, but also with her thoughtful guidance in teaching, nurturing me to be an instructor as well as a researcher.

I am grateful for all the resources in various areas that enabled my research. Theatre companies Toneelgroep Amsterdam and Seongbukdong Beedoolkee kindly shared the video recordings of their productions with me. The librarians at UW provided me with essential help in accessing valuable resources, and administrative staffs at UW, the amazing Brenda Weiss in particular, made it possible for me to reach this point. Also, I was able to launch my project thanks to the generous funding from the Fulbright Foundation and the Korean-American Educational Commission. The financial supports from the UW-Madison Graduate School and the A. W. Mellon Foundation enabled the completion of this project. I must also thank my supervisors who trusted me and showed me examples to follow as an instructor. While I was working as a TA in several positions, Brad Hughes and Nancy Linh Karls at the Writing Center, Morris Young and Mary Fiorenza in the English 100 program, Larry Edgerton in the Summer Collegiate Experience program, Claus E. Anderson in German, Nordic, and Slavic+ Department all taught me different aspects of teaching, inspiring me with various qualities I wish to emulate and develop in my future career.

Throughout my years in Madison, my professors at Yonsei University continued to send me guidance and encouragement from afar. Mi Seong Woo showed me unstinting support and trust, and what I learned from her became the foundation of who I am as a scholar. I am honored to follow in her footsteps as an alum both at Yonsei and UW-Madison. To Kyung Won Lee and Hong Won Suh, I owe my thanks for the academic inspiration and consultations they kindly provided in times of need.

I am also indebted to many of my colleagues who have shown me unlimited kindness and support. Their help in so many different shapes was essential in pursuing my academic goals while keeping my sanity. I wonder if I could ever pay back to Hyonbin, who has continuously assisted me from the start to the completion of my doctoral journey in every aspect possible. As we continue our careers in academia, I expect to have a chance to pay my gratitude during our long companionship. Also, Sungjin Shin, who read, wrote, and discussed with me, imbued me with her positive energy, which has been an essential help in completing this dissertation. I thank my friends and editors Steffen Silvis, Niccole Carner, and Holly Berkowitz for letting me sharpen my ideas with more clarity and accuracy, and for providing me with comforts and laughs whenever I needed them. Ashley Bellet, whose creativity brought color into my life, and Kathleen Cawley, whose humor brightened my days, also became my support whenever I was in need of help, whether it be emotional or practical. In addition, I dare to call my time in Madison one of the greatest chapters of my life, thanks to the enjoyment and friendship in the Korean Tennis Club, USTA, and St. Paul's University Catholic Center community.

Last but not least, my biggest thanks must go to my mother, Mi Hyung Lee, and my sister, Sabina (Sung Yun) Park. My doctoral degree would have been impossible if it were not for my mother's devoted encouragement and patience. I also thank her for being a model educator, which has inspired me in pursuing my own career. And, to my sister, who is my oldest friend, I express my gratitude for her long-distance support. The last line goes to my beloved companion, Munji, for whose existence I am deeply blessed.

Abstract

This dissertation analyzes the depiction of Cleopatra and Othello in Shakespeare intertexts, in British and world theatre from the seventeenth century to the present. It examines how these two characters, who explicitly represent the racial and cultural "Other" in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606) and *Othello* (1604), respectively, are reframed to voice each adapter's cultural and political views. Unlike previous studies of Shakespearean adaptations, which have tended to focus on either intracultural or intercultural rewritings, this project juxtaposes intra- and intercultural variations and demonstrates how the adapted texts take similar advantage of Shakespeare's canonicity, while problematizing the claims of the canon's universality. This study thus examines the shaping influence of historical and cultural difference on the various authors' reactions to Shakespeare's plays through comparative analyses of the disparate portrayals of the two lead characters who are the Others on the basis of race and culture—and gender, in the case of Cleopatra.

My objective is to offer fresh insights through analyses of selected adaptations from within and outside British culture. The English adaptations include plays by John Dryden, Mary Pix, and George Bernard Shaw, while the world authors include Derek Walcott (Saint Lucia/Trinidad), Murray Carlin (South Africa/Uganda), Ahmad Shawqi (Egypt), Ivo van Hove (Belgium/the Netherlands), and Hyun-tak Kim (South Korea). The list of plays attests to the diversity of the chosen texts for this study—eight plays from six countries, written or performed in four different languages, ranging over three centuries. In addition, the plays represent a wide variation in their styles, from Elizabethan and neoclassical to realistic, metatheatrical, postdramatic and experimental. By analyzing these plays with a focus on their sociocultural

contexts, this dissertation speculates the significance of re-creating Shakespeare as a way to examine our perception of the marginalized in our own contemporary society.

Chapter 1. The Other in Shakespeare's Plays: A Global Perspective

Othello. Her name, that was as fresh
As Dian's visage, is now begrimed and black
As mine own face. (*Othello*, 3.3.389-391)

Antony. O this false soul of Egypt! This grave charm
Whose eye backed forth my wars and called them home,
Whose bosom was my crownet, my chief end,
Like a right gypsy hath at fast and loose
Beguiled me to the very heart of loss. (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 4.12.25-29)

What is the significance of staging and watching Shakespeare in 2020? Why are 400-year-old plays still relevant to a contemporary audience? Further, what is the meaning of performing Shakespeare today in places where his works are considered "foreign"? On April 23, 2016, the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's death was celebrated all over the world.[1] The Globe Theatre in London, for instance, presented a project entitled "The Complete Walk," which combined 37 short films, each showing a scene from a play by the Bard, shot in the locations where the plays are set. To emphasize the "international appeal" of Shakespeare, the project was also made available in cities outside England, including Madrid, Gdansk, and Taipei (Young). Barack Obama, who was then visiting the United Kingdom as the president of the United States of America, stopped by at the Globe and enjoyed a short scene from *Hamlet* as a private performance (Kennedy, M.). Outside England, the anniversary was celebrated with various

[1] The 23rd of April, coincidently, is the conjectural date of Shakespeare's birth. The Parish Register at Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-upon-Avon records his baptism on Wednesday, 26th of April 1564. Baptisms were expected to take place within three days after the birth, and no later than the first Sunday after the birth (Shakespeare Birthplace Trust).

performances of Shakespeare's works in many countries, including Egypt, India, Jordan, and the U.S. to name a few (Kennedy, M.). South Korea was no exception; there was a series of Shakespearean performances, including the British Council's project titled "ShakespeareLives (Shakespeare Korea)," featuring an operatic adaptation of *Macbeth* (directed by Geon-young Lee); ballet versions such as *Shakespeare in Ballet: Midsummer Night's Dream* (directed by In-hee Kim), and Kenneth MacMillan's *Romeo & Juliet* (performed by The Universal Ballet); a music-centered performance, *The Tiger Lillies Perform Hamlet* (by Republique Theatre, directed by Martin Tulinius); and adapted plays such as *Hamlet - The Play* (directed by Dong-yeon Kim) and *Henry IV—Prince and Fallstaff* (directed by Kwang-bo Kim) (British Council).

To South Korean audiences, Shakespeare is one of the most familiar foreign authors, indeed, the most famous foreign playwright. Interestingly, however, oftentimes the audience sitting in a performance are convinced that what they are watching is *the* Shakespeare, without thinking deeply about the changes the play undergoes as it is translated and interpreted by the adapters of the piece, who re-create the work to make it suitable specifically for a contemporary South Korean audience. Many argue that Shakespeare is "universal," quoting his wide-spread fame and reception; however, from the perspective of a non-European audience, Shakespearean plays do represent the perspectives of the West. These perspectives are considerably more evident in the plays that feature characters who are singled out from their European settings, raising questions about the identity of "others" and their relationship with the mainstream members of their society.

"Shakespeare is ubiquitous," says Ton Hoenselaars, introducing a series of articles that discuss Shakespeare around the globe (1033); however, this widespread popularity cannot be separated from sociopolitical implications. Considering all the translated and adapted versions of

his plays worldwide, Shakespeare certainly is a playwright whose works are most widely known and performed. His works have been translated into more than eighty languages as individual texts, and even the complete works are available in more than thirty different languages (Orkin 1071). Shakespeare's plays have been performed abroad from early on. From the 1580s, some touring players traveled across the English Channel, often sponsored by noblemen; these troupes performed works by Thomas Kyd, Christopher Marlowe, and Thomas Middleton more frequently, but also played Shakespeare's later on (Katritzky 261; Hoenselaars 1034). There is a record that, in 1605, a play featuring the character of Falstaff was performed at the French court before Henri IV (Dobson and Wells, qtd. in Hoenselaars 1034). Then his plays reached Asia with the East India Company, where the performances had diplomatic and political purposes. Hoenselaars points out that such incidents reveal "how Shakespeare first made his way to Asia as part of a potent expansionist urge of a deep-seated politico-economic nature" (1035). The Bard's influence was evident across the Atlantic Ocean as well. In his *Democracy in America* (1835-40), Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that "[t]he literary genius of Great Britain still shines its light into the depths of the forests of the New World. There is scarcely a pioneer's cabin where you do not find a few odd volumes of Shakespeare" (qtd. in Hoenselaars 1035). Thus, the expansion of the British Empire evidently played a major role in not only introducing Shakespeare to the colonies within its reach, but also imprinting the proud conviction about the universality of his work.

Notably, Shakespeare's work has not been simply "played" straightforwardly all over the world; as much as Shakespeare traveled alongside imperial propaganda, his works were simultaneously adapted and appropriated to various degrees by other cultures. In fact, alterations to his works took place liberally both within and outside the national borders of Britain. Adaptations of Shakespeare, Mark Fortier notes, began while he was alive, with John Fletcher's

The Woman's Prize, a continuation of *Taming of the Shrew,* which was written circa 1611 (1046). Since then Shakespeare's plays have been continuously regenerated, in plausible resemblances to the "original"; mild adaptations that kept most of the plot and language but made noticeable changes in costume and design; translations into contemporary English or other languages; bold adaptations that highlight the adapters' creativity, and even cross-genre adaptations into novels, films, graphic novels, video games, and so forth.

In all of these inter-related works, there is one element in particular that invites subtle tensions to arise during the process of translating, adapting, or appropriating: the presence of the Other. Despite the difference in the contexts, the "Others" in Shakespeare's plays gained increased attention in the adapted works from within and outside the British context. From the early modern period onward, racial and cultural diversity in Britain increased significantly, and at the same time the nation's contact with the world grew wider, thus leading the British people to be more aware of racial and cultural Others in and out of their country. Also, as Shakespeare's works traveled outside Europe, certain audience groups began to find themselves in the Others within the Western paradigm of Shakespeare's plays. What, then, happens when the "Other" is marginalized on the stage, while an audience of his or her peers observe the scene? Further, what if the production team is clearly conscious of the political dynamics in the source text and modifies it to fit their audience?

In this dissertation, I attempt to answer these questions through an analysis of Shakespearean intertexts—including both closely related adaptations and work with distantly echoing allusions—which take Shakespeare as their foundation and build to serve their own cultural and political needs and speak to their own audiences. I also categorize works altered within Britain as "intracultural adaptations," and those altered elsewhere around the world as

"intercultural adaptations." As the sheer quantity of his work attests, Shakespeare's thirty-seven plays touch on a wide array of themes. Among these, the identity of the minority, particularly concerning those who are marginalized due to their race and cultural origin, matters more than ever in twenty-first century culture. Considering the vastly increased interactions across national borders and the growing importance of diversity within communities, the perception of otherness arguably needs more critical attention now than at any other previous time.

Among Shakespeare's thirty-seven plays, *The Tempest, Hamlet, and Othello* are the most regularly adapted (Sanders 52). Julie Sanders points out that, because *Othello* depicts racism through dialogue and action, the play "proved a rich source for texts seeking to examine the tensions of multicultural societies in the modern era" (52). While *Othello* is a play that shows the racial Other in a white-dominant society, there is a counterpart that depicts the racial Other in her own land: *Antony and Cleopatra*. Racism might stand out less in the characters' dialogue and action in the latter play because one of the play's main locations is Alexandria, Egypt; still, the contrast between the East and the West is apparent in this play as well. Some scholars, like L. C. Knights, regard "the range and depth of the poetry" as a reason that gives a universal value to *Antony and Cleopatra* (qtd. in Brown 23). However, from a contemporary point of view (and more so in the discussion of "global Shakespeares"), the strengths of *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Othello* lie in the intertextuality that allows many points of intervention, and the themes found in them—such as race, foreignness, and gender—that are discussed with increasing frequency and significance in our society.

To trace origins, *Othello* and *Antony and Cleopatra* are themselves adaptations of pre-existing texts. Although neither of them follows a particular source-text to a degree that designates it a faithful and deferential inheritor, both have a strong intertextual connection with

pre-existing texts. It is widely accepted that *Othello*'s plot was largely taken from Giraldi Cinthio's *Hecatommithi* (1565), while Shakespeare referred to *A Geographical Histoire of Africa* (1550) to shape Othello as a character. Likewise, although he made changes to details, Shakespeare took the characters and the main plot of *Antony and Cleopatra* from Plutarch's *The Lives of Noble Grecians and Romans*, which was translated into English by Sir Thomas North in 1579. Intertextuality is already present in Shakespeare's work, which in turn becomes the source-text for the various works discussed in this dissertation. Although I use several different terms—adaptation, appropriation, rewriting, variation, or intertext—to refer to the plays chosen for the project, they are used to indicate an intertextual connection, from straight adaptations clearly identified by the author to more loosely connected texts that share only the same theme and plot structure.

The portrayal of racial and cultural Others in Shakespeare's plays is not a new topic of conversation in Shakespearean scholarship. Scholars such as Ania Loomba, for example, have provided insights on race and gender in Shakespeare plays and their adaptations from the 1990s. However, although there are many discussions of intercultural Shakespeare adaptations accompanied by the theoretical perspectives of postcolonialism and interculturalism, little critical attention has been paid to analyzing both intra- and intercultural adaptations together. Thus, my dissertation offers new insights by juxtaposing selected adaptations from both within and outside British culture. Among the eight selected plays, three are by English playwrights (John Dryden, George Bernard Shaw, and Mary Pix), while the other five are from around the globe, including Egypt (Ahmed Shawqi), South Africa/Uganda (Murray Carlin), Saint Lucia/Trinidad (Derek Walcott), Netherlands (Ivo van Hove), and South Korea (Hyun-tak Kim), respectively. My choice of plays excludes productions that deliberately emphasize exotic differences through

indigenous performance styles or traditional modes of aesthetics. In the case of intercultural adaptations in particular, I have taken this methodological stand to avoid the works that demonstrate "Shakespearean orientalism," to use Dennis Kennedy's phrase, which means "the importation of Eastern modalities into Shakespeare performance in the West" (294). It is a form of "orientalism" in that the performance in question is using Eastern aesthetics and styles in a decorative manner, using their exotic qualities to impress Europeans audiences. The term could be extended to include non-European productions aiming to appeal to Western audiences through an emphasis on "foreignness," satisfying the expectation of orientalism or exoticism in the West. Instead, the intercultural works I discuss in the following chapters employ realistic or postdramatic styles to help the audience focus more on the modification of words and ideas. Although I selected works that are spread over a long timeline, including Restoration plays as well as modern and contemporary ones, my analysis focuses on the themes and values each playwright underlines in relation to their sociocultural environment. Exploring the intercultural rewritings of Shakespeare alongside those that are intracultural, this dissertation investigates the impact of the historical and cultural contexts on the authors' reactions to Shakespeare's plays, revealed through comparative analyses of the disparate portrayals of Cleopatra and Othello—the two Shakespearean characters who are racial and cultural Others while also being the protagonists in their respective plays.

Before proceeding to a description of the individual chapters, I want to lay the groundwork by discussing the key concepts that informed this project. First, I will examine briefly the early modern perspectives on the Others that are foundational to my discussion, followed by a gloss on the terms "adaptation" and "intertextuality" which offers the rationale for using the adapted works as a way to understand the adapters' sociocultural perspectives as well

as their contemporary audiences. Adaptations, and more broadly, intertexts, as in the cases of the works discussed in this project, demonstrate clear examples of interculturation and transculturation. In addition, the concept of global Shakespeare will be introduced to provide a background for examining a broad range of intracultural and intercultural intertexts. Based on these concepts, I will also explain the methodology I employ in my analysis of the plays.

The Others in Shakespeare's World

Shakespeare and his audience witnessed the birth of colonial power, and, at the same time, racial distinctions in a modern sense. They encountered "foreign" subjects and their different cultures inside and outside of their realm. Internally, London's population tripled in size between 1520 and 1600 due to continuous migration, and externally, the East India Company was established on December 31, 1600 (Loomba 13)—four years before *Othello* (1604), and six years before *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606) was written. Although scarce but clear documentations attest to the presence of black people living and working in British society as early as the mid-1500s,[2] they were not regarded as "a distinct, considerable population" in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Habib 4-5). However, their number grew rapidly, and in 1768, the number of black servants in London was estimated at 20,000 (Taylor 12). Londoners' reactions to these foreigners were self-contradictory; they were "more open" to trading goods and slaves, and yet more "insular" in their treatment of outsiders who happened to live among them (Loomba 4). As encounters with foreigners became more frequent, their "strangeness" became less attractive (Hunter 45), and more emphasis was placed instead on "the nature of the

[2] Imtiaz Habib lists a collection of records of black people in early modern British society, including professionals such as Peter Negro, a soldier, in 1548, and a needle-maker recalled by William Harris in the early 1550s (2-4). The first black people to arrive in England were those who accompanied Catherine of Aragon from Spain in 1501 (Habib 22-23).

deep difference" (Harris, B. 97). Such distinctions between the (supposedly) superior self and the outsiders not only generated fabricated images of other cultures but also contributed to England's cultural "self-fashioning," to use Stephen Greenblatt's term.

The distinction started with "us" in the nation versus "others" from abroad, which soon solidified into a racial distinction between white and black. According to Gary Taylor, although Queen Elizabeth I commanded "Negroes and blackamoors" to be expelled, targeting them based on their skin tone, the group contrasting those "blackamoors" were "people of our nation," not "whites" (24). In other words, although a darker skin tone was a mark of otherness, in Elizabethan England "white" as the racial counterpart of "black" has not been firmly established yet. Further, possessing white skin was far from being a source of superiority. "Corporeal whiteness" in this period, Taylor observes, "was a symptom of excess phlegm, and phlegmatic people were short, fat, slothful, sleepy, idle, dull, heavy, slow voluptuaries" (34). The ideal tone of skin complexion was not white, but "golden," as is observed in the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries (Taylor 35-36). Shakespeare did use "white" as a compliment for women, but for adult male characters being described as "white" was an insult. Such different usage leads Taylor to conclude that the term did not carry the meaning of racial distinction as we know it today (Taylor 38). However, "white" gradually changed to mean Europeans in a "positiv[e] and exclusiv[e]" way, and by 1661, "whites" started to be used as a generic noun (Taylor 47). Thus, the nature of the word "white," Taylor points out, is figurative, rather than literal; it is part of an identity, which can be either personally or socially formed through selective memory. When one describes a person as "white," he explains, it is not a literal description, but instead a word "construed as a generic identity, [which] helps to produce practical colorphobia" (7-9). Since

then, a darker skin tone, as opposed to white, has become one of the factors that define someone as the Other—with a connotation of inferiority—in Western European culture.

Considering the social atmosphere in which the concept of the Other began to consolidate on the basis of race, Othello and Cleopatra have become prime figures for exploring the negotiation of racial otherness in Shakespeare's plays and in the numerous intertexts that have followed his work. *Othello* and *Antony and Cleopatra* are worth exploring in that they are the only two plays of Shakespeare that have geographical and racial Others as their protagonists. Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* is also described as a Moor and is a major figure in the play, but he takes the role of a villain or antagonist, rather than a protagonist. Another marginalized character, Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice,* is disliked by the rest of the characters due to his different religion, but he still shares the same European geographical and social background. Cleopatra, who is an Egyptian female on the throne, and Othello, a famed Moorish general, are "Others" that are distinctively visible because of their racial difference and their dominant position in their society—and for the audience, also because of their strong presence on stage as the leading characters in their respective plays.[3] Othello, who is singled out as an outsider in the Italian setting of the play, and Cleopatra, who resides in her Egyptian kingdom, are both used to depict the "foreign East" that is opposed to the homeland of the author and his original audience, represented by Desdemona's Venice and Antony's Rome. Thus, an analysis of these two characters' afterlives reveals varying perspectives and attitudes towards racial and geographical Others—who, in the source texts, are marginalized in accordance with the social standards of Shakespeare's time—as they travel around the world in various productions, which will be discussed in detail in the following chapters.

---

[3] Also, both of their names appear in the titles of the plays, signaling their significance and strong presence in the plays.

Adaptation, Intertextuality, and Cultural Relationships

Adaptations and intertexts of Shakespeare provide useful insights in understanding the changing perspectives on the marginalized members of a society in a different time and place. Shakespeare has become a conveniently accessible source for writers and performers in and out of England, offering a wide range of works for a comparative study. To regenerate his or her version of Shakespeare, each creator makes conscious and deliberate choices in deciding what to retain and what to change on the basis of the commonly shared ideas in society as well as his or her own point of view. To analyze their works properly, it is important to recognize the varying levels of intertextual relationships in them. Intertext can include a broader range than adaptation as it can be a trace of an unintentional allusion as well as an intentional connection calculated by the author. Thus, all adaptations by definition demonstrate deliberate intertextuality, while not every intertext is considered an adaptation. Therefore, before discussing each play in this dissertation, it is essential to examine the process and the significance of creating adaptations and intertexts as a literary convention, which provides the basis for using these works as representative social commentaries.

First, the definition of adaptation requires some clarification. When creators intentionally underline the intertextual relationship between their work and a certain pre-existing work, the newly created piece can be categorized as an adaptation or an appropriation. According to Julie Sanders, adaptation can be distinguished from appropriation based on the writer's attitude: while adapters clearly introduce their work as "an interpretation or re-reading of a canonical precursor," appropriators tend to make the relationship more subtle. However, she adds that the two terms are often similar in that "a political or ethical commitment shapes a writer's,

director's, or performer's decision to re-interpret a source text" (2). Therefore, it is important to evaluate the sociocultural moment of adaptation to analyze the political and ethical dimension of each work. Similarly, the practice of quotation has to be distinguished from citation. In adaptive texts, "quotations" can be either supportive or questioning, while "citations" show a more deferential relationship to the source text (Sanders 4).[4] On the whole, adaptation "constitutes a more sustained engagement with a single text or source than the more glancing act of allusion or quotation, even, citation, allows" (Sanders 4). Adaptation by its very nature enlarges the authority of the source text, as it acts as the base ingredient of the project; however, as Sanders notes and this dissertation will further explore, "adaptation can also be oppositional, even subversive" (9). As an adapted text is an explicit representation of the later author's interpretation of the source text, the Shakespearean canon has functioned as a "test bed" for centuries, providing a "cultural barometer for the practice and politics of adaptation and appropriation" (Sanders 51).

Among many Western literary canons, Shakespeare's works became a particularly effective "test bed" because of their canonical status, malleability, and the wide variety of the works either stemming from or connected to them. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, the co-editors of *Adaptations of Shakespeare*, state that "As long as there have been plays by Shakespeare, there have been adaptations of those plays" (1). It is hard to deny that the continuous reworkings of Shakespeare fortify his canonical status, contributing to his title: "a guarantor of cultural value" (Fischlin and Fortier 6, 11). Even subversive playwrights, regardless of their position in the canon, make use of the presupposed greatness of Shakespeare's literature to garner attention for their confrontational messages, while more deferential ones share the light

[4] Marjorie B. Garber also highlights the double meaning of quotation: "authenticity or doubt" (8).

of the canon's fame. At a glance, this seems to prove the perpetuating power of Shakespeare; however, from a different angle, it indeed attests to the fact that his fame is deeply indebted to the presence of ample adaptations and intertexts.

Considering the use of Shakespeare on the global stage, the foremost reason for the perpetuation of the Bard in fact lies in the adaptability of his plays. As Dennis Kennedy puts it, "the universality" of Shakespeare comes "not from Shakespeare's transcendence but from his malleability" that allows every adapter to make changes to his text to serve his or her own purpose (301). Expressing a similar opinion, Parmita Kapadia, who analyzes highly intertextual and postmodern adaptations of Shakespeare by Salman Rushdie, argues that "Shakespeare's literary endurance and global iconic status depend upon the revision, adaptations, and appropriations of his work" (3). Even Jacques Derrida, who expresses his admiration for the Bard, adds that "everything" can be found in other authors as well as in Shakespeare:

> I know that everything is in Shakespeare: everything and the rest, so everything or nearly. But after all, everything is also in Celan, and in the same way, although differently, and in Plato or in Joyce, in the Bible, in Vico or in Kafka, not to mention those still living, everywhere, well, almost everywhere. (67)

Shakespeare's plays contain themes that could be called "universal"; however, this is not a unique characteristic that applies only to Shakespeare. His plays provide easier ways for many adapters around the world for various reasons; these could include the convenience that comes with his firmly established status as a canonical author, the impact they can generate using his well-known titles, the intertextuality already embedded in his plays that offers the potential for expansion in meanings, and his marketability, among other reasons.

Taking full advantage of the canon's accessibility, adapters take Shakespeare's plays to express themselves, and, through the act of adaptation, the canon is constantly being reframed. To Edward Said, quotation is "a constant reminder that writing is a form of displacement," since even a subtle allusion as well as a direct quotation reaffirms that "other writing serves to displace present writing" (22). The quotation or allusion we see at the present moment is taking the place of a previous text, emphasizing, repurposing, or altering its meaning. In the frame of the adapter, Shakespeare does not necessarily remain the authoritative owner of the meaning; instead, the adapter's intention and perspective take hold, creating a work that is more relevant and tangible to his or her time and place. On a similar note, acknowledging the originality of adaptation, Fortier asserts that "inasmuch as Shakespeare stands at the apex of dramatic and literary creativity, translation and adaptation stand there, too" (1046). Adaptation is not a passive one-way transmission of an existing text, but an active application of ideas that allows the discussion of a theme to evolve in response to the unique dynamics of each creator's community. For that reason, adaptation can be seen as "a process rather than a beginning or an end" (Fischlin and Fortier 3). As attitudes of adapters toward their source text vary, the importance of considering the specifics of any cultural work that re-contextualizes Shakespeare becomes more vital when understanding the dynamic between the work and certain political issues.

Such intention and perspective should be read in the context of intertextuality as the adapters are locating themselves within a stream of conversation among other texts with connectable themes. Graham Allen acknowledges that "[t]exts, whether they be literary or non-literary, are viewed . . . as lacking in any kind of independent meaning" (1). Pointing out that a newly created text is based on its precedents, Allen argues that a text should be interpreted in relation to other texts:

> The act of reading . . . plunges us into a network of textual relations. To interpret a text, to discover its meaning, or meanings, is to trace those relations. Meaning becomes something which exists between a text and all the other texts to which it refers and relates, moving out from the independent text into a network of textual relations. The text becomes the intertext. (1)

An intertextual understanding of a literary work, he concludes, provides a vision "resistant to ingrained notions of originality, uniqueness, singularity and autonomy" in authorship and reading (6). Using Roland Barthes's view that a text inevitably has a relationship with those previously written and read, Allen concludes that "every text has its meaning, therefore, in relation to other texts" (6). Thus, according to such concept, every existing text innately expresses intertextuality to some extent. In my project, however, I focus on the plays that exhibit a more specific level of intertextuality that points to a particular source text (i.e. Shakespeare's), thus making possible a profound examination of contextual interpretation. When the concept of intertext is considered in literary analysis, the complex network of meanings is enlarged immensely, expanding the possible boundary of interpretation through newly created connections among applicable (con)texts.

Contextual interpretation of a text has its basis on the notion that a literary text invites various interpretations rather than delivering one definite message. Mikhail Bakhtin clarifies the term "literary language," which, unlike "absolute language," is more open to interpretation. According to Bakhtin, a story, which is composed of literary language, exists "as a rejoinder in a given dialogue, whose style is determined by its interrelationship with other rejoinders in the same dialogue" (274). Thus, as Dennis Cutchins reiterates, the innately relative nature of reading literature "always generates multiple readings or possible interpretations" while "also always in

dialogue with other language" (72). "Other language," which expands literary interpretation beyond the realm of literary texts, includes a broad range of contexts, such as geographical, cultural, social, and historical environments. Providing an insight into the context of intertextuality, Bakhtin points out that any utterance, as well as literary composition, is related to its historical context which generates a social meaning:

> The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness and around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it—it does not approach the object from the sidelines. (276-77)

This applies to any literary text, including playscripts for theatre performances. Considering that playscripts are to be performed live, and are thus directly exposed to the immediate reaction from an audience, intertextual plays are as much socially engaged as any other genres in literature. Although Bakhtin does not directly mention intertext or adaptation in his discussion of dialogic concepts, his ideas are well echoed by scholars in adaptation studies. Jorgen Bruhn highlights Linda Hutcheon's emphasis on the broad range of adaptations, which is not limited to literary text; rather, it should be situated "within a broader framework, relating to political, economic, and legal circumstances" (Bruhn 10). Hutcheon also acknowledges that not only the "adapters" but also the audience and the cultural context are contributors to adaptations (qtd. in Bruhn 10). Thus, intertextual (re)creation can connect not only literary but many other works across genres while absorbing and revealing contextual influence from its surroundings—such context, either cultural, social, historical, or political, in turn establishes an intertextual relationship with the

newly created work. Cutchins argues that Bakhtin's dialogic thought, which considers all utterances and meanings interrelated within a complicated web, suggests that "when we label a text an adaptation we are simply acknowledging one of the particular relationships that we perceive between texts" (74). However, when we recognize a text as an adaptation, or even as an intertext of a certain pre-existing text, such a particular relationship is not selected arbitrarily. To be considered as an intertext, and as an adaptation in particular, the connection between the texts, intended by the creator or not, should be strong enough to be exceptional and significant enough to affect the interpretation of both texts.

Rewriting presents a way of interpreting the source text, more so if the work echoes the pre-existing work with a distinctive purpose. In both adaptation or appropriation, underlining the intertextuality of a newly written piece adds meaning—revering, questioning, or a mixture of the two—to the source text; at the same time, the new piece's meaning can be clarified through its relationship to the source text(s). One of the clearest examples of this process demonstrates itself in postcolonial adaptations of Shakespeare. Jyotsna G. Singh defines the main function of postcolonial theory as "to question and reinvent the way in which a culture or society is represented, especially within the histories of colonialism" (81). Although, as Barthes mentions, every text is an intertext, the intertextual nature of postcolonial literature is distinctively noticeable since it takes an existing representation in a colonial text(s) to fulfill its purpose.

As will be discussed more specifically below, Shakespeare's works, those that stage the cultural, racial, or geographical "Other," have been recreated and received in connection with a network of meanings that differ immensely according to the time and place of each piece. Such differing—oftentimes even antithetical—groups of meanings that are woven into the rewritings of Shakespeare demonstrate what circumstances his play originally encountered, as well as in

what context the adapted text was created. Because Shakespeare's plays were widely disseminated with the tide of colonial expansion, works that have intertextual relationship with Shakespeare's texts are also highly intersectional, connected closely to the strong political impact. As Singh notes, "interrogations of colonization, empire, and their aftermath in relation to Shakespeare were intersectionally linked to continuing material struggles for racial, economic, social, and gender equity in the global north and south" (104). The characters who are considered as racial and geographical "others" to the early modern British audience are portrayed in a way that justifies imperialism during the expansion of imperial power. However, in a postcolonial context, where the majority of the audience is likely to find the "others" in the play similar to itself in respect to race and culture, the revised play often amplifies the voice of the previously marginalized characters, expressing the view of the colonized.

As interpretations of the source text, rewritings can also function as a direct act of commentary. Although present in any work with a recognizably evident intertextual link, rewriting as commentary is more clearly manifested in postcolonial adaptations of Shakespeare, which actively utilize contemporary sociopolitical, cultural, and theoretical contexts. Focusing more on the role of adapters, Kamilla Elliott delivers the shared perspective of scholars in adaptation studies: "adaptations forge critical 'commentaries' on the words they adapt, and these 'commentaries' are 'impacted by movement in, and readings produced by, the theoretical and intellectual arena as much as by their so-called sources'" (Wagner and Dueley, qtd. in Elliott 20). Writing—and performing—a highly intertextual work can be an invitation to discuss topics which are further clarified through the process. Retelling the story in one's own context functions as a commentary, showing the adapter's reaction to the original play. Unlike any individual

reaction from the audience and the readers, this performed and published interpretation in the form of an adaptation becomes a public commentary shared with its own audience.

Global Shakespeare: Intracultural and Intercultural Adaptations and Intertexts

When adaptation is defined in the broader sense that includes any rewritings that show a certain relationship to a pre-existing text, it can be further categorized into intracultural and intercultural adaptations, based on the context of the piece. Defining adaptation as "the creative use, reappraisal, revision, or rewriting of Shakespeare's work and ideas," Hoenselaars lists the work of John Dryden, Sir William Davenant, David Garrick, Voltaire, and many others as examples (1040). The first three authors from this list, as well as John Fletcher, can be regarded as intracultural rewriters who share or inherit Shakespeare's historical and cultural context. Of course, as time passes, English society has experienced various changes; however, there exists a clear shared identity to group them together despite the substantial time gap, which streams down all the way to the most recent production of Shakespeare by the Royal National Theatre.[5] Studying several examples of intracultural rewritings of Shakespeare, such as the ones by George Bernard Shaw and Tom Stoppard,[6] Sonya Freedman Loftis perceives an actor's body as a "vessel for cultural memory" as well as an embodiment of the literary text (xiii). Also, highlighting the adapters' position as inheritors, she points out that major playwrights in modern and postmodern drama tended to consult "the remains of the Renaissance" at critical junctures in their careers, and argues that "modern drama has constituted and built itself in response to its Elizabethan

[5] Or, as it is more commonly called, the National Theatre (of Great Britain).
[6] Her study also includes Heiner Müller, who shares European cultural heritage although he cannot be considered as intracultural rewriter.

past" (xi). Intracultural rewritings—with possible exceptions—tend to inherit Shakespeare. Although the attitudes and interpretation vary according to each adapter's sociopolitical situation and perspective, intracultural adapters find their national poet inside themselves, often leading to a commentary that can be characterized as "yes, but."

Intercultural adaptations, on the other hand, refer to rewritings created outside of an English or British context. Shakespeare's plays have been performed in other European countries, such as France and Germany, since the early modern period. Although they have some shared characteristics, European adaptations of Shakespeare outside England should still be considered intercultural works since each country has developed a distinctive cultural and social environment, with different historic experiences. The contrast to intracultural rewritings, however, is more clearly highlighted in intercultural adaptations outside Europe, particularly in previously colonized nations. Naturally, intercultural adaptations of Shakespeare gained more attention with the emergence of postcolonial studies in the late twentieth century, being frequently regarded as a way to write back to the colonial power (or, the "centre").

Oftentimes, intercultural adaptations are categorized as "Global Shakespeare." To be precise, the term "Global Shakespeare" has two different connotations—the first refers to touring Shakespeare, which are productions created in Britain and brought to audiences overseas; the second is Shakespeare rewritten in various international contexts, be it a more conservative translation, a more aggressive adaptation, or even an outright appropriation. Regarding traveling Shakespeare, Martin Orkin notes that although it could be used as evidence of "Shakespeare's sustained and continuing worldwide potential for inviting scrutiny, prompting creativity, or providing enjoyment," in some cases, it becomes "an iconic or liberating political reference

point" based on the specific time and place, as in Nelson Mandela's case on Robben Island,[7] for instance (1071). Even when the production itself is an intracultural creation, when it is brought to an audience outside England, the experience of reception is intercultural.

Most intercultural adaptations fall into the second category, and while rewritings of Shakespeare in non-European cultures have encountered various receptions, one of the persistent reactions is the skeptical attitude of questioning their relationship to Shakespeare. Some critics or scholars would call these non-European productions "other Shakespeares," a phrase which is often used dismissively to indicate their lack of "authenticity":

> For all their inability to reflect an authentic Shakespeare, these productions do point to something *out there*, beyond the whitewashed walls. They point most immediately to the alienated character of "universal" Shakespeare, to the necessary loss of an ineffable Shakespeare in the power of the performative to reveal, rewrite, and reembody new meanings, new "Shakespearean" force. (Worthen 168)

Such an interpretation and evaluation of intercultural Shakespeare adaptations becomes even more apparent when the "foreignness" of a production stands out more clearly through their culturally and ethnically specific artistic choices. However, defining them with references to "inability" and "inauthenticity" is a highly prejudiced labelling, which is caused by an insufficient understanding of the productions' contexts, which in turn prevents an accurate grasp of their messages. Unfortunately, this Eurocentric attitude emerges in a variety of occasions. When a non-European adaptation is mounted on a stage where it is "non-mainstream," where, in Alexa Joubin's words, "classic theatre is assumed to be aligned with some versions of upper-

---

[7] Nelson Mandela and other prisoners on South Africa's Robben Island circulated a copy of *Complete Works of Shakespeare*, signing their names next to their favorite passages. For further information, refer to David Schalkwyk's *Hamlet's Dreams: The Robben Island Shakespeare* (Bloomsbury, 2013).

middle-class white masculine culture," the exotic nature of the production is further emphasized (429).[8] When a production is perceived as foreign and exotic, the cultural background, or the ability of the audience and reviewers to understand it, can be questioned. Introducing a collection of essays on intercultural Shakespeare productions, Sarah Dustagheer and Aleksandra Sakowska note the reviewers' tendencies against unfamiliarity in an international Shakespeare festival:

> As such, reviewers fell back on their own racial and cultural signifiers as to what a "right" Asian Shakespearean performance should be. As Walking notes, reviewers [sic.] "inability to read the politics in contemporary Chinese performance led to their sense that the production [Lin Zhaohua's *Coriolanus*] was therefore inauthentic, both culturally and politically." (13-14)

In the same collection, Derek Dunne makes a similar point, noting that the best reviews were granted when the reviewers had overcome the "position of ignorance" by thoroughly comprehending the local and global contexts of the production (qtd. in Dustagheer and Sakowska 15). Thus, in interpreting intercultural rewritings of Shakespeare, it is imperative not to limit the focus to what seems exotic and foreign by European standards, but instead to consider the specific cultural and political context of each work.

"Global Shakespeare," through the very existence of the term, attests to the author's widespread fame and influence, although cultural and sociopolitical factors cannot be ignored. As Joubin mentions, under the myth of "Global Shakespeare," Shakespeare "is believed to be universal, which is why the canon has gone global; on the other hand, global Shakespeare is seen

---

[8] Joubin uses the phrase to discuss the position of "diasporic Shakespeare" as a distinctive genre of global Shakespeare, contrasting the case of an actor with a particular race and ethnicity performing Shakespeare in a country where he or she is not a minority to the case in which he or she is "non-mainstream." In the latter, Joubin argues, the actor's identity makes the performance perceived as "global" or "exotic," which is a different kind of global Shakespeare from "national, international, and touring Shakespeare" (429).

as evidence of Shakespeare's universality" (427). Providing an example for such a view, Derrida insists that "Here the example of Shakespeare is magnificent. Who demonstrates better that texts loaded with history offer themselves so well in contexts very different from their time and place of origin, not only in the European twentieth century, but in Japanese or Chinese transpositions?" (63). The simple fact that Shakespeare is staged all over the world, however, does not necessarily prove his genius and the universality of his work. As briefly mentioned above, various reasons exist behind the prominent presence of Shakespeare on the world stage. In some cases, Shakespeare's texts are selected because of the convenience of copyright. Due to the canonical position of the author, adaptations of Shakespeare can be ignored by political censorship, which Mark Burnett recognizes as a contributing factor for the dissemination of Shakespeare (277) .[9] Another undeniable reason for Shakespeare's global fame lies in the political power of Great Britain: with the expansion of the British Empire, the fame of Shakespeare expanded as well. As Dennis Kennedy puts it, unlike the case of Europe, "Shakespeare arrived in most Asian (and African) environments in the baggage of empire" (291). With its link to colonial power, Shakespeare's work used to (and to some extent still does) symbolize a high level of class and culture. As a reaction to that, however, Hoenselaars notes that adaptations of Shakespeare outside Europe after World War II demonstrate "a critique with profound political repercussions" rather than reverence toward the canon, using Shakespeare "to write back to the omphalos of the European empire, and that of Britain in particular" (1041). Although at first Shakespeare's works were disseminated as part of a colonial strategy to solidify the oppressors' power, as the political situation changed with the age of colonial independence, many postcolonial playwrights found a way to speak through Shakespeare.

---

[9] His discussion focuses on film adaptations, not live theatre.

As a part of "talking back" from their own cultural and political point of view, many writers outside Europe have adapted Shakespeare to correct previously misrepresented or less represented figures in the early modern Western canon. Amid the myth of global Shakespeare, Joubin argues, his canon provided world cinema and theatre with a space where local tradition could coexist with that canon, which is foreign enough to provoke adapters' creativity. Joubin adds, "Shakespeare is both daunting, thanks to centuries of interpretative traditions, and liberating, thanks to the historical distance" (424). In this sense, she continues, Shakespeare can become "a vehicle of empowerment, an agent to foster the multicultural good" (426). Joubin views adapting from someone else's work, "quotation," in other words, as "a gesture of deference or a demarcated space of reflection" (436). Either way, directly adapting or echoing the works of Shakespeare can be seen, in Garber's words, as "cultural ventriloquism, a throwing of the voice that is an appropriation of authority" (16). Expressing an opinion similar to Joubin's, Richard Wilson claims that "there is . . . No 'global Shakespeare,' . . . as everywhere his work has been acculturated to affirm regional priorities" (14). The adapters need the link to Shakespeare because that gives their voices a better chance to be heard; however, they do not give their full consent to re-present his text with fidelity, since what Shakespeare created does not satisfy their standard and, more importantly, their purpose. Although the messages they deliver vary, these tactics are not a new intercultural invention because they were already employed by intracultural rewritings that appeared relatively closer to the time frame and culture of origin.

Not all global Shakespeare outside Europe, however, has the uniform purpose of talking back to the empire. Orkin warns that the binary concept of dividing adapted works into "reactionary, colonizing, or imperialist (global) metropolis and provincial and subordinate (local)

nonmetropolis may sometimes be misleading" because "the 'colonial' (metropolitan) location and 'postcolonial' (nonmetropolitan) location are not homogenous entities" (1072). As Sujata Iyengar and Miriam Jacobson mention, some scholars note regional or ethnic groups' intention "to create a global, transnational, or trans historic identity through Shakespeare" in their productions (3). In other cases, as Bi-qi Beatrice Lei, Judy Celine Ick, and Poonam Trivedi point out, some Asian Shakespeare productions are meant to be "intra-Asian adaptations," whose audience is one another, not the European countries in the "centre" (qtd. in Iyengar and Jacobason 3); for these intra-Asian adaptations, the imposed centre-periphery binary holds no significance since they have created their own centre. For example, in *Re-playing Shakespeare in Asia*, Trivedi shows multiple cases in which the narratives and the texts of Shakespeare adapt to the local, cultural, and political specificities in India, Japan, China, The Philippines, Korea, Taiwan, and Indonesia. In these cases, adapters repurpose Shakespeare's works to "fit" in their own local contexts, not necessarily considering those outside the specific locality (6).

When global Shakespeare is localized, intercultural adaptations of Shakespeare can no longer be limited to a counter-narrative against colonialism. Sonia Massai goes against such binary generalization, which ignores the diversity of productions from Asia. She distinguishes local adaptations on the basis of three different target audiences at the local, national, and international levels. Massai suggests that the local adapters, or the authors of the "appropriations," work from their base to make their plays local for their own target audience rather than simply importing the global icon from the West. Acknowledging that multiple studies focus on rewritings from areas that are not described as post-colonial, she further emphasizes the need to explore "the impact world-wide Shakespeare has on their target audience" (6). For her, "world-wide Shakespeare" is significant not because of the canon's universal value, but because

of the locality of the rewritings as the local artists make the canon their own, taking advantage of its status as “the powerful global icon” (4). Although many Shakespearean adaptations from non-European contexts have been used to fight against the colonial ideology, not all non-European adaptations were created to serve that same purpose; instead, there are ample examples of Shakespearean adaptations which were created for their local audience and customized to local needs, without much considerations of the audience outside. In these cases, Shakespeare’s canon, which originally came from outside their culture, functions as a convenient material to use, rather than a colonial remnant to overcome.

Texts and Methodologies

The plays in this project were chosen from both intracultural and intercultural contexts to broaden the view in considering various aspects of Shakespeare intertexts. By juxtaposing intra- and intercultural rewritings, I challenge the claim that regards intercultural adaptations as appropriative and inauthentic (Worthen 168). Both intra- and intercultural writers engage intertextually with the Shakespearean canon, taking advantage of its established centrality while making modifications, and as a result they question the universality of Shakespeare regardless of the level of authenticity observed in each rendition. The list of plays, excluding the two source texts, attests to the diversity of the chosen texts—eight plays from six countries, written or performed in four different languages, ranging over three centuries. Also, the chosen plays show a wide variation in their styles, from Elizabethan and neoclassical to realistic, metatheatrical, postdramatic and experimental.

As the table below indicates, for intracultural rewritings I have chosen three plays, two from the Restoration period (Dryden and Pix) and one from the late nineteenth century (Shaw),

to compare how the portrayal of the Other diverges, depending on the historical positioning of the authors. In addition, to examine the different gender perspectives, I have selected one work by a male author (Dryden) and another by a female author (Pix), comparing the different views within Restoration drama. For intercultural examination, I have included five works from different cultures, and from different moments within the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The authors of the plays are respectively from Egypt (Shawqi), South Africa/Uganda (Carlin), the Caribbean (Walcott), Belgium/the Netherlands (van Hove) and South Korea (Kim). Among the five intercultural adaptations, two were written in English (Carlin and Walcott), one was translated into English from Arabic (Shawqi), and two others were performed in Korean (Kim) and in Dutch (van Hove), respectively. The details are compared in the following table:

	Title	Author	Year[10]	Venue[11]	Language
Source Texts	*Othello*	William Shakespeare	1604	England	English
	Antony and Cleopatra	William Shakespeare	1606	England	English
Intracultural Intertexts	*All for Love*	John Dryden	1678	England	English
	The False Friend	Mary Pix	1699	England	English
	Caesar and Cleopatra	George Bernard Shaw	1899	England	English
Intercultural Intertexts	*The Death of Cleopatra*	Ahmed Shawqi	1929[12]	Egypt	Arabic
	Not Now, Sweet Desdemona	Murray Carlin	1968	Uganda[13]	English

[10] Year of Premiere.
[11] Venue of Premiere.
[12] *The Death of Cleopatra* was written in 1927, but first performed in 1929.
[13] The first reading of *Not Now Sweet Desdemona* took place in London in 1968. Its full performance premiere was at Makerere University, Uganda, in 1968.

	A Branch of the Blue Nile	Derek Walcott	1983	Barbados	English
	Roman Tragedies	Ivo van Hove	2007	Netherlands	Dutch
	Oh THe yELLOw	Hyun-tak Kim	2016	South Korea	Korean

In most instances, I have used the published texts of the selected plays for my literary analysis. In the case of Pix's *The False Friend*, I used the text found in *Early English Books Online*. Van Hove's *Roman Tragedies* and Kim's *Oh THe yELLOw* have not been published, but I received video clips of both plays from the theatre companies, and for the latter, the script from the author as well. I have analyzed Van Hove's *Roman Tragedies,* which was performed in Dutch without an available English translation, by relying heavily on its performance style instead of on close textual analysis. To examine the subtitles projected during the performance, I have used an automated translator since they were in short and direct language. For the other two plays that were not originally written in English, I have used Jeanette Wahba Sourial Atiya's translation of Shawqi's *The Death of Cleopatra*, and for Kim's *Oh THe yELLOw,* I have used my own translation.

Chapter Outline

I have grouped the eight plays into four chapters; in each chapter, I have paired two plays that demonstrate certain similarities and disparities appropriate for a discussion of a specific theme such as gender, postcolonial interpretation and identity, or audience engagement, while also considering their chronological proximity. Chapter 2, "Female Characters' Agency and Blame in Restoration Theatre," focuses on the depiction of gender in the late 1600s in England, examining John Dryden's *All for Love* (1678) next to Mary Pix's *The False Friend* (1699). Unlike other chapters that include discussions of intercultural adaptations, this chapter discusses two intracultural intertexts of Shakespeare. As intracultural rewriters, both Dryden and

Pix act as inheritors of Shakespeare, using his plays as source texts to build their own ideas without much need to reinterpret or react. Still, due to the difference in their respective social positions as male and female playwrights, their relationship to Shakespeare is almost antithetical. Furthermore, the content of their plays (and the portrayal of female characters in particular) demonstrate how the authors' own identity affects their gender perceptions. As this chapter focuses on the authors' perception and portrayal of gender, Dryden's depiction of female characters as the Other is juxtaposed with Mary Pix's alterations to plot and character, which increase the agency of female characters.

Chapter 3, "Adapting Characters into National Representatives," examines the influence of nationalism and the political needs of a nation on the adapted texts through an analysis of Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1899) and Ahmed Shawqi's *The Death of Cleopatra* (1929). This chapter discusses Shaw's intracultural adaptation next to Shawqi's intercultural one, scrutinizing the subjectivity of historical narrative as well as the use of a character as a representative image in promoting a shared national value. In *Caesar and Cleopatra*, Shaw's contrast between the two political leaders exaggerates the difference between the West and the East, highlighting the superiority of the West. An analysis of Shaw's play shows how he internalizes the ideas of his time: the power of an empire validates its rule over other countries. In contrast, Ahmed Shawqi, who is praised as "the Prince of Poets" in Egypt, depicts Cleopatra as a responsible and patriotic queen, reshaping her image in a newly independent Egypt to express national pride and cultural confidence. In Shawqi's play, Egyptians appear to be competent and dignified, and their queen, similar to the heroic Antony of many Western narratives, agonizes between duty and love. She is clearly described as a strong leader—stronger than her Roman partner—who demonstrates her mental strength as well as her political intelligence. This chapter underlines Shawqi's attempt to

erase the colonial stereotype of Cleopatra as a way to build a connection to his contemporary Egyptian audience shortly after the achievement of independence. However, Shawqi shows limitations in that he represents an aristocratic class from pre-modern Egypt, as well as patriarchal constraints that marginalize and instrumentalize femininity.

Chapter 4, "Postcolonial Staging and the Form of Metadrama," discusses two metadramatic plays: Murray Carlin's *Not Now Sweet Desdemona* (1968) and Derek Walcott's *A Branch of the Blue Nile* (1983). I analyze the different messages delivered in the two postcolonial adaptations of Shakespeare, revealing that a postcolonial identity inevitably includes hybridity, which necessitates the individuals' struggles between imposed and indigenous history. Although both plays are from postcolonial locations (by a South African and a Saint Lucian/Trinidadian author, respectively) and use metadrama to convey their messages, they have contrasting attitudes in dealing with the influence of colonialism and the prevalence of Eurocentric viewpoints in life on and off the stage. This chapter juxtaposes Carlin's approval of Shakespeare's universal genius and suggestion for a peaceful unity among the members of the community with Walcott's acceptance of hybridity in postcolonial culture, and his suggestion of an active adaptation based on local reality. In the process, the common form of metadrama plays an essential role in inviting the audience to be critically engaged, as they observe the characters in the play discussing their interpretations and applications of the play-within-the-play that is being performed.

In Chapter 5, "The Audience as an Agent of Social Critique," I discuss two experimental productions: Ivo van Hove's *Roman Tragedies* (2007), and Hyun-tak Kim's *Oh THe yELLOw* (2016). While they both use postdramatic tactics to amplify their messages, their depiction of the Other is antithetical. In van Hove's play, Cleopatra's intersectional otherness is not physically

evident, but her culture and gender are caricatured, offering her as farcical entertainment for the audience; in contrast, Kim highlights the physical difference of Othello, demanding that the audience realize not only the presence of racial discrimination but also their own othering gaze on Othello's body. In addition, the two directors use opposing methods to offer a rhizomatic experience to their audience. While Kim cuts the play into multiple episodic scenes with distinctive settings, van Hove creates a marathon production that runs for six hours without an intermission, forcing the audience to miss certain parts of it. In both cases, the audiences are provoked to assemble their own narrative instead of passively following a linear and logical drama; in so doing, both van Hove and Kim successfully turn their audience into "emancipated spectators," to use Rancière's term. As the audience actively engages in generating their own experience through the production, the plays' messages leave stronger imprints in their minds.

I end my dissertation by speculating about the significance of adapting, performing, and reading Shakespeare in our present time. Shakespeare remains one of the most influential playwrights on the global stage, but the meaning of his name changes constantly because of shifts in time and place. Through this panoramic survey of Shakespeare intertexts that covers a wide geographical scope and timeframe, my concluding chapter explores how Shakespeare's marginalized characters, Othello and Cleopatra, have demonstrated the adapters' (and, by extension, each community's) perception of the Other in their society. In so doing, Othello and Cleopatra from four centuries ago can become the means for examining how we perceive the marginalized in our own society here and now.

Chapter 2: Female Characters' Agency and Blame in Restoration Theatre

This chapter focuses on two British plays from the late 1600s that are inspired by Shakespeare's plays: John Dryden's *All for Love* (1678), which was written in the middle of the Restoration period, and Mary Pix's *The False Friend; or the Fate of Disobedience* (1699), which appears at the end of the century and registers various changes. In particular, I pay close attention to the depiction of gender in each play. Although the influence of the common societal perception of gender is evident in various playscripts, an author's individual perspective reveals itself in his or her writing; the juxtaposition of the two plays provides an intriguing example of such distinctive perspectives. As its title implies, Dryden's rewriting of *Antony and Cleopatra* removes the political aspect from the encounter of the two leaders and instead focuses on their private relationship; by doing so, the play reduces the queen to a woman who is desperate for and obsessed with a man's love while dramatizing Antony as a tragic hero. To examine how conspicuously the social norms of England during the Restoration period affected Dryden's character portrayal, this chapter also investigates a female writer's work from two decades later.[14] Pix's *The False Friend* is not an obvious adaptation of Shakespeare's work, but it does contain extensive intertextual references to *Othello*. Despite its conclusion and the overall emphasis on traditional values such as filial obedience and feminine chastity, Pix's characterization shows a certain level of innovation that deviates from the established stereotypes of her time. In this chapter, I analyze Dryden's masculine depiction that marginalizes female

---

[14] To select a female playwright among Dryden's contemporaries, it should be Aphra Behn. However, Mary Pix fits better for this chapter's purpose for two main reasons: 1) Unlike Behn, who was the only professional playwright of her time, Pix had other female playwrights who were known and active enough to be a topic of a discourse in their society, thus being forced to be more conscious of her gender; 2) Pix's *The False Friend* shows traces of *Othello*, fitting to be discussed in this project.

characters as the Other in contrast to Mary Pix's alterations to the plot and the characters which enhance the role of female characters. Through my analysis, this chapter shows how each author perceives the agency of the characters of different genders, revealing the impact of individual identity as well as the authors' social and historical environment on their character portrayal.

In *Comic Women, Tragic Men*, Linda Bamber analyzes the relationship between Shakespeare's identity as a male author and the characters he creates. Observing the evil female characters in Shakespeare's tragedies, she points out that "their evil is inseparable from their failures as women" (2). She notes that in Shakespeare's work, the feminine is "always something unlike and external to the Self" (4), concluding that "The Self is masculine, then, in Shakespearean tragedy, and women are Other" (9). She uses "Other" not to denote a marginalized group, but to convey a Lacanian concept, which counters the concept of "Self." In summary, Lacanian "Other" refers to other people one meets in a society, and by extension, indicates language and laws of the society that an individual is required to follow. Still, Bamber's insightful analysis underlines the inseparable relationship between an author and his or her creation. She notes:

> The feminine in the tragedies can be similarly defined in terms of evil, obduracy, and the issue of recognition. . . . Like the world outside the Self, the feminine causes suffering, appears evil, and may actually *be* evil. And like the world outside Self, women in the tragedies are notably separate from us, governed by their own laws whether their natures are good or evil. (22, emphasis in the original)

Based on the construction of a masculine Self and a feminine Other, a play written by a male author is bound to offer a masculine frame. Bamber adds that the play *Antony and Cleopatra* leads the audience to experience things from Antony's perspective, in which "Cleopatra's

motives are hard to swallow" (24). Similarly, in his adaptation, Dryden constructs a world that shows his own relationship with the characters; the difference is that Dryden enlarges the gap between the two main characters, making Cleopatra appear as an Other that is even more distanced from the Self than she is in Shakespeare's play—not merely in the context of psychoanalysis, but also in the context of gender and culture.

One of the most significant changes between the Elizabethan and the Restoration theatre is the emergence of female actors and playwrights. According to Fidelis Morgan, Charles II "had passionately enjoyed plays and women" during his stay in France, and after coming back to London, he issued a Royal Warrant which "specified that only women should play women's parts" (ix). With the presence of actresses, the number of female roles increased, but this did not initially change the stereotypical portrayal of gender. Writing about the afterlife of Shakespeare's plays, Emma Deplege points out that Shakespeare's female characters became more polarized "into negative, lusty figures who distract male characters from their public duty, and passive, virtuous characters who take on symbolic significance as contested object over which legitimate and illegitimate males are seen to fight" (6). Similarly, Owen notes that Restoration playwrights who adapted Shakespeare's plays portrayed the female characters as more "sentimentalized, feminine, often victimized and more virtuous," seeking a "moral refinement" of Shakespeare (151). Owen concludes that while Restoration playwrights "substantially increase[d] women parts and add[ed] 'love interest' to Shakespeare's plays," their portrayal could be "considered to undermine the strength of Shakespeare's women and to disempower them" (151). Although some degree of shift in gender perception is present in Dryden's work, it is not until female writers staged their own portrayals of gender models that more significant changes took place in female characters, exemplified in their agency and attitudes, although still subject to social constraints.

Unlike female actresses, who rapidly entered the Restoration theatres, it took longer for female playwrights to make a sustained appearance as professional writers. During the reign of Charles II (1660-1685), Aphra Behn was the only female playwright who successfully maintained her career; in the 1690s, however, following Behn's pioneering footsteps, several female playwrights emerged, three of whom were collectively titled the "Female Wits."[15] Morgan explains that until the public got tired of the novelty and began to take an adverse position at the end of the century, women had the opportunity to be involved in theatre through acting and writing during the later seventeenth-century (xi). Elizabeth Howe also notes the change in gender perceptions of the time, listing meaningful incidents: "a popular sovereign, Queen Mary, ruled alone while her husband campaigned abroad, a number of pamphlets were published extolling the rights of women, and the first English periodical conceived solely for women was produced" (qtd. in Caldwell 195).[16] The trend continued with the accession of Queen Anne. Mihoko Suzuki argues that female writers portrayed an image of a female monarch with Queen Anne in mind even before her reign (547, 560). Suzuki interprets such a portrayal as veiled criticism of William's reign (560). As the result of changes in and out of the theatre space, women playwrights at the end of the seventeenth century had a chance to share their works, which contained new types of female characters who decide on their own and act for themselves.

Although this chapter pays close attention to the differences in gender portrayal in Dryden's *All for Love* and Pix's *The False Friend,* the two share a common feature in that they both have a clear intertextual relationship with Shakespeare's work—Dryden to *Antony and*

[15] Laura J. Rosenthal suggests that liberal individualism and finance capitalism at the end of the century contributed positively to women's authorship (9).

[16] Tanya Caldwell evaluates that *All for Love* creates "a powerful but very human queen" as an answer to the changing society where "the rise of female power" was taking place (197). I disagree with this evaluation because Dryden's Cleopatra might be "human" but not "powerful."

Cleopatra, and Pix to *Othello.* Staging an adapted version of an existing play was a typical practice in the Restoration theatre. Following the Parliament's ban of plays from 1642 to 1660, theatrical work in the Restoration period was performed exclusively at two patent theatres: Thomas Killigrew's King's Company and William Davenant's Duke's Company.[17] Since there were not many plays available for the stage immediately after the ban, the theatres mainly mounted pre-1642 plays by Fletcher, Beaumont, Jonson, Massinger, Middleton, Shirley, and Shakespeare (Fretz; Murray 16). Even years after the reopening of the theatres, the strict censorship during the Exclusion Crisis (1678-82) led writers to rewrite existing plays rather than devise new ones (Depledge 1). In particular, Depledge points out that from around 1677, Shakespeare's plays were brought back to the stage systematically (5). Further, the adaptations of Shakespeare did not stop at acknowledging him as an author of the source play but elevated his status "with unprecedented reverence" (Depledge 2). However, the quantity of adapted plays and heightened reverence do not necessarily mean that everyone unanimously deemed Shakespeare impeccable. As Barbara Murray notes, some Restoration critics disregarded his plays due to their "improbability, triviality, and unnaturalness," and the playwrights compared his plays to "a heap of unstrung jewels" or "un unweeded garden," pointing out his "irregularity" (19). Still, as Susan J. Owen points out, the adapters of Shakespeare's plays during the Restoration period did not intend to debase his work, but to polish the plays to be more popular, and to "make him worthy of his exalted status" (147).

[17] Between these two, it was the King's Company that obtained the rights to most of the plays which were staged by "the pre-1642 King's Men" since Killigrew's group had many experienced actors who have been acting from before the Civil War (Fretz). On the other hand, Devenant's, consisted of younger actors, could not acquire the rights to "the more obviously popular plays by Shakespeare," which nudged them to be famous for "creatively adapting plays" (Fretz). The two companies merged in 1682.

Unlike the intercultural adaptations of Shakespeare that are introduced in the following chapters, in intracultural rewritings the authors approach Shakespeare as successors who have inherited Shakespeare's work as their asset, building upon and making use of it. His well-known characters and plots are used to connect to the audience more conveniently. Rather than *replying to* or *reacting to* or even *coming up with an interpretation* from a certain perspective as is the case in intercultural adaptations, intracultural rewritings merge the materials from Shakespeare's plays into theirs. In this sense, ironically, Shakespeare's authorship is less important than the fact that the adapters have abundant well-received texts in their hands to work with—they simply own them. In contrast, in intercultural rewritings, it is more important to locate the adapters' perspective in interpreting and reacting to Shakespeare because of his canonical status as "the" representative author of an imperial language. To intercultural adapters, Shakespeare's authority is an overwhelming challenge to overcome; to intracultural adapters such as Dryden (and even Pix to a certain degree) who came on the scene before the emergence of bardolatry, Shakespeare was their inheritance, and at their disposal.

In several of his writings, Dryden expresses his high opinion of Shakespeare while maintaining that Shakespeare's writing should be adapted to suit his own time. In the "Preface" to *All for Love*, Dryden points out that although the models established by the praise-worthy ancient poets allow regularity, such models are not apt for "English tragedy, which requires to be built in a larger compass" (24). This is why Dryden chooses to adapt a piece written by Shakespeare, whom he evaluates highly for the variety of his plots and characters. Calling Shakespeare "divine," Dryden says he has "professed to imitate him" (25). He praises Shakespeare not merely for the topics and characters, but also the language: "'tis almost a miracle that much of his language remains so pure, and that he who began dramatic poetry

amongst us . . . should by the force of his own genius perform so much that in a manner he has left no praise for any who come after him" (25).[18] Similarly, in "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy," through the character of Neander, Dryden expresses his appreciation for variety, which proves the value of English plays in comparison with French ones (69, 78). And such variety in plot and characters, he proceeds, is the gift of Shakespeare and Fletcher (78). In his preface to *Troilus and Cressida,* Dryden explains more specifically what he sees as the strength of Shakespeare's character development: "'Tis one of the excellencies of Shakespeare, that the manners of his persons are generally apparent, and you see their bent and inclinations" (217); "no man ever drew so many characters, or generally distinguished 'em better from one another, excepting only Johnson" (219). He further praises Shakespeare for his natural talent: "He was the man who of all modern, and perhaps ancient poets, had the largest and most comprehensive soul. All the images of Nature were still present to him, and he drew them, not laboriously, but luckily" ("An Essay" 79). He goes on: "no man can say he ever had a fit subject for his wit, and did not then raise himself as high above the rest of poets" (80).

While he expresses his doubtless respect and love for Shakespeare, Dryden also criticizes his shortcomings. He admits that Shakespeare is "many times flat, insipid; his comic wit degenerating into clenches, his serious swelling into bombast" (80). Also, he diagnoses Shakespeare's language as "a little obsolete" (81).[19] Making a similar point, in his preface to *All for Love*, while praising the genius of the poet, Dryden presupposes that "words and phrases

[18] Dryden praises Shakespeare's genius (not learned, but his own) in other places as well. One of which is found in his epistle to Congreve: "Heav'n, that but once was prodigal before, / To Shakespeare gave as much; she could not give him more" (178).
[19] In his Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*: "Yet it must be allowed to the present age, that the tongue in general is so much refined since Shakespeare's time, that many of his words, and more of his phrases, are scarce intelligible. And of those which we understand, some are ungrammatical, others coarse; and his whole style is so pestered with figurative expressions, that it is as affected as obscure" (203).

must of necessity receive a change in succeeding ages" (25).[20] John Olin Eidson concludes, "To Dryden, the Elizabethan age was unrefined and unlearned. Poetry was in its infancy" (279). While Dryden praises Shakespeare for the creative power that indubitably enriched English drama, from a more "mature" perspective, Dryden feels the need to refine Shakespeare's writing. Dryden sees "failings" in Shakespeare's "manner of expression": "the fury of his fancy often transported him beyond the bound of judgment, either in coining of new words and phrases, or racking words which were in use, into the violence of a catachresis" ("Preface" to *Troilus* 224). Comparing Shakespeare with Ben Jonson, Dryden calls the latter "the more correct poet," but notes that Shakespeare had "greater wit" ("An Essay" 82). After all, he concludes: "We acknowledge them [Ben Johnson, Fletcher, and Shakespeare] our fathers in wit; but . . . were they to entertain this age, they could not make so plenteous treatments out of such decayed fortunes. . . . For the genius of every age is different" ("An Essay" 99).[21] Thus, Dryden's adaptation of Shakespeare's play can be taken as his attempt to make Shakespeare's writing refined enough to serve his own time.

The Entrapped Hero: John Dryden's *All for Love*

Dryden's *All for Love* is a deliberate adaptation of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*. The play enjoyed stable popularity to the extent that it was "also known in its own time as *Antony and Cleopatra*," being performed instead of Shakespeare's version (or any other versions of the story) for nearly 150 years (Caldwell 184, 205). What makes this play worth attention is,

---

[20] The same idea is presented in "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy" when Crite (representing Sir Robert Howard) admits that if an ancient poet lived in their contemporary time, "he might accommodate himself to the age he lived in" (55).
[21] Also, in his Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*: "If Shakespeare were stripped of all the bombasts in his passions, and dressed in the most vulgar words, we should find the beauties of his thoughts remaining; . . . 'tis our fault, who succeed him in an age which is more refined, if we imitate him so ill, that we copy his failings only, and make a virtue of that in our writings which in his was an imperfection" (227).

however, not merely its popularity. He had adapted Shakespeare's *The Tempest* twice prior to *All for Love*. Katharine Eisaman Maus notes that Dryden and William D'Avenant's *The Tempest* in 1667 was "the most popular play on the Restoration stage" (189). The play was re-adapted in 1674, this time into an "opera" for the new Dorset Garden theatre. This version, which was a major success as well, was characterized by its spectacular scenery (Maus 189). Although *All for Love* is not the first Dryden play which was adapted from Shakespeare's, it shows a clear distinction from the two versions of *The Tempest.* In *All for Love* Dryden moves entirely from the fanciful elements such as music and scenery to write a tragedy in blank verse. Unlike in his previous heroic dramas, as David M. Vieth puts it, in this play Dryden "cast off 'his long-loved mistress, rhyme' . . . to embrace the richness and flexibility of blank-verse tragedy" (xv). By inaugurating blank verse as the medium of his tragedy instead of decorative rhymes, to which he had adhered passionately to express his poetic talent as well as the refined beauty of the English language, Dryden squarely faces Shakespeare in a way that he had avoided through the rhymed heroic plays of the past. As his first serious play in blank verse, *All for Love* becomes an important landmark in Dryden's career.

According to Richard W. Bevis, Dryden's *All for Love* is "often called the finest Restoration tragedy" (59). While he dismisses the play's poetic quality in comparison to Shakespeare's writing, Bevis notes approvingly that Dryden's work is "effective on-stage" with the reduced number of scenes and characters (59). He views Dryden's Antony as a "softer hero," evaluating that "love versus duty, or honour, or ambition, is no longer a contest, as the title tells us" (59). Tanya Caldwell takes a less decisive point of view; she notes that the play is ambiguous and self-contradicting, inviting different ways of interpretation and staging (which is the main reason, according to Caldwell, that the play could appeal to a wider range of audiences for a

longer period of time) (184-187).[22] She describes Antony as "at once a great hero and an utter failure as a hero" (188). Although Bevis's point and some of the casting choices Caldwell introduces suggest that the play showcases the victory of private love over public duty, *All for Love* is still heavily based on the theme of love versus duty, dividing the world into Egypt and Rome as representations of the two contrasting values.[23]

The first scene in Dryden's *All for Love* locates itself shortly after the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra at the battle of Actium. The play then unfolds the story that leads to the two main characters' deaths, focusing on the emotional and private relationship between them. In the play, Ventidius, a faithful friend of Antony, tries to persuade Antony to leave Egypt. Although Antony is in distress because of the recent defeat for which Cleopatra gets a major share of the blame, he renews his trust in Cleopatra when she presents the evidence of her dedication: a letter that proves her refusal of Julius Caesar's proposal.[24] To change Antony's mind, Ventidius brings in Octavia, Antony's wife, with their two children. Antony is touched and decides to follow them to Rome, prioritizing his honor as a Roman general and his duty as a husband. To regain Antony's love, Alexas, Cleopatra's eunuch, advises Cleopatra to provoke Antony's jealousy by presenting her false affection toward Dolabella, Antony's friend. Ventidius and Octavia witness a suspicious scene between Cleopatra and Dolabella and report it to Antony. Feeling betrayed, Antony

---

[22] Caldwell points out that the play does not have "a stable value system," arguing that the uncertainty of meaning enabled the play to be acceptable to different groups of audience (192). Indeed, Antony, Cleopatra, and even Octavia show inconsistency in their words and behaviors: Antony changes his decision between the two women, Cleopatra dismisses the title of wife at first but later owns it, and Octavia plays the role of devoted Roman wife but eventually gives it up.

[23] Ann A. Huse, who analyzes *All for Love* based on its historical context, views Antony's choice between duty and honor in relation to the religious conflict and political situation of Dryden's contemporary society: "Dryden champions a national leader's choice of a foreign woman and her religion of sensory impressions, responding to and subverting the general rhetoric of Restoration anti-Catholic sentiment" (23). She argues that Dryden, in defense of the king who was criticized for loving a French woman, bestows a positive impression on Cleopatra's foreignness which keeps the monarch awake and alive (36-7). She further mentions that Dryden's portrayal pictures the hero's love as "an appreciation for a foreign culture and religion" (45).

[24] It is suggested in the play that Caesar proposed to ensure the safety of Cleopatra and her kingdom if she would betray Antony (65).

becomes furious with jealousy, which in turn triggers Octavia's departure (she is frustrated by Antony's strong emotion toward Cleopatra even after their reconciliation). Although Antony eventually decides not to leave Egypt, Cleopatra feels regret and blames Alexas for making her lose Antony's trust. To save himself, Alexas lies again to Antony, falsely reporting that Cleopatra has killed herself. Devastated, Antony stabs himself, only to realize in his last moments that Cleopatra is alive. Cleopatra promises to follow him in death and kills herself shortly before the arrival of the Roman army. Overall, Dryden centers the narrative around the couple's romantic relationship and their emotions. The story's political background is mostly taken out, as is much of Cleopatra's perspective. The play situates Antony as a hero caught in a dilemma between his public honor and private love, equated respectively with Rome and Egypt.

In *All for Love*, the boundary between Rome and Egypt is clear and rigid; one represents the just and rational and the other, the false and emotional. As Bevis points out, the contrast between the two worlds is established from the very first scene, where Dryden juxtaposes the image of Serapion, an Egyptian priest, next to that of the Roman general Ventidius;[25] the scene sets up the framework of Egypt as "superstitious, weak, verbally luxuriant," in contrast with the "strong and shar[p]" Rome (60). Continuing the categorization, Cleopatra embodies love whereas Ventidius represents duty. In addition, Bevis elaborates, Egypt and Rome draw further sets of contrasts, such as "private/public, emotion/reason, hedonism/stoicism, disease/health, sycophancy/bluntness, etc." (60). Within this distinction, Antony, who is Roman and falls in love with Cleopatra, can be located in the middle of the two realms.

Considering the clear contrast between Egypt and Rome, the closer Antony positions himself to the Egyptian realm, the further he departs from the Roman realm, which, to the

[25] Throughout the play, Ventidius represents Rome. Alexas describes him as the living representation of Roman virtue: "In short, the plainness, fierceness, rugged virtue / Of an old true-stamped Roman lives in him" (I. 105-106).

Romans, means the hero's ruin. As his stay in Egypt continues to mar his honor, Dryden's Roman characters repeatedly emphasize that Cleopatra ruins their Roman hero. He was a perfect hero before falling in love with Cleopatra, and even after the embarrassing outcome at the Battle of Actium (in which he retreated to follow Cleopatra), his agony is viewed as a proof of his heroic quality. According to Ventidius, because Antony's virtue surpasses that of the common people, his high virtue leads him to apply a higher standard to his own deeds (I. 133). In the eyes of Ventidius (and the Romans whom he represents), Antony is the best human being who could possibly exist (I. 403-407)—that is, before the influence of Cleopatra. Antony's only fault, in Ventidius's point of view, is Cleopatra. Thus, Antony's decision to meet Cleopatra before he leaves Egypt, which allows her the chance to change his mind, foretells his downfall: "VENTIDIUS. Y'are undone; / Y'are in the toils; y'are taken; y'are destroyed" (II. 226-227). To Ventidius, Cleopatra is a dangerous seducer who ruins the ideal hero—a hero, however, who is not able to resist her charm once he sees her. Owen notes that Dryden's "masculinist" alterations often depict female characters as "bad heroes," and such depiction implies that excessive love for women, a form of effeminacy, prevents men from performing their masculine duty such as state affairs (161). Still, Owen adds, a unique feature of Dryden's "masculinism" is that his version of masculinity allows sentimentality (161). This feature is well exemplified in *All for Love* as Antony's emotional behavior is praised as a proof of his exceptional virtue. Thus, in spite of the characteristics that define Rome and Egypt, when it comes to a Roman hero, being emotional and sensitive is not framed as a negative trait, unlike the case when such qualities are exhibited by an Egyptian heroine. Following the same logic, when the Roman masculine perspective is applied, Cleopatra's attractiveness or art of conversation do not count as positive values.

Although Ventidius is Cleopatra's harshest accuser, even he admits her charm, which, in turn, presents her as more dangerous:

VENTIDIUS. Her eyes have pow'r beyond Thessalian charms

To draw the moon from heav'n. For eloquence,

The sea-green Sirens taught her voice their flatt'ry,

And while she speaks, night steals upon the day,

Unmarked of those that hear. Then she's so charming

Age buds at sight of her, and swells to youth.

The holy priests gaze on her when she smiles,

And with heaved hands, forgetting gravity,

They bless her wanton eyes. (IV. 234-242)

His description of Cleopatra's attraction does not create a positive image of her; rather, the language he uses—"charms," "Sirens," "Flatt'ry"—connects her with deception, implying that her charm does not generate genuine love. Furthermore, following the description, her attraction would distract "the holy priests" from their rightful duty and make them commit a misdeed—like Antony, who is distracted by her and makes wrong decisions.[26] Instead of praising her beauty or charm in a positive light, this passage exempts Antony from any blame, shifting the responsibility to Cleopatra's magical charm, something Antony could not have resisted.[27]

---

[26] Yvonne Hann finds that, to Ventidius, whether Cleopatra's love is true or false is not as important as the fact that her love costs Antony his political power. "What matters to Ventidius, and the Roman ethos he represents, is that Cleopatra's love has caused Antony to forgo his involvement in the political. She has depoliticized Antony" (392).

[27] Ventidius is not the only one to blame Cleopatra for seducing Antony. Despite his love for Cleopatra, Antony perceives Cleopatra as the cause of his downfall: "That I drive my ruin / From you alone—" (II. 258-259). Also, although Octavia is a female character, she functions as a mouthpiece for patriarchal values, viewing the (inappropriate) love between her husband and the foreign queen as the fault of Cleopatra entirely (III. 427-429). According to Octavia, who echoes Ventidius, Antony's misfortune is due to Cleopatra's seduction, which "snare[d]" Julius Caesar previously (85). Furthermore, putting the blame for their relationship solely on Cleopatra through the words of an "exemplary" female character (who represents the feminine values of which the males in the society approve), Dryden attempts to make his patriarchal frame more convincing.

Regarding the romantic relationship of the two political leaders in the play, Yvonne Hann asserts that Dryden shapes the play to emphasize love (as opposed to power). She argues that Dryden "conspicuously avoids assigning blame or political motivations to either Antony or Cleopatra," demonstrating that "only those who are truly great, Antony and Cleopatra, have the ability to understand how the personal can outweigh the political" (375). However, although Dryden might exempt Antony from any blame for deserting his political responsibilities in favor of love, it is not the case for Cleopatra; she is criticized by all the Roman characters (including Antony), carrying the blame Antony shifts on her—despite the fact that Antony himself acted as the decision-maker with full agency.[28]

In contrast, despite all the blame laid on her, Cleopatra does not have much agency in the play. Although she is on the throne, as a female character she is likened to an object for males to take and conquer. For that reason, whether Caesar or Antony first laid eyes on her is a matter of great importance to Antony. He emphasizes that he was the one who first saw and loved Cleopatra, but "Caesar stepped in, and with a greedy hand / Plucked the green fruit ere the first blush of red" (II. 168-169). By characterizing Cleopatra as a damaged product, Antony establishes that he was full of love and merciful that he took her in, even though she was "stained by Caesar, / And not half mine" (II. 276-277).[29] No matter how much Antony loves her, it does not change that she is not whole, but damaged, stained, and thus at fault. This idea is furthered when Ventidius accuses Cleopatra of an affair with Dolabella: "VENTIDIUS. You know she's

---

[28] Not stopping at blaming Cleopatra for the hero's downfall, Dryden makes her and her entire nation the signifier of evil and misfortune. "VENTIDIUS. The nation is / One universal traitor, and their queen / The very spirit and extract of 'em all" (V. 156-158)." Also, V. 145-152.

[29] Furthermore, the Roman characters objectify Cleopatra, repeatedly weighing her in terms of economic value. Ventidius reproaches Antony for losing his dominance for the sake of his unprofitable love: "See Europe, Afric, Asia put in balance, / And all weighted down by one light, worthless woman!" (I. 371-372). As if replying to such accusation, Cleopatra tells Antony, "Your int'rest calls you hence;" (II. 408). It is not honor or Roman value, but the interest, or profit, that calls Antony away from her. Ventidius keeps putting Cleopatra on a scale: "And what's this toy / In balance with your fortune, honor, fame?" (II. 427-428).

not much used to lonely nights" (IV. 302). These accusations reflect Dryden's attitude toward women; according to Laura. L. Runge, Dryden continuously emphasized chastity in women, making "sexual modesty . . . a principle of general poetic decorum late in Dryden's career" (206). J. Douglas Canfield also notes that the Roman characters in the play define Cleopatra as "the very sign of inconstancy," demonstrating their "traditional Western patriarchal morality placed in service of late feudal, aristocratic ideology" (67-68). Dryden's Cleopatra is blamed for lacking sexual modesty; her previous relationship with Caesar affects her current reputation and is used to dismantle her truthfulness. This contrasts with Antony's case where his previous relationships, either it be with Fulvia or Octavia, do not cause any issues—even though, both times, it was he who left his partners.

The unequal status Dryden bestows on his two lead characters stands out more clearly through the choice(s) they have. Despite being a queen of her country, Cleopatra does not seem to have any choice other than putting forth her best efforts to secure Antony's love. Naturally, she is totally dependent on Antony. The moment she is sure that Antony has abandoned her, she gives up her autonomy as well as her status as a queen: "CLEOPATRA. I am no queen. / . . . I'm fit to be a captive: Antony / Has taught my mind the fortune of a slave" (II. 7-15). Whereas Antony can—and, for some time, does—decide to leave Cleopatra for his honor, Cleopatra rejects her duty and honor as soon as she loses Antony; she further says that she lived for Antony alone, and that she would rather die than bear Antony's absence (III. 468-469). Norman Suckling regards such dependency of Cleopatra a sign of her genuine love:

> Shakespeare's Cleopatra does not love Antony at all, until the last act. . . . She is more concerned with her power over Antony than with his happiness or his honor; . . . But

> Dryden's Cleopatra is a very different character, and may be said genuinely to love Antony, not merely to exploit him. (51)

Although Suckling seems to give more credit to Dryden's heroine for her truthfulness, her loyalty and devotion to the point of obsession makes her, in Hann's terms, "a one-dimensional version of the Egyptian queen" (379). This version of Cleopatra does not care for her political status, and, even in private relationship, as Marilyn Marie Holguin evaluates, she does not have "the same decided powerful and authoritative presence over Antony that she wields in Shakespeare" (181). Canfield also confirms that Dryden eliminated any ambiguity that could question Cleopatra's love for Antony (68). He further explains that Dryden is the only playwright between 1542 and 1677 who suggested that Antony and Cleopatra's love began when Antony put Cleopatra's father back on the throne—that is, before her affair with Caesar (69).[30] Underlining Dryden's emphasis on Cleopatra's consistent love, Canfield argues that Octavia, who in the end decides to leave Antony, is presented as a counter-example, concluding that "in the value system of the play, Cleopatra does 'deserve' Antony 'more' (III.I.450)" (69). However, it should be taken into consideration that Cleopatra and Octavia are not in the same position; whereas Octavia appears to be capable of wielding political power as a legitimate wife and Western woman (thus approved by Roman patriarchy), Cleopatra, a foreign mistress, has to be totally dependent on a man. Dryden's Cleopatra is more committed to love but possesses less influence in both private and public realms. In this sense, the title, *All for Love,* applies to Cleopatra, to whom love is the only thing that matters; however, the same is not true in the case of other characters, and Antony in particular, whose gender as well as social position allows him to be inconsistent in love.

---

[30] Canfield also provides that Appian is the only ancient historian to support such portrayal (69).

It is possible to interpret Cleopatra's lack of agency and dedication to love in another way than the author's masculinist portrayal of subordinate femininity. In his essay "Narcissus in Thy Face," Jonathan Gil Harris argues that the two characters and the two cultures they represent can be read as "specularity" rather than opposition (410). He explains that as Narcissus is fascinated by his own reflection, Romans' desire for Cleopatra and the exotic land is a projection of their own desire, featuring "what they do not or cannot have" (415). While this is a valid argument worth exploring, it still remains that Dryden divides the two—the self and the reflection of its desire—clearly, painting Cleopatra through his masculinist and Eurocentric gaze. After all, following Harris, Cleopatra embodies what is not Roman, fulfilling the desires of the Roman hero for the exotic and the oriental which he does not possess. This corresponds with the very definition of the Other. She, as the Other in the play is never represented as herself.[31] Regardless of who she actually is, she is characterized as someone the Romans wish her to be. Thus, as Harris argues, Cleopatra could be read as the reflection of Antony himself rather than his opposite, but it is still true that Dryden employs a foreignness and femininity to portray what a worthy Western male hero should not possess, thus maintaining a clear boundary between the two realms. In other words, in this play, the reflection never transcends the self, and the self never recognizes the reflection.[32]

To present the theme of love versus honor, Dryden establishes two clear sets of rivalry within his play: the first one is between friendship and love, and the second one is between the two female characters, Cleopatra and Octavia. To take a closer look, these two rivalries exhibit

---

[31] Harris also points out that Cleopatra's body repeatedly disappears "when it seems most overwhelmingly present" (417).

[32] Harris adds that the early modern audience had a reminder, as a boy actor played the role of Cleopatra, exposing the exotic foreigner to be the same as themselves underneath (424). However, I argue that this is a perspective from the modern audience, who would regard boy actors' playing female roles as exceptional enough to take note.

Dryden's gender perception by prioritizing masculine friendship over feminine love, and also exalting an exemplary feminine model of patriarchal modesty. As Vieth introduces, Dryden assigns Cleopatra to be the "representative of love" who confronts against Ventidius, "the spokesman of Roman honor" (xxi). The rivalry is not only an individual competition between Antony's male friend and female lover, but also a matter of value priority between love and honor. The confrontation between the two parties appears throughout the play. For example, when Ventidius first persuades Antony to leave Egypt, Antony compares Egypt to "prison of a town" (II. 146) and calls Ventidius "my deliverer" (II. 148). Naming Ventidius his deliverer from a prison characterizes Cleopatra as someone detaining Antony against his will. Male friendship is again emphasized later in Act V, when Ventidius proves his loyalty toward Antony, being "pleased with this brave Roman fate" in which he follows Antony to death (V. 180). He is ready to boast that he indeed is the one who died with Antony (V. 184). In comparison with the romantic relationship depicted in this play—which is changeable depending on circumstances, Ventidius's dying moment proves the superior strength and steadiness of male friendship. At his death, calling him "my leader," Antony laments, "My queen and thou have got the start of me" (V. 335-337). Although Antony at this moment is mistaken in believing that Cleopatra is dead, in his mind, even in death, his female lover and his male friend are both waiting for him, waiting for him to make his choice between the two.

Which side Dryden is on—between masculine and feminine love—is controversial. To interpret the relationship between Antony and Cleopatra, Bradley considers how a man's domestic relationship was viewed in the seventeenth century. According to Bradley, the public regarded Charles I's "uxoriousness—or 'feminine love'"—as the cause of his loss of power (185-186). Likewise, in Dryden's play, "subordination through love to a woman continues to be

equated with political disaster in public life" (186). Bradley concludes that the play "rejects masculine love in favor of feminine love" in the end, and that the choice gains even more power because the feminine love is presented in such a public way (186); however, throughout the play, the overpowering benefit of masculine love in comparison with feminine love is suggested repeatedly, underlining the lost opportunity of the rational choice which could have bettered the hero's fate. Such implication is consistent with Dryden's view, according to which he places Shakespeare over Fletcher, insisting that "the excellency of that poet [Shakespeare] was . . . in the more manly passions; Fletcher's in the softer: Shakespeare writ better betwixt man and man; Fletcher, betwixt man and woman: consequently, the one described friendship better; the other love" ("Preface" to *Troilus and Cressida* 227). He continues: "Friendship is both a virtue and a passion essentially; love is a passion only in its nature, and is not a virtue but by accident: good nature makes friendship; but effeminacy love" (227). Revealing a similar attitude, when Dryden gives himself approval for excelling Shakespeare in the preface to the play, he specifically points out the scene between the two males: "by imitating him [Shakespeare] I have excelled myself throughout the play; and particularly, that I prefer the scene betwixt Antony and Ventidius in the first act to anything which I have written in this kind" (26). Despite the implication from the title, the content of his writing demonstrates Dryden's priority on masculine love over feminine one.

The second rivalry is between Octavia and Cleopatra, which juxtaposes a legitimate Roman wife with unapproved foreign mistress. Dryden continuously reminds his audience of the contrast between the two female characters—one is the epitome of the feminine values expected by Roman males, and the other is the one who goes against these values. Octavia calls Cleopatra "that bad woman" (III. 356), "a strumpet" (IV. 251), and "an abandoned, faithless prostitute" (IV. 288). Like Ventidius, Octavia blames Cleopatra and her charms for Antony's ruin, excusing

Antony from any responsibility (III. 435-438). Whereas the main weapon Cleopatra wields is her charm, Octavia's power stems from her value as a "proper" Roman woman: "A Roman: / A name that makes, and can unmake, a queen" (III. 419-420). To Octavia, her Roman values—the values prescribed for women in the Roman patriarchy in particular—are absolutes that should be imposed on other women, providing a yardstick with which she can judge them regardless of their social position or cultural background.

Cleopatra's royalty does not put her in a superior position to Octavia even in her own court. The confrontation between the mistress and the wife, which is Dryden's invention, sets the rivalry even clearer. Although Cleopatra belittles the title of wife, describing it as desireless and powerless (II. 83-84), Octavia exerts her power as a wife in Cleopatra's court.[33] In Act III, Octavia demonstrates her power over Antony by bringing their two little daughters, who make a successful appeal to Antony's emotion; in the following scene, Octavia stresses the political power she can grant to Antony (III. 300-302). More importantly, Octavia is firmly aligned with Roman values. Dolabella describes her as "neither too submissive, / Nor yet too haughty," titling her "a wife and Roman" (III. 268-270). He further praises her faithfulness (toward Antony), her modesty, and her silence (III. 333-335). Not only her identity as a legal wife and Roman, but also her characteristics—such as being modest and silent—contrast her with Cleopatra, who is a mistress and the Other, bold, and vocal. Despite the fact that Cleopatra genuinely loves Antony, this does not fulfill the Roman criteria, since her love ruined Antony's honor. In contrast, Octavia states clearly that she loves Antony's honor, and that she regards it as her own (III. 292-293).

[33] Until Cleopatra positions herself as Antony's wife upon her imminent death, she clearly takes the position of a mistress—not a wife—and is regarded as such by both herself and Antony. She adamantly refuses the term "respect" since "Respect is for a wife," which would suit "cold Octavia" (II. 81-82). To Cleopatra, wife is an empty title which is "dull, insipid lump, without desires" (II. 83). As Antony titles her, "mistress" is the identity with which Antony defines Cleopatra (II. 196).

Antony and Octavia share the same Roman values: duty and honor. Antony regards it his duty to go back to Octavia not only because it is a way to keep his honor, but also because he feels obligated to pay Octavia back, calling himself "her branded slave" (III. 296). Although he claims that he would never "be conquered but by love" (III. 316), he soon admits that he is "vanquished" by the duty he owes to Octavia and their children (III. 363). Even to his own children, Antony sees himself as "a thriftless debtor" (III. 365). Either based on honor, practical benefit, or duty, reuniting with Octavia is described as a rational choice for him to make.

The rivalry between Cleopatra and Octavia mirrors the one between Cleopatra and Ventidius discussed earlier, because it is a competition between Egyptian and Roman values. The difference in the female rivalry is that by making the female characters fight each other (and letting one of the women fight for their patriarchal values), the male characters can keep some distance from the inelegant battle scene which could demean their dignity. In the "Preface," Dryden explains why he added the scene which presents the two women's confrontation:

> I judged it both natural and probable that Octavia, proud of her new-gained conquest, would search out Cleopatra to triumph over her, and that Cleopatra, thus attacked, was not of a spirit to shun the encounter. And 'tis not unlikely that two exasperated rivals should use such satire as I have put into their mouths; for, after all, though the one were a Roman and the other a queen, they were both women. (14)

As she does in the first rivalry, Cleopatra again represents love while Octavia speaks for Roman honor. Analyzing the confrontation scene, Holguin argues that "the adulterous character eventually takes on features of the faithful-wife archetype, while the literal wife plays like the *other* woman" (154, emphasis in the original). She notes the importance of this added scene, which increases Octavia's stage time despite the play's "economy of language, time, space, and

characters" (159). In this scene, Holguin argues, the two woman "verbally assault one another over a man, in a fight with comedic undertones, however serious its implication might be" (169). On one hand, the scene devalues the two female characters of high status as they fight with "comedic undertones"; on the other, their confrontation saves male characters from a disgraceful fight. Marcie Frank points out that "in the scene Dryden criticizes as the major flaw in his play, two women fight, and in the scene Dryden selects as his favorite, two men declare their love for each other" (312). Frank argues that, by making the two women of high social status fight each other, Dryden highlights the gender category over the social categories (320). With the focus on the rivalry between the female characters that fight for "male political power and value," Frank concludes, the play "thereby displac[es] male rivalry onto a 'safe' sphere" (323). Despite the fact that the male characters have conflicting values especially when Ventidius argues against Antony's decision, it is their loving friendship that gets a focus; the fighting part, instead, is left for the female characters.

However, even Octavia, who represents an exemplary and decent Roman female, loses the approval the moment she deviates from the code of feminine conduct assigned by Roman patriarchy. She loses her silence when Antony continues to care for Cleopatra even after his decision to leave Egypt. As Antony demands that Octavia leave, she explodes: "Wherein have I offended you, my lord, / That I am bid to leave you? Am I false / Or infamous? Am I a Cleopatra?" (IV. 394-396). Even though she is equipped with her Roman identity and virtue, it does not seem to be effective anymore once she vocalizes her criticism against Antony. This insinuates that, in Dryden's world, the most important womanly virtue is limitless understanding and obedience toward men. Once Octavia tells the truth—that Antony still cares for Cleopatra—out loud, thus pointing out Antony's fault, she is immediately branded as "this Fury" despite all

the honor and faithfulness she showed to Antony (IV. 412). The moment Octavia becomes bold and vocal in promoting her own emotion and will, rather than advocating on Antony's behalf, is when Antony deserts her. This reveals what Dryden considered as an ideal wife and ideal woman: a modest and obedient supporter of men. Indeed, Runge mentions that Dryden assigns "smoothness" as an ideal female conduct, while he considers "an angry, voluble or emotionally volatile woman violated social decorum" (209). Runge finds that Dryden's concept of femininity "connoted confinement, ornament, and the status quo" while masculinity contains "the concept of heroism" as well as "a sense of intellectual mastery" (209). Based on such a concept, the moment Octavia violates the social decorum of female conduct, she can no longer represent the ideal Roman (and patriarchal) value, and thus loses her place in the competition.

While *All for Love* demonstrates Dryden's masculinist perception of gender, at the same time, the play shows some evidence of change in gender perceptions of the time, which is moving from a hierarchical to a binary concept. Regarding the perception of gender in the Restoration period, Runge explains that people generally perceived females occupying a lower tier in the same category with males, rather than in an entirely different or opposite category (199). Applying this concept to *All for Love,* Antony's decreased agency while he is in love with Cleopatra indicates a significant damage to his masculinity. Ventidius, who compares Antony to an innocent sacrifice being slaughtered by a priest, berates: "[S]he has quite unmanned him" (I. 174). He goes on and laments that "the lord of half mankind" has been turned into "a woman's toy" (I 176-177). The consequence of loving Cleopatra is losing his manly power and becoming a "toy." As "toy" is the term Ventidius uses for Cleopatra in a belittling manner later in the play (II. 427), using the very word to indicate Antony—and describing him further as a toy possessed by a woman—implies that Antony's masculinity is taken away, along with his agency. Based on

such a view, it is possible to move up or down between the two—as Antony's masculinity, due to the influence of Cleopatra, is diminished into femininity. Providing a different point of view, however, Frank cites Thomas Laqueur, noting that the understanding of gender identity shifted from "a hierarchical understanding of gender differences (in which women are lower on the scale than men), to an oppositional understanding of gender differences (in which men and women are incommensurable, that is, weighed on different scales)" (314). Indeed, Dryden establishes a clear and solid gender binary in the play. Ventidius divides even the sound of instruments along gender lines: "Egyptian timbrels" (which, he dismissively says, make "effeminate sounds") versus "Roman trumpets" (I. 194-195). Accordingly, the sound of the trumpets is used to signal Antony's entrance while timbrels are used for Cleopatra's (III, stage direction, pp. 68). The contrast of genders, combined with the double standard that is applied differently according to genders, aligns with Frank's argument. At the same time, as Egypt (represented by Cleopatra) is feminized through this dichotomy, taking the submissive and inferior position to be conquered, the gender hierarchy in this play functions to support the cultural hierarchy between the colonizer and the colonized in a Eurocentric framework.

Still, it is important to note that Dryden's gender description is not a simple contrast between the two categories. Although the play presents a solid gender binary, it maintains an evident hierarchy between male and female. Such a hierarchy is further clarified by the presence of a middle point: Alexas, the eunuch. In spite of his social status, Alexas exerts his agency to some degree. It is Alexas who directs Cleopatra's action. Although Cleopatra is in a position that allows her to command Alexas, she listens to what he says and acts according to his scheme. This shows her lack of autonomy; she is dependent on men to decide her course of action. Yet, between Antony and Alexas, both of whom exhibit agency, there exists a clear distinction.

Whereas Antony betrays Cleopatra to pursue the values he prioritizes, such as honor and duty, Alexas acts from base motives, employing schemes that are far from honorable. In Dryden's play, it is Alexas who conjures the lie about Cleopatra's death, which in turn provokes Antony to kill himself (V. 228-234).[34] It is clearly indicated that the lie about her death is solely for his own sake: "ALEXAS. What can I say to save myself from death? / No matter what becomes Cleopatra" (V. 138-139). Observing Alexas's actions, Vieth suggests that "Alexas's incapacity for either love or honor emphasizes that Antony's problem is his excess of these positive qualities" (xxvii). By the same token, the presence of Alexas, who exerts his agency in a dishonorable manner, underlines the masculinity in Antony's devoted love at the end of the play. They might appear to be controlled by Cleopatra, and thus lack masculine agency; however, the contrast between the two proves that—at least towards the end—Antony's devotion and loyalty toward his love are due to the abundance of his heroic qualities. Thus, Alexas demonstrates that Dryden is still using the concept of hierarchy in gender in addition to the binary categorization. In this hierarchy, Alexas—the one who is "between" male and female and thus lacks complete masculinity—has greater agency than the female leader, but is degraded below the male leader due to his dishonor and disloyalty.

Dryden's perception of genders does not stop at the representation of the characters on stage. Exploring the hierarchy of genders during Dryden's time, Runge argues that the hierarchy "becomes a tool in Dryden's hands to disclose the discriminations of literary criticism" (210). "Gendered decorum," she goes on, classifies sound and pronunciation in language as well as the literary styles into masculine and feminine, which leads to "a code to restrict the female reader

---

[34] Pointing out that *All for Love* is unique in that Cleopatra is not involved in the lie about her suicide at all, Hann suggests that the queen has great mind to understand and value "the personal" (as opposed to "the political") (399). Although Hann is correct that Cleopatra prioritizes her love over political gain or public reputation, such prioritization could mean her lack of autonomy rather than her superiority.

and writer to appropriate subjects, styles, and genres with a particular emphasis on modesty" (210). Looking at Dryden, it seems that the hierarchy between genders maintains its concrete boundary regardless of the application of binary understandings of gender identity. Being a male author, Dryden himself was included in one part of the boundary, and, as examined above, his description of gender is highly biased in a way which exalts his male character and belittles its female counterpart.

Female Authorship and Female Agency: Mary Pix's *The False Friend*

Small but clear changes to such depictions of gender can be found in a female writer's work two decades later: Mary Pix's *The False Friend* (1699). Her play, written for a production at Lincoln's Inn Fields, shows a complex set of variations echoing Shakespeare's *Othello*. Although Aphra Behn (1640-1665) was among Dryden's contemporaries, she was practically the only woman who maintained her career as a professional playwright during her time, which makes her unique and exceptional. The playwright I discuss here, Mary Pix (1666-1709), not only succeeded in mounting her plays continuously, but also had the opportunity to build meaningful relationships with other female playwrights of her time.[35] Pix was one of the "triumvirate of female playwrights" who staged their plays in the 1695-96 season (Mann 258). Jean I. Marsden notes that, along with Catharine Trotter and Delarivier Manley, Pix was recognized as one of the "Female Wits" (660). However, unlike the other two who "have been praised for their depiction of 'feminist' themes" by later scholars, Pix is regarded "as conservative and even as an 'intellectual lightweight'" (660). Still, Marsden argues, "viewed

---

[35] Nancy Cotton explains that Behn was "an often embattled minority of one" whereas in the 1690s, with the encouraging discourse about women's intelligence, the female playwrights including Pix were "conscious of themselves as a group with a novel place in the culture" (10).

within the context of late-seventeenth-century and early-eighteenth-century English drama, Pix's plays are more innovative in terms of form and subject matter," and "more successful" than those of the other two writers (660). Pix wrote twelve plays, including *Ibrahim, the Thirteenth Emperor of the Turks* (1696; it was successful enough to be revived in 1702, 1704, and 1715), and *The Spanish Wives* (1696; it was also revived in the early eighteenth century) (Morgan 44-47).

Although Dryden and Pix are both inspired by Shakespeare's work, they demonstrate different approaches not only in the depiction of their own characters but also in their attitude toward Shakespeare: while Dryden confidently evaluates Shakespeare, regarding himself as an inheritor of the Bard and as one who is living in a more "refined" age, Pix places herself in a more humble position. Nancy Cotton notes that Pix's prologue to *Queen Catharine; or, The Ruines of Love* "admits the inability of her 'enervate voice' to 'wake the mighty dead,'" excusing herself from dealing with "the martial side of history" (115). Although Trotter, Manley, and Pix all made use of "the chivalry and amorousness of men, and the partisanship of the women" to advertise themselves (Cotton 91), Pix in particular, continuously positioned herself in a modest place, referring to herself as "the imperfect Woman" ("Preface to *Ibrahim,*" qtd. in Cotton 89), and "a Defenceless Foe" ("Epilogue to *Ibrahim,*" qtd. in Cotton 92), and to her work as "worthless trifles" ("Dedication to *Deceiver Deceived,*" qtd. in Cotton 120). Pointing out that her sex was the reason why Pix was twice abused in public (once when she was ridiculously portrayed in a satiric burlesque called *The Female Wits; or, The Triumvirate of Poets at Rehearsal* [by anonymous Mr. W. M., 1696], and the other when George Powell plagiarized her play),[36] Cotton suggests that such a humble approach is "due partly to her fear of attack as a

---

[36] "Had she been the only new woman playwright of the 1695-96 season, her existence alone would not have provoked *The Female Wits*. Similarly, George Powell probably stole from her play because she looked a likely

woman playwright" (120). Considering that she had to be careful and conscious about her social position as a female author, it seems reasonable that she tried to demonstrate her support for the reformation of drama in response to Jeremy Collier's criticism of the immorality of dramas (1698, *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage*).

As specified in its prologue, *The False Friend; or The Fate of Disobedience* (1699) is written with the clear intention to provide a moral lesson. The play, however, is regarded as one of her less successful works; little scholarship focuses on the piece, and Morgan dismisses it as "rather dull" despite its foreign setting and its "colorful frenzy of madness and death" (47). Cotton also calls it "the worst of her plays" (115), characterizing it as "a muddle of melodrama and moralizing" (119). Still, this play proves its significance in that it demonstrates the changes in Pix and her contemporaries' perception of gender, which is strikingly different from Shakespeare's or Dryden's point of view. *The False Friend* shares neither the main characters nor the plot with Shakespeare's *Othello*, and the author never mentioned any direct relationship between the two plays. Thus, *The False Friend* cannot be considered as an intentional adaptation of Shakespeare; however, it is possible to analyze it as an intertext of *Othello* based on the comparable points in the setting, character development, and expressions. The play introduces two sets of lovers: Emilius and Lovisa, and Adellaida and Brisac. The play opens as Emilius, the son of the Viceroy of Sardinia, arrives on the shores of his home country with his wife, Lovisa, shortly after their marriage. After meeting in France, the pair married without approval from their parents. Emilius asks Appamia, a close childhood friend, to help him get the approval from his father, as the Viceroy tends to grant her wishes easily. However, Appamia, who loves Emilius, is devastated and schemes to harm Lovisa with the help of Zelide, her Indian slave. While Emilius

victim, one whose sex as well as social class made her seem too insignificant to protest" (Cotton 120-121).

and Lovisa are the subjects of the main plot, Adellaida, Emilius's sister, is part of a subplot involving her relationship with Brisac. Brisac, who turns out to be Lovisa's brother, is in love with Adellaida and marries her in secret against her father's will. Appamia, like Iago in Shakespeare's *Othello*, proceeds with her scheme of deception; she provides wrong information to Lovisa to make her doubt Emilius's love, while setting up the scene so that Emilius and Brisac mistake each other and fight. Deceived by Appamia, Emilius kills Brisac, feeds poison to Lovisa with his own hands, and dies at the hand of Bucarius, who loves Appamia and is therefore drawn into her scheme.

Despite major differences in plot and character, *the False Friend* contains enough intertextual traces to be considered in relation to Shakespeare's *Othello.* First, the plot is based on a newly married couple that has recently traveled to a new setting. Similar to Desdemona and Othello, the husband and the wife in Pix's play are from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and they married without patriarchal approval. Also, there is a character who is highly trusted by a main character but betrays and schemes against him, driving the story to a tragic end. The scheme dismantles the couple's love and trust for each other, and the deceived husband ends up killing his own wife. In addition, Pix retains a character named Roderigo, who performs a similar role to Shakespeare's character with the same name, and as Jacqueline Pearson points out, some of Pix's lines closely resemble Shakespeare's (26-27).[37] Pearson observes that the villainous central character, Appamia, can be regarded as the "female Iago" in that she is the one who betrays Emilius's trust. However, at the same time, Appamia also shows

[37] David D. Mann and Susan Garland Mann also note the traces of Shakespeare in the play, mentioning "a female Iago" as well as the setting and the similarities in the plot and the characters (114).

some aspects of Othello in that she invokes some of his lines to “heroize her suffering and legitimate her love” while referencing her “black Revenge” (26).[38]

There are two major differences that Pix presents through her alterations in plot and character: she bestows distinctively greater agency on the main female characters and decreases the emphasis on race. Although both couples are combinations of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds (French and Spanish), the topic of race is far less visible in comparison to *Othello* since all the main characters fall into the category of white Europeans. The only racial Other, Zelide, is out of the central focus of the play due to her peripheral role. Similar to Dryden’s play, Pix’s work also shows a clear gender binary, but in Pix, the dynamic between men and women is significantly different, especially in the context of agency, because the female characters make most of the impactful decisions in the plot. Although Pix frames *The False Friend* as a morality play that warns against filial disobedience, she provides the female characters with active roles, opening up the possibility of an early stage of feminism.

Pix employs subtle strategies to question the established gender perceptions of her time. One such strategy is to question the credibility of sight. By exposing the unreliability of what they see, she casts doubts on stereotypical ideas that her audience might take for granted—racial stereotyping being an example of such ideas. Thus, examining the deceptive nature of sight in her work can eventually lead to an understanding of her attempt to question traditional gender perceptions. As in Shakespeare’s *Othello*, setting up a scene which one can witness with one’s own eyes is crucial in framing the lie in Pix’s play. Upon Appamia’s order, Zelide sets up a scene so that Brisac, Lovisa’s brother, can see the proof that Emilius is tainting the honor of Lovisa and her family (40). In addition, similar to the handkerchief that functions as an ocular proof in

[38] “OTHELLO. Arise, black vengeance, from thy hollow hell” (*Othello*, III.iii.450).

Othello, in *The False Friend*, a letter that Emilius is hesitant to share with Lovisa confirms her doubt about his love: “The Letter, which, at sight / Of me, so hastily you hid—Let me see it;” (42). Not content only with repeating the concept of a misleading ocular proof in Shakespeare, Pix presents the contrast between words and sight in *the False Friends*.

Pix emphasizes the possibility of deception and danger in visual perceptions as opposed to words. At the beginning of her scheme, Appamia warns Emilius against telling his full story to Adellaida because it could ruin her mischievous plan: “Stay not with *Adellaida* to tell your Story, / Only learn Intelligence, and leave me to Explain ye” (8). Similarly, Appamia prevents Adellaida from using words to communicate and resolve conflicts with Emilius by insisting that words are what false men use to mislead women: “Stopt my Ears at the bewitching Charmers” (32). Later, Appamia reveals more directly her worries about the potential of words to reveal truth, cautioning that the plan could go awry if Brisac and Emilius speak and resolve the matter without harming each other: “[T]hey may talk, and / All be well” (40). In this play, relying on words, or the act of telling, is considered more effective in revealing truth than relying on sight, or the act of seeing, which leads to deception. Acknowledging the deceptive nature of sight, when Bucarius penetrates Appamia’s lie, he decides not to rely on what he sees, saying, “I know her Soul deceitful, / And will not trust my Eyes to Gaze” (27). What complicates Pix’s argument in the play, however, is that she places an example that shows the discrepancy between appearance and truth alongside an opposing example at the same time.

The False Friend still repeatedly connects evil deeds to blackness, which is a familiar—and for that reason easily accepted—connection for her first audience, but she mixes some doubts into the familiarity. After all the tragic events, what Bucarius says demonstrates how Pix provides two opposing examples that complicate the relationship between sight and truth:

Buc. Come forth thou Woman! Angel in View

In Action Fiend! And thou Black

Accomplice; whose Looks and Deeds are

Parallel[.] Come forth. (58)

Although his lines still maintain the rigid distinction between good (white) and evil (black) as a premise, the boundary becomes blurry since the stereotypical example ("Black / Accomplice" [56-57]) comes with a simultaneous counter-example ("Angel in View / In Action Fiend" [55-56]). To take a closer look, Zelide is a character who exemplifies such a double-layered portrayal, as Pix complicates the stereotypical dichotomy of evil black and good white with loyal Zelide. She is connected to the concept of evil and danger in several places in the play. Zelide is "skill'd in / Baleful Drugs" (28), and upon Appamia's request, she offers Appamia the main tool for her revenge: her "fatal Compound" (46). Besides her skill with poison, the implied connection between blackness and evil deeds appears again when Appamia describes her horrendous scheme. She calls it "my Black, and Guilty Annals" (11) and "black Revenge" (10; 59), using "black" interchangeably with "evil." In Sardinian society, Zelide's dark skin symbolizes evil. Such prejudice stands out clearly when her appearance is contrasted to that of Appamia's. As Zelide warns against the plan out of her (converted) Christian faith and the fear of hell, Appamia laments:

App. Canst thou fear Hell, that look'st its Offspring?

Complexion'd, as our Fancy paints Devils--

But (Oh'!) for me, who have a thousand times

Been told my Form was bright as Angels Form,

To sink amongst Internal black Tormentors! (46)

Zelide, with her darker skin tone, represents what Appamia and her society—and, by extension, Pix and her first audience—imagine Devils to look like (also, "Devil Moor" [58]). In contrast, Appamia's whiteness entitles her to be called an angel regardless of her nature. Yet, despite the stereotypical representation of Zelide as the racial Other, it is repeatedly emphasized that Appamia's Indian slave is "faithful."[39] Zelide tries to put a stop to Appamia's evil plan, advising her to "Think well Madam; for after Death, / Repentance is too late!" (23). However, her social status does not grant her power or agency despite her accurate understanding of the situation and good conscience. Zelide cannot help providing her owner with the tools for her scheme, emphasizing faithfulness as her dominant characteristic. After all, Zelide counters the negative stereotype of a character of color with her moral virtue and loyalty, but such a quality does not clash entirely against the norm of Pix's society (that connects black to evil), since she ends up contributing to her mistress's evil scheme. Thus, Pix suggests a novel perspective, but in a moderate degree instead of being revolutionary; the stereotypical boundary is questioned without being broken.

According to Pearson, Zelide's portrayal in juxtaposition to Appamia serves to dismantle the strict hierarchy between male and female. She finds similarities between the contrast of blackness versus whiteness and good women versus evil women, which white patriarchy conceptualized (18). She further explains:

> The cruelty, lasciviousness, and treachery stereotypically associated with blacks also feature in certain female stereotypes, so that black women tend to appear as doubly inferior. Consequently, women writers, in producing more sensitive representations of

[39] "Why, Faithful Creature, why dost weep?" (9); "Yet I believe thou / Art faithful;" (10); "App. "O Faithful Slave!" (11); "App. Industrious, and Faithful is the *Indian* Slave—" (27). Such faithfulness is attributed to her origin and race: "App. *India* alone can breed thy Fellow!" (12). Although Zelide was of a high position in her own country (28), her nobility is merely used to reinforce her faithfulness rather than impacting her social status in Sardinia.

> black characters, were also subtextually presenting more positive representations of themselves. (19)

Considering that the black slave Zelide is morally superior to her white mistress Appamia, Zelide's presence on stage undermines the socially constructed binaries. Pearson expands her idea:

> If white men are associated with culture, and black men, like women, with nature, and if the whites are represented as morally more culpable than the blacks, then one effect of this may be to give a newly positive value to women and to female experience. (23)

Although Pix does not venture far enough to change the stereotypical portrayal of Zelide, she allows some amount of virtue that goes against the common assumption of the society. In so doing, rather than using Zelide as a representative of a different race, Pix uses Zelide to promote her more pronounced argument against the stereotypical representation of gender.

From the very first scene of the play, the difference in the attitudes of the female and male characters stands out clearly; the female characters have more practical and realistic worries while the male characters tend to be idealistic and optimistic. Upon their arrival on the Sardinian shore, Lovisa expresses a reasonable concern. She worries that Emilius's father might have chosen a different woman to marry his son, which would threaten Lovisa's status as a wife since their marriage was in secret (3). Also, she worries that in this foreign land, no one can prove her "Noble Birth," and that even if people could trace lineage down, she would have lost her status as a daughter because of her disobedience, leaving her with a title of "Wandring loose One; a wanton Mistress" (3). She is clearly aware of the sacrifice she made to follow Emilius: she broke ties with her family and society, damaging her status and reputation (2). As does Shakespeare's Desdemona, Pix's Lovisa breaks out of her privileged position for the sake of

love. Lovisa's sacrifice, which is more severe than Emilius's, in turn leads her to think of the realistic risk factors. Naturally, she demands that Emilius share his plan for persuading his father; however, he does not have any plans other than going to the palace and thinking about the next step from there: "Emil. I'le to my Father's Palace, which adjoyns, and / Learn how to proceed;"(7). Lovisa's reason for being more practical is confirmed by Appamia later in the play:

> App. Not upon him, but the false wanton I'd punish; your
>
> Sex is by custom privileg'd to Injuries like these, your
>
> Honours scarce tainted, call a Venial Crime, but
>
> In a Wife 'tis sure unpardonable. (25)

Similar to the contrast between Antony and Cleopatra where only the female is blamed for the intimate relationship, Appamia reaffirms that it will be only Lovisa who will be condemned when the unapproved relationship between them is revealed. In addition to the isolation from her family and culture, due to her gender, Lovisa will receive the most damage if they fail to secure patriarchal approval, which makes her more desperate than Emilius to find a practical solution.

Pix's female characters are not only rational, but also active. Indeed, one of the most evident changes Pix made in her play is that her female characters are more active agents in comparison to Desdemona in *Othello* or Cleopatra in *All for Love*. In *The False Friend*, it is the female characters' decisions and actions that drive the play's narrative. The most notable example is Appamia's agency as everyone else falls into her scheme although it ends up bringing about a tragic end. She is the "villain" of the play, echoing Iago in the aspect that she actively plans and moves to achieve the future she wants for others as well as herself (26). To arrive at her chosen end, she directs and manipulates the actions—and even the fates—of the male characters. One clear example is Bucarius, who acts as she orders in exchange for her promise of

marriage. Despite the fact that he knows what Appamia has in mind, he decides to carry out her order: "Revenge on his fair Choice, and I am to be the Fool / Employ'd" (27). Aware of her hidden intention, Bucarius claims that he would "counter-plot her purposes" (27); however, his counterplot does not flip or prevent Appamia's scheme but stops at revealing her as the culprit after all the tragic events, allowing Appamia to have a partial success in having her revenge.

Throughout the play, Appamia possesses the most information (with the exception of Bucarius, to whom Appamia confides her plan to some degree), and possibly the most power in terms of both economic possession and relationship-based influence. Early in the play, Appamia is the only one who knows both the true identity of Brisac/Don Lopez (10) and the secret of Emilius. In other words, she is the only one who knows the secret marriages in the main plot as well as the sub plot. This information gives her enough agency to act fast; it does not take long for her to come out of shock and decide to take action against the newly married couple: "'T was the last Sighs of my Expiring Love; / And from the Death of that I Rise / Another Woman" (11). Further, she knows how to use her information and power. When she plans to use Bucarius in her scheme, it is not merely based on his affection toward her, but also on her exact understanding of his political desire—that he wants to supplant the Viceroy and thus does not want Emilius to return (11). The extent of the information she possesses, along with her economic power and social status, allows her enough agency to act as the central character of the play.

Other female characters also demonstrate their agency. Even Lovisa, who is in an insecure position in a foreign country, demands clearly "I must be heard" when she needs attention from Emilius (3). More prominently, Adellaida is the one to whom Emilius reaches out for help because he assumes that she can exert more influence on their father (17). Shortly after, her true agency reveals itself when Adellaida attempts to protect her partner, going against the

stereotypical image of a passive female in need of protection. She demands that Emilius swear to not harm Brisac (19). Later in the play, again, Adellaida protects Brisac (from Lorenza, a suitor for her who is about to challenge him):

> Adel. Stay thee a Moment; and know—That Noble
>
> Youth's my Husband—If after this knowledge, thou
>
> Dar'st to lift thy Impious Hands against him;
>
> If thou dost Wound him (For Chance of 't Rules the Brave:)
>
> Blasted be my hopes for ever, when I not double all those Wounds
>
> Upon my Bosome! (48)

Although revealing her relationship with Brisac (disguised as Don Lopez) can harm her reputation and risk her position, she takes action to prioritize the safety of her husband. Furthermore, she knows how to exert the power she has based on her relationship and uses it to protect Brisac, who, despite being a male, does not possess as much power due to his status as an outsider in this culture.

Although the theme of honor does not take a central spot as in Dryden's play, Pix's characters still place an emphasis on honor and fame. The difference is that in *The False Friend,* among several possible aspects of honor, the one demanded most stridently is a woman's honor—chastity.[40] Although the Viceroy promises to not force her against her will (21), he expects her to be ignorant of males ("unknowing yet / Mankind" [21]), and not to have a say in her relationship with a man ("I know she wou'd as / Soon forgoe her Honour, as Contradict my

---

[40] Such a standard is applied differently depending on gender, as is clearly observed in the case of Brisac versus Lovisa. Although Brisac himself has married without approval, Brisac rages against Lovisa, blaming her for ruining the honor of the family: "Bris. Curst, Curst *Lovisa!* Contagion of my Blood! / Disgrac'd is our, till now, untainted Honor" (43). Brisac's conduct does not matter, but the same conduct by a female in the family is interpreted as a disgrace.

will [21]). The Viceroy's perspective, however, does not seem to represent Pix's position as the audience at this point is clearly aware of the marriage of Adellaida and Brisac, which proves that Adellaida is far from ignorant in a romantic relationship. Later when Lorenzo dies, the Viceroy blames Adellaida for Lorenzo's suicide, calling her "False Girl" (50). The demand for innocence and obedience precedes a promise. Furthermore, her honesty, which allows her to tell Lorenzo what she actually thinks, is not taken as a virtue but yields a tragic result and blame, all because she marries at her will. Discussing the portrayal of female characters during the Restoration period (in the Comedies of Cibber and Vanbrugh in particular), Laurie A. Finke notes that despite "the notorious lewdness of the drama of this period, Restoration heroines are remarkable for their virtue" (175). Also, writing about Cibber and Vangrugh, Finke concludes that no matter how sympathetic they are to their female characters, being male authors in a masculinist society, they cannot help being limited by the society they are depicting (175). Judging from the emphasis on female chastity, the same social influence (which emphasizes patriarchal values) was exerted on Pix, even though she was a female author. However, considering Pix's tendency to present herself as a modest writer, as well as her declared intention in this play (to contribute to the moral reform of the stage), it is questionable whether her emphasis on chastity is due to the limits on her imagination as a member of a masculinist society, or due to the social constraints that limit her free expression of more radical ideas.

Despite the ample examples of female agency in the play, Pix's characters define lack of agency as feminine, which aligns with the emphasis on the expected obedience of women. Bucarius regards carrying out Appamia's orders as a factor that takes his masculinity away,

which could be an echo of the popular perception in Pix's contemporary society.[41] Placed within this social atmosphere, Appamia's strong agency has even greater significance. Considering that she is the character who directs what others (Emilius, Bucarius, and Lovisa) should do, and that they carry out most of her orders, it is possible to say that Appamia is the most "masculine" character in the play. In addition to lack of agency, the characters equate femininity with softness, gentleness, and weakness. In the earlier part of the play, Brisac describes Appamia as "Pitifull / And kind, as her soft Sex Inspires" (16). Appamia herself also attributes weakness to females, defining emotions such as pity and guilt as "the Woman's weakness" (41). Although she creates characters who deviate from the feminine expectation throughout the play, Pix implies that Appamia's nature before the arrival of the married Emilius used to conform to the expected qualities for an ideal female in this society.

Although the play comments on both genders, it focuses more on females, and, above all, portrays the moral expectations from them; gentleness and obedience are praised, weakness is presumed, and disobedience and jealousy are warned against: "Vice. My *Adellaida*! perfect Image of thy Mother, / Sweet in thy obedience; and of Temper gentle!" (13). The Viceroy's praise and affection toward his daughter are contingent upon whether she meets the expectations of obedience and a gentle temper. Appamia's final words strengthen the same idea. As a clear counterexample, she confirms that behaviors—like hers—that do not conform to the social norm yield negative outcomes for everyone. As a villain who has gone against the expected qualities for females, Appamia warns: "Let me for ever / Warn my Sex, and fright 'em from the thoughts of / Black Revenge, from being by Violent Passions / Sway'd" (59). Together with the last

---

[41] Buc. If now I shake not off the Effeminate Slavery.
Boys shall Proclame my Folly's, and hout me
From the Society of Men; (26)

homily from the Viceroy, Appamia completes the ending as a moral lesson in the play. However, although in consonance with the final warning of Appamia, the epilogue and prologue to the play suggest that Pix is doing more than simply delivering traditional moral lessons for women. In the "Epilogue," Pix claims that the goal of the play is "to shew you *Nature* more than *Wit*." Based on the ending and also on the "Prologue" by Hodgson, the "nature" she tries to show through the play is mainly moral virtue, especially in the form of filial obedience. Hodgson approves Pix's position as an author, stating "A Woman, to Contribute [to Refine the Stage], does Intend, / In Hopes a Moral Play your Lives will Mend" (Prologue). Interestingly, however, he goes on to mention men's responsibility: "And those Misfortunes which on *Men* do fall, / To their False Selves they Chiefly owe 'em all. /Did *Men* Reform, all *Women* wou'd do well" (Prologue). In comparison to Dryden, who places blame solely on the female character, Hodgson puts the responsibility on men, arguing that they could lead all women into reformation. This is noteworthy, considering that in *The False Friend* the active agent who brings about the fatal consequence is indeed a female character, Appamia.

Furthermore, although it seems that *The False Friend* attempts to show a moral lesson to persuade people to follow traditional norms, the case of Adellaida suggests a possibility for a different interpretation. Having gone against her father's will, Adellaida laments, "How vain are all the Cautions of our Sex; / How weak the best Resolves of Woman-kind!" (15). She (reasonably) expects a tragic outcome to follow, and is fully aware that, as a female in a patriarchal society, there is not much she can do to save herself and her partner. While the praised and derided qualities express the expectations prevalent in Pix's society, Adellaida, who takes the position of a protagonist (thus building audience sympathy), shows the possibility of a change, hinting that the limited ability of Adellaida and her tragic fate are unfair.

Likewise, the fate of other characters at the end of the play makes the professed intention in the prologue—that Pix intends to highlight obedience as a value for women to follow—questionable to some extent. In the end, most of the male characters in the plot (Emilius, Brisac, Lorenza, and Bucarius) die, but two of the main female characters, Appamia and Adellaida survive. Even before the tragic ending, Adellaida laments receiving "A Parents / Curse . . . / Since then Curses have the power to kill" (55). Then she curses the whole world, starting with Emilius who (mistakenly) kills her husband. Considering the moral lesson, it seems that the death of the villain and the disobedient child—more so because she gets cursed by her own father—would more strongly align with the supposed intention of the play. However, the two active females survive, and Lovisa, who followed the will of a man, is the only major female character who dies at the end of the play. The fates of these characters, which are dissonant with the moral lesson of the play, make the emphasis on female conduct in the ending questionable. At the very least, it can be said that Pix encourages female agency through Appamia and Adellaide's survival.

Examining Pix's play in juxtaposition with Dryden's is meaningful in that it sheds some light on how an author's individual identity was reflected in his or her writing. *The False Friend* in particular is an apt example to analyze alongside the most popular Restoration play because it is not generally recognized as a distinctive feminist piece. For that reason, Pix's play demonstrates how a female author creates a different gender portrayal in comparison with a male author from the same period. Granted, *All for Love* and *The False Friend* have an eventful two-decades gap between them; however, the plays clearly reveal the different perspectives that stem from the authors' different identities. "Woman must write her self," insists Hélène Cixous (875). She perceives writing as a means for creating change. According to Cixous, women should write

in their own voice because men—who have dominated writing for so long—cannot represent them. The act of writing will let women realize and regain what they have within themselves. Cixous goes on:

> [I]t will tear her away from the superegoized structure in which she has always occupied the place reserved for the guilty (guilty of everything, guilty at every turn: for having desires, for not having any; for being frigid, for being "too hot"; for not being both at once; for being too motherly and not enough; for having children and for not having any; for nursing and for not nursing . . .) (880)

Dryden's Cleopatra, who is created by a male author and framed through a male view, is guilty of everything negative that happens to the male hero, Antony—regardless of her faithful love or her lack of agency. Although not too long after Dryden's time, the female characters created by Pix demonstrate the possibility of change in the gender perceptions of the Restoration era. In the frame of a female author, the female characters can have as much—if not more—agency as the male characters. Despite the constraints of social norms in that time, Pix succeeds in creating a different type of female representation to share with her audience, thus extending the possibility of change.

Chapter 3. Adapting Characters into National Representatives

While Chapter 2 discusses two plays adapted in Britain, this chapter compares intracultural and intercultural adaptations, focusing on two plays about Cleopatra: George Bernard Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1899), and Ahmed Shawqi's *The Death of Cleopatra* (1929). Although they are both featuring Cleopatra as their heroine, the two plays frame her from antithetical perspectives, representing the opposing sides of British imperialism. Through an analysis of these plays, I examine the influence of political atmosphere and national need on the adapted texts. Although their depictions of the queen are exactly antithetical, they employ similar strategies, revealing that literature can contribute to the construction of a national identity by representing certain groups of people with well-recognized characters.

To recapitulate, in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, Cleopatra is mainly depicted as an extremely emotional, capricious, aggressive, and dangerous woman; she seduces Antony, a great Roman general who, prior to meeting her, maintained his perfect reputation based on his military achievements. Such an image is attributed to the queen not only in Shakespeare's work, but also in most well-known Western representations; Cleopatra (and the Egypt she represents) is often depicted as temperamental and irrational, in contrast with her counterpart(s) from Rome. Depending on the focus of each piece, the Roman values emphasized in characters such as Julius and Octavius Caesar, Antony, and Octavia range from rationality to generosity, bravery, and decency. One of the clearest examples of such a binary depiction appears in Bernard Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1899), which highlights the contrast between the two lead characters. Setting a childish sixteen-year-old Cleopatra next to a mature middle-aged Julius Caesar, Shaw underlines the superiority of Caesar, his Rome, and—by extension—the imperial power of the

West. The play was first published in 1901 as part of *Three Plays for Puritans*, in which each of the three plays is subtitled with a genre: *The Devil's Disciple* is "a Melodrama," *Captain Brassbound's Conversion* is "an Adventure," while *Caesar and Cleopatra* is "a History." Although the subtitle gives the impression that *Caesar and Cleopatra* is based on historical facts, thus maintaining "objectivity" to some extent, Shaw's play demonstrates how subjective a historical depiction can be, depending on an author's intention and sociocultural background.

Although Cleopatra is a historical figure, portrayals of her vary significantly when she becomes a *character*—depending on when, by whom, and for whom she is written. In *La Chambre Claire,* Roland Barthes calls history "a form of memory fabricated from positive recipes" (qtd. in Bann 5). As Stephen Bann summarizes, for Barthes, "historiography could no more effectively disavow its fictional status than any other form of discursive language" (5). In "The Discourse of History," Barthes questions if historical narrative (i.e. "the narration of past events") can be different from "imaginary narration" in its objectiveness (7). Oftentimes, when something is "based on history" or described as a "historical fact," it is expected to add credibility to the utterance to a certain degree even though the audience is likely to be aware that it could include the author's choices, both intentional and unintentional, and his or her imagination to some extent. Barthes points out that from the moment historians start to collect a historical fact to organize pieces of information into a narrative, they are bound to exert their subjective judgement (8, 15). He quotes Nietzsche: "There are no facts in themselves. It is always necessary to begin by introducing a meaning in order that there can be a fact" (16). A historical fact exists as an event in the past, which is objective by itself, but when it is selected to be retold, the reproduced piece of information must contain subjectivity.

Viewpoints on colonial empires provide evident examples that demonstrate the subjective nature of historical narrative. "Take up the White Man's Burden," wrote Rudyard Kipling in 1899 (the same year Shaw wrote *Caesar and Cleopatra*), urging the United States to develop the Philippines (311). He goes on to say, "Go bind your sons to exile, / To serve your captive's need," thus framing colonization as a sacrifice on the colonizer's part (311). While depicting colonization as a mutually beneficial relationship in symbiosis ("To seek another's profit / And work another's gain" [Kipling 311]), the overall poem emphasizes the responsibility and "burden" of "the White Man," pleading with Americans (and other European colonizers) to go to the undeveloped colony for the good of those "inferior" people despite their ingratitude and the hardships on the way. Behind this appeal, as Patrick Brantlinger points out, was Kipling's firm belief that the British Empire that governed over India and Africa was characterized by "energy, honor, and beneficence" (172). This was by no means a universally shared opinion even in Kipling's lifetime. Brantlinger notes that the poem was parodied and cited from almost the very beginning, as was seen in the case of Henry Labouchère's "The Brown Man's Burden" (1899). Brantlinger also provides *The Black Man's Burden* (1920) by Edmund Morel as an example that argues directly against Kipling's acclamation of empire (173). Shaw, however, seems to have shared Kipling's views on imperialism—at least partially. As will be discussed in detail later, through *Caesar and Cleopatra* Shaw reveals his view of empire: when it is run appropriately by a capable leader, it is a benevolent form of assistance granted to the uncivilized and inferior parts of the world. Considering the subjectivity of historical narrative, which is often heavily affected by its sociocultural contexts, it seems only natural that a story of Cleopatra told from the viewpoint of the colonized would draw a different picture of British imperialism. Several years after Egypt's independence from Britain in 1922, Ahmed Shawqi, the national poet of Egypt,

also recreated the story of Cleopatra—possibly the most famous female Egyptian in history—to let her serve as the country's representative. Shawqi depicts Cleopatra as a responsible and patriotic queen, reshaping her image in a newly independent Egypt to express national pride and cultural confidence.

For both Shaw and Shawqi, writing a play that features a historical figure to express their political viewpoints—instead of an evidently fictional character—is a highly strategic choice. By connecting their plays to historical events, the two authors attempt to use the illusion of objectivity (which stems from the expectation that historical narrative is based on what is "real") to amplify their messages. When a historical narrative creates an image, the image holds power over those who have a close connection to that piece of history. For instance, when Shaw presents an image of empire, it can potentially have a stronger impact on Shaw's contemporary audience, who were living in the era of British imperialism. Further, as a certain historical viewpoint can be shared by a group of people (either within a political group or a nation), a distinctively customized historical narrative can affect how a group of people perceive themselves. More specifically, it can form a concept that distinguishes "us" from "them," fortifying a unity among those on the same side and enlarging their distance from those who are on the opposite side.

Shaw's "History" and the Glorification of Caesar

Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra*, written in 1898 and premiered as a staged reading in 1899, depicts the duration of Julius Caesar's stay in Egypt from 48 BCE to 47 BCE. The published playscript has two prologues. The prologue which appears first in the text, written in 1912 for a remount of the play, shows the Egyptian God, Ra, who addresses the audience

directly to summarize the historical background of Egypt before Caesar's arrival, and to admonish the "dull" audience on whom the "instruction is wasted" (134). The second prologue, titled "An Alternative to the Prologue," was written first and originally included in Act One when Shaw first wrote the play. This version shows a group of Egyptian guardsmen having a conversation about the current news of their sixteen-year-old queen, Cleopatra, and the approaching Roman soldiers. Following the two prologues, the play unfolds as Caesar meets Cleopatra by the Sphinx, depicting the relationship between the two rather comically. Cleopatra does not recognize Caesar, and expresses her fear of the Romans, warning him, "Climb up here, quickly; or the Romans will come and eat you" (147). As the play proceeds, Caesar expels Ptolemy—Cleopatra's brother, who has ascended to the throne—from the palace to replace him with Cleopatra and teaches her how to be a queen while leading his troops in the battles against the Egyptian army, that supports Ptolemy. Cleopatra depends greatly on Caesar, hanging onto his words, and appears to learn and change herself to some degree. However, she still is depicted as an attention-seeking and immature girl who fails to become an appropriate queen by the end. The play ends as Caesar, who almost forgets to even bid farewell to her, leaves with a promise that he will send her Antony, a Roman general, to love as his replacement.

As a prominent member of the Fabian Society, Shaw openly expressed his view on imperialism through his plays and other writings as well as public lectures. His position can be summed up as taking the validity of imperialism for granted while criticizing the capitalist exploitation that took place in the British empire. Analyzing *Fabianism and the Empire*, Patricia Pugh finds Shaw's main claim to be the one about the method of imperialism, rather than the validity of it: "whether the people wished it or not, Britain possessed an empire, and socialists had to face up to this and do the best they could with it" (105). What he wanted was a "world

federation" where "the Great Powers" perform a policing function to ensure international benefit (105). In Shaw's ideal empire, "a strong federation of countries populated and run by Englishmen" would appropriately benefit all the subordinate countries so that they would "gladly adhere to the mother country" (106). As Shaw accepts the idea of imperialism while being against the colonizing practices around the world during his lifetime, his plays exhibit a somewhat ambivalent attitude in dealing with colonialism. Discussing Shaw's *John Bull's Other Island* (1904), Kathleen Ochshorn notes that the play makes a satire of both exploitive colonialism in Ireland and stereotypical Irishness outside Ireland, while expressing Shaw's concerns about that nation's unpromising economic ability (181-188). In the process of the satire, Ochshorn argues, Shaw could ridicule the stereotypical portrayal of Irish people while acknowledging some truth behind it because of his marginal position as "an Irishman in England" (191). *Caesar and Cleopatra* similarly reveals Shaw's ambivalent attitude toward imperialism; the satire he creates, however, should be read differently than in *John Bull's Other Island*. Unlike the case of Ireland, in *Caesar and Cleopatra*, in which he creates his Egyptian characters, he does so without a deep understanding of the culture and history he portrays. Shaw appropriates Egyptian culture and personages to emphasize the validity of the (Western) empire and highlight its effective leadership, which can support his idea of an ideal world federation governed by the Great Powers.

In this play, Shaw pictures Cleopatra as more immature than she is in the received historical narrative and eliminates the sexual liaison between her and Julius Caesar; in so doing, he directs the audience's attention to his political message without any distraction from an emotional and romantic plot which would gain sympathy from the audience. To reveal his intended message as well as the strategy he uses to successfully convey it, I will first examine

how he establishes a connection between the play and his contemporary society and analyze his purposes. Next, I will discuss his literary schemes in the play, such as character development and the use of figurative language, with a detailed textual analysis that demonstrates his perception of history, which shows his stance as a member of the British empire.

While the play is set in ancient Egypt, Shaw makes it relevant to his contemporary audience through the comparison between the Roman empire and the British empire. In the 1912 version of the prologue, Ra draws a direct comparison between contemporary England and ancient Rome: "Know that even as there is an old England and a new, and ye stand perplexed between the twain; so in the days when I was whipped was there an old Rome and a new, and men standing perplexed between them" (130). Calling the audience "foolish" for expecting to see "a story of an unchaste woman," Ra proceeds to claim that, after seeing the story of "the old Caesar and the child queen . . . ye shall marvel . . . that men twenty centuries ago were already just such as you" (133). Considering the parallel Shaw draws between the two empires, the political relationship between Egypt and England during his lifetime is significant. According to Malouf, after the Indian Rebellion of 1857, "the 'informal' modes of colonization" that began in the early modern period became an "Imperialist system" (207). It brought "a view of centre and periphery as essentially connected by matters of state," and divided their view of the world "into formal colonies and the spheres of influence of the great power" (E. J. Hobsbawn, qtd. in Malouf 207). The situation of Egypt operates as a clear example of "the spheres of influence." After England gained control over the Suez Canal in 1875, for Shaw's contemporary audience, Egypt became a country at the periphery of their empire. Despite several declarations from England asserting that "England had no wish to annex Egyptian territory," in the end Egypt became a "veiled protectorate" of the empire (Evans 43). Certainly, the political situations of England and

Egypt in the late nineteenth century, where Egypt had its own sovereign but was controlled by the British government, resembles that of Egypt and Rome in Cleopatra's time.[42] Although Egypt had its own queen, the true ruler of the country was the European man who exerted his power on the queen.

In the detailed preface he inserted in the 1930 edition of the text, Shaw states clearly that he intends to correct the injustice done by Shakespeare to Caesar. To offer "an improvement on Shakespeare's [play]," Shaw alters the major characters and the genre. Shaw does not approve of *Antony and Cleopatra* because the play unjustly glorifies Antony, who is not worthy of the label of a tragic hero; he does not find any value in the heroine, Cleopatra, either. To Shaw, they do not represent any great human spirit, so elevating them to heroic positions is unacceptable:

> Shakespear's *Antony and Cleopatra* must needs be as intolerable to the true Puritan as it is vaguely distressing to the ordinary healthy citizen, because, after giving a faithful picture of the soldier broken down by debauchery, and the typical wanton in whose arms such men perish, Shakespear finally strains all his huge command of rhetoric and stage pathos to give a theatrical sublimity to the wretched end of the business, and to persuade foolish spectators that the world was well lost by the twain. (29)

No matter how great a military general Antony is, he does not qualify as a hero whose fall "the ordinary healthy citizen" should pity, because he failed to maintain his noble demeanor and mission by falling into the hands of the foreign queen. Cleopatra reminds Shaw of Circe, "with the horrible difference that whereas the ancient myth rightly represents Circe as turning heroes

[42] Further, as Weintraub points out, Shaw's young Cleopatra mirrors Queen Victoria, who ascended the throne at eighteen in 1837, guided by the prime minister, Viscount Melbourne, who was fifty-four, just like the middle-aged Caesar (20). Another similarity can be found in that Queen Victoria had a powerful and devoted nurse and servant, Louise Lehzen (Weintraub 20). To Shaw's audience, therefore, the story of Caesar and Cleopatra could resonate in multiple ways, reflecting their political situation both internally and externally.

into hogs, the modern romantic convention would represent her turning hogs into heroes" (29). From Shaw's perspective, Antony is a "hog" who indulged himself against his honor and duty, and is wrongly perceived as a hero merely due to the magic of his love story with Cleopatra. Leaving disqualified Antony behind, a better heroic alternative is Caesar, who, in Shaw's play, is not seduced by the young queen—which goes against the historical fact that Caesar and Cleopatra had a sexual liaison, which produced a son, Caesarion.[43] Shaw professedly did not care much about the play's lack of historical accuracy: "I never worry myself about historical details until the play is done; human nature is very much the same always and everywhere" (Shaw, qtd. in Wikander 195). As Stanley Weintraub notes, Shaw wanted to "change the world as he saw it" (19). To achieve his goal, Shaw altered the historical details, characters, and genre of the play.

In Shaw's opinion, the story of Cleopatra is not a valid topic for a tragedy, which is the reason for the change of genre to "a history." Shaw's firm stance against the idea that romance should be the center of every work dictates his artistic choices:

> And when I see that the nineteenth century has crowned the idolatry of Art with the deification of Love, so that every poet is supposed to have pierced to the holy of holies when he has announced that Love is the Supreme, or the Enough, or the All, I feel that Art was safer in the hands of the most fanatical of Cromwell's major generals than it will be if ever it gets into mine. The pleasures of the senses I can sympathize with and share; but the substitution of sensuous ecstasy for intellectual activity and honesty is the very devil. (21)

Shaw acknowledges that love can be an apt topic for some works; however, for him it is not the supreme theme since it does not hold any higher value. Further, as he regards the relationship

[43] Ptolemy XV Philopator Philometor Caesar in his official name.

between Antony and Cleopatra as a story of seduction and debauchery rather than of true love, he does not approve making such “sexual infatuation a tragic theme” (30). Instead, Shaw tells his story as a comedy, highlighting Caesar’s great leadership and intelligence while ridiculing Cleopatra’s incompetence and folly.

To better elevate Caesar, Shaw diminishes Cleopatra, maximizing the contrast between the two. From the beginning, Shaw communicates clearly that Cleopatra is no match for Caesar, setting the 16-year-old girl against a middle-aged ruler. Ra in the prologue indicates, “Cleopatra is as yet but a child that is whipped by her nurse” (133). In contrast to the pubescent Cleopatra, who is too immature and inexperienced to take control of her own attendants—and instead is controlled by them—Caesar is an experienced leader who has achieved numerous accolades and military victories. Although it is historically true that Cleopatra was a lot younger than Caesar, Shaw exaggerates the gap. Shaw takes from Plutarch that Cleopatra was of a young age when she first met Caesar, while ignoring the fact that the hero was charmed by the young girl (Couchman 36). Historian Theodor Mommsen’s account, which Shaw referred to when writing the play, confirms Shaw’s distortions further. Mommsen writes that Cleopatra was sixteen when Ptolemy took the throne, which happened three years before Caesar’s arrival (Couchman 40). Other historical sources set Cleopatra’s age when she first met Caesar at twenty-one (Weigall, qtd. in Couchman 40) or even twenty-two (*Cambridge Ancient History*, qtd. in Couchman 40). Changing the age of the young queen to sixteen allows Shaw to portray her immaturity with more ease in contrast to Caesar.

Such a contrast is further consolidated by the figurative languages attached to the heroine. Regarding the position of Cleopatra and Egypt before a strong invader, Shaw uses language to address or describe Cleopatra which frames her as a weak creature confronting a predator. In

addition to being addressed as a "kitten," the stage direction states that she "*runs like a gazelle to Caesar*" (221), and "*skip[s] like a young fawn*" (222). Considering that both a gazelle and a fawn are objects of prey, such language resonates with Cleopatra's seemingly unrealistic fear—that "the Romans will come and eat" her (147). While highlighting Cleopatra's weakness and youth to deny her any serious action, Shaw symbolically depicts the power hierarchy of the colonizer and the colonized through the consistent use of diminutive imagery associated with the Egyptian queen.

Her image as an immature child is clearly established even before Cleopatra comes onstage, through the conversation among the characters in her court. Belzanor, a guardsman in the palace, dismisses the idea of waiting for her command before responding to the Roman army, exclaiming, "Command! A girl of sixteen!" (141). The one who has control in the palace is not the queen, but her nurse, Ftatateeta; she nonchalantly tells the guards that Cleopatra is hiding because she "chid" her for her wrong behavior and proclaimed that "the Romans came as a punishment for her disobedience" (144). Cleopatra's first appearance cements this image. Not realizing that she is talking to Julius Caesar himself, she expresses her fear of being eaten by the Romans. She "*seriously*" warns Caesar about the "barbarians," and shares an unrealistic piece of information about their chief, Caesar: "his father was a tiger and his mother a burning mountain" (149). Even considering her youth, Shaw's Cleopatra is unrealistic and gullible to the point of nonsense. Her childish character gets more emphasis because of the expectation that the queen of a country would be more mature and responsible during a time of political and military danger.

The interaction between Caesar and Cleopatra gives no hint of romance, but clearly resembles a teacher-student relationship. During their first meeting, Caesar immediately assumes a position of trainer for the young queen; rather than revealing his identity, he tries to make

Cleopatra behave in a more mature way by threatening that Caesar, who eats cats and girls, will indeed eat her "unless you make him believe that you are a woman" (151). Addressing her as "my child" (150), "silly little girl" (151), or later as "kitten" (154, 174),[44] Caesar instructs her in how to be a queen, which Cleopatra accepts more than willingly: "I will do whatever you tell me. I will be good. I will be your slave" (152). The lopsided power dynamic between the two in turn removes any possibility of a serious romance to occur in their relationship. When asked if she loves Caesar, Cleopatra replies, "Can one love a god?" (213). Although she obediently follows the directions from Caesar, her dependence on him further highlights her incompetency, instead of transforming her into an appropriate queen. As Shaw's Cleopatra never climbs up to the level where she can be an equal to Caesar both as a ruler and an adult, a romantic relationship cannot be established between the two. By taking the position of a romantic partner away from Cleopatra, Shaw intensifies the unbalanced power dynamic between the center and the periphery.

Even the teacher-student relationship, however, does not prove to be successful on her part as Cleopatra does not demonstrate any solid proof of improvement, or the capacity of growth until the end of the play. Some scholars, such as Weintraub and Gyeong Hye Kim, insist that Caesar successfully educates Cleopatra. Weintraub notes that she "develops through the acts from a kitten to be stroked into a cat with menacing claws" (24), and that she "flowers under Caesar's tutelage" (25). Similarly, Kim concludes that the play displays the process of the Egyptian people's self-recognition—in other words, the process of moving from ignorance toward enlightenment, revealing Shaw's revolutionary and progressive ideas, which are "not limited by race, time and place and also ha[ve] universality to transcend everything" (67, 70). In

---

[44] In their first meeting, Cleopatra describes herself as a descendent of a black cat and the river Nile: "My great-grand mother's great-grandmother was a black kitten of the sacred white cat; and the river Nile made her his seventh wife" (148). Still, addressing her as "kitten" solidifies the link between the queen and immaturity.

front of the Egyptian characters, Cleopatra boasts that "Caesar has made me wise" (211); however, in front of Caesar, even after months of his "teaching," she expresses her one-sided dependence, saying "I am only a child" (228). In the final scene, Caesar—the "tutor" himself—confirms the failure of her training; as Cleopatra pleads with him not to desert her, Caesar impatiently exclaims, "What! As much a child as ever, Cleopatra!" (242). Shaw's Cleopatra never improves: she remains submissive and dependent even after months under the tutelage of Caesar, Shaw's valorized hero and leader. Shaw's ideal imperial ruler thus does not help Cleopatra grow; instead, he makes her worship and rely on the colonizer.

One major reason for the failure of improvement—or, the success of non-improvement from the imperial perspective—can be found in the method Caesar employs; he directs rather than mentors her. Cleopatra does not change into a true queen but moves from being under the control of her nurse, Ftatateeta, to the tutelage of new master, Caesar. As the stage description indicates, on the surface, she attempts to demonstrate "*her newly-acquired dignity as a queen*," but she struggles with "*a strong impulse to put out her tongue*" at Ptolemy, who is getting Caesar's attention, while "*fidgeting with the restlessness of a child*" (167). Whereas Cleopatra is entirely focused on Caesar's reaction, to Caesar Cleopatra is merely a pawn. He shows no desire to teach her; rather, he makes her behave as he wants, using threats and commands: "CAESAR. Be quiet. Open your mouth again before I give you leave; [sic.] and you shall be eaten" (164). Because she simply acts as she was directed, without actually learning how to be a queen, she does not improve beyond a superficial level. Her language, which is not appropriate for a ruler, attests to her consistent immaturity. In addition to making Cleopatra call herself Caesar's "slave" (152), Shaw gives her a jealous desire for Caesar's affection, for which she easily declares that she would abandon her recently gained throne.

CLEOPATRA. Am I to behave like a Queen?

CAESAR. Yes.

Cleopatra immediately comes down to the chair of state; seizes Ptolemy; drags him out of his seat; then takes his place in the chair. . . .

CAESAR. [*touched by Ptolemy's distress*] Come here, my boy, and stand by me.

Ptolemy goes over to Caesar, who, resuming his seat on the tripod, shakes the boy's hand to encourage him. Cleopatra, furiously jealous, rises and glares at them.

CLEOPATRA [*with flaming cheeks*] Take your throne: I dont want it. (164)

To Shaw's Cleopatra, Caesar's attention is more important than the throne—or her people, who are not even within the scope of her consideration—and any change (or improvement) in her behavior is out of her obedience to Caesar, rather than her "dignity as a queen" (167).

Cleopatra's incapacity for improvement partly stems from Caesar's dismissive and instrumentalizing attitude, but it also has its basis in her innate qualities. Shaw's Cleopatra does not display the makings of a sovereign or an understanding of the role. From the scene where Caesar first intervenes to put her on the throne, it is clear that Cleopatra's understanding of the role of sovereign has an immediate connection to abusive power:

CLEOPATRA. Give me something to beat her with. [*She snatches a snake-skin from the throne and dashes after Ftatateeta, whirling it like a scourge in the air. Caesar makes a bound and manages to catch her and hold her while Ftatateeta escapes*].

CAESAR. You scratch, kitten, do you?

CLEOPATRA. [*breaking from him*] I will beat somebody. I will beat him [*She attacks the slave*]. . . . I am a real Queen at last—a real, real Queen! Cleopatra the Queen! (154-55).

As soon as she is reassured that she has support from this foreign general, who can overpower everyone else in her court, she unleashes her violence against her subjects.

What is more, Shaw presents her disqualification as a queen in multiple aspects as an inherited flaw, connecting it to her historical and cultural backgrounds. As he explains Cleopatra's characterization in the note at the end of the play, he claims that her immaturity does not have much to do with her young age (249). Although he admits that a typical sixteen-year-old woman would not be as childish as the character he conjured, Shaw denies Cleopatra any maturity, expressing his disbelief in the possibility of a decent education around her:

> It must be borne in mind, too, that Cleopatra was a queen, and was therefore not the typical Greek-cultured, educated Egyptian lady of her time. . . . But I do not feel bound to believe that Cleopatra was well educated. Her father the illustrious Flute Blower, was not at all a parent of the Oxford professor type. And Cleopatra was a chip of [sic.] the old block. (249)

Shaw's dismissal of any decency in Cleopatra thus stems from his dismissal of her father, the king of Egypt. Cleopatra's reaction to Caesar, who says he has work to do, echoes the author's comment: "Work! What nonsense! . . . Kings dont work. My father was King of Egypt; and he never worked" (174). The deeply rooted ignorance and incompetence of Shaw's Cleopatra, together with the accompanying note, reveals Shaw's biased perspective on Egypt and Egyptian culture. Indeed, in Shaw's depiction, Cleopatra is not a uniquely incompetent character at all—

there is not a single Egyptian character who shows enough decency and capability to take responsibility for their own country.

Cleopatra's disqualification as the leader of a nation is not simply an individual defect, but a symbolic representation of Egypt's incapacity. This representation is further solidified by the fact that in *Caesar and Cleopatra*, Egypt as a whole appears to be incompetent, framing Caesar's arrival as a blessed rescue. Caesar's attitude from the beginning is dismissive of Egypt as a dependent country. He corrects Cleopatra, who introduces herself as "Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt": "CAESAR. Queen of the Gypsies, you mean" (148). Egypt before Caesar's intervention is not in order. Ftatateeta, Cleopatra's nurse and technically one of the subjects of the queen, scolds her ruler for "order[ing] the lamps to be lighted without my permission" (153). Such a reversed power dynamic is not unique to Cleopatra and Ftatateeta; the alternative to the throne, Ptolemy, is controlled by Pothinus, a eunuch. Ptolemy, "the king of Egypt" in Act Two, is a mere mouthpiece for Pothinus, (imperfectly) repeating the words fed to his mouth "*without any vocal inflexions"* (159). The two pairs operate in parallel, and both Pothinus and Ftatateeta are aware of what they are doing:

> POTHINUS. And mark this, mistress. You thought, before Caesar came, that Egypt should presently be ruled by you and your crew in the name of Cleopatra. I set myself against it—
>
> FTATATEETA [*interrupting him—wrangling*] Ay: that it might be ruled by you and your crew in the name of Ptolemy.
>
> POTHINUS. Better me or even you, than a woman with a Roman heart; and that is what Cleopatra is now become. (214)

It makes no difference to Egypt whether Cleopatra or Ptolemy holds the throne. The Egyptian court will have the same structure in which a servant controls his or her ruler until a foreign power brings a new order. As the queen's nurse rightly perceives, after the establishment of the new order, the young queen "will not listen to any of her own race: she treats us [the Egyptian people] all as children" (214). After Caesar's arrival at the court, the child-queen treats even the most powerful people around herself as children, reflecting the infantilization of the colonies by the colonial power.

Shaw's portrayal of the Egyptians in the play is bluntly belittling; however, his depiction of the Roman empire is not entirely positive either. One scene that reveals Shaw's critical attitude toward the empire is at the beginning of the play. In the prologue, Ra criticizes the exploitive colonizers in both the Roman and the British empires:

> So they [the old Rome] robbed their own poor until they became great masters of that art, and knew by what laws it could be made to appear seemly and honest. And when they had squeezed their own poor dry, they robbed the poor of other lands, and added those lands to Rome until there came a new Rome, rich and huge. And I, Ra, laughed; for the minds of the Romans remained the same size whilst their dominion spread over the earth. (130)

Assuming the perspective of a representative Egyptian deity, Shaw scorns both empires for being greedy for the economic benefits of colonization, taking it as a proof that they are unfit to rule. Still, he never objects to the governance of an empire when it is done right—as is exemplified by his rational and generous hero, Caesar.

In *Caesar and Cleopatra*, it is impossible to find any description that shows the conquerors' respect toward the indigenous culture of the nation they are invading. Rufio, one of

Caesar's generals, takes the tripod the Egyptians were using for a religious practice to offer it to Caesar as a chair "*with Roman resourcefulness and indifference to foreign superstitions*" (161). In addition, Caesar keeps pronouncing Ftatateeta's name incorrectly, showing no desire to give it a try and instead (incorrectly) shortening her name at his will: "Nobody can pronounce it, Tota, except yourself" (163). This displays his lack of respect for the people who used to play an important role in the Egyptian court. While this scene reveals the powerless position of the Egyptians who have no choice other than to simply accept whatever Caesar says, at the same time it highlights the blatant disrespect that imperialists show. However, it is hard to say that Shaw is criticizing the Romans' lack of respect through these scenes. Shaw portrays them as funny happenings rather than proofs of serious defect, allowing them to provide quick comic relief instead of coalescing into a negative critique of Roman.

Although Shaw criticizes the corrupt side of British imperial leadership (by capitalists in particular [Malouf 210]), to him, it is not a question of whether the empire has the right to govern, but of how to govern properly. Such right is justified by the apparent incompetence of the Egyptian characters in his play. As Benedict Anderson points out, colonial racism, which considers the entire people in a colony as inferior, was an essential concept in the construction of "Empire," which "attempted to weld dynastic legitimacy and national community" (150). According to Anderson, colonial racism reassured Europeans that no matter what position they had in their own society, they were still superior to the "subjected natives" (150). In Shaw's play, it is only Caesar who even slightly considers "*the welfare of Egypt*" (155), and as Rufio accurately points out, what Egypt has by itself is merely a "toy king" whom the Romans put in place (166). Shaw's approval of imperialism thus reveals itself in his depiction of Egypt as a place where incompetent people are in great need of an intelligent and generous leader like

Caesar, who will govern Egypt in place of its own hopeless leaders. Through Caesar's dialogue, Shaw suggests that governing a state in an orderly peace is the best form of art: "Is peace not an art? Is war not an art? Is government not an art? Is civilization not an art? All these we give you in exchange for a few ornaments. You will have the best of the bargain" (239). Moreover, because the Romans devalue Egyptian art and culture, as imperialists they feel no guilt about destroying that ingenious civilization, since, in their consideration, the Western order they bestow is the best thing that can happen in the colonies.

Interestingly, Shaw's attitude toward imperialism, which appears to be progressive only up to a certain point, resembles his attitude toward feminism—he expresses his support for active women in society as long as they stay in line. Although some female characters in *Caesar and Cleopatra* occasionally take on an important position, they do not surpass the capability of their male counterparts. The only time Cleopatra uses her power independently is when she orders Ftatateeta to kill Pothinus, to whom Caesar granted a safe escape from the scene. This action, however, causes the situation to deteriorate, attesting to Cleopatra's lack of foresight, as if to prove a guardsman's foreshadowed comment: "this rule of women will be the ruin of Egypt" (141). Witnessing the outcome of Cleopatra's decision, Rufio smirks, "The game is played and lost, Cleopatra. The woman always gets the worst of it" (235). Rufio, contrasted with Ftatateeta, embodies another example of the gender dynamic in the play. Ftatateeta carries out the queen's order and kills Pothinus; however, according to Rufio, it was not done properly:

> RUFIO. Tell your executioner that if Pothinus had been properly killed—in the throat—he would not have called out. Your man bungled his work.
>
> CLEOPATRA. [*enigmatically*] How do you know it was a man?
>
> . . .

> *Ftatateeta is lying dead on the altar of Ra, with her throat cut. Her blood deluges the white stone.* (235)

Rufio promptly models what he says; he kills Ftatateeta in a "proper" way, by cutting her throat without any noise, and Cleopatra discovers her body after Rufio's exit. He proves that an exceptional woman, like Ftatateeta, can perform a surprising feat, but not as well as himself, a man. The example of Cleopatra and Ftatateeta insinuates that although it is probable that women can "rule," they will not do it as properly as men.

Shaw's writing reflects his internalization of the ideas of his time: the power of an empire justifies its right to rule another nation. As Judith Evans points out, in England in the 1890s, "ideas about Britain's imperial role and the destiny of the British as an imperial race were pervasive" (41). In 1893 Joseph Chamberlain, who later became Colonial Secretary in 1895, expressed his belief to the House of Commons, asserting that the British were "the greatest governing race the world has ever seen" (Evans 41). As Michael Malouf summarizes, to the Tories the empire was "essential to the expression of British nationalism," and the Liberals defined it "as a moral, civilizing mission" (208). Although Shaw's opinion on the empire expressed in his political writings was not exactly the same as theirs, his play reflects the imperialist attitudes of his own time. Even in the last scene of the play, when Caesar leaves Egypt, Shaw makes it clear that the country will be under the control of a Roman. Here, Caesar, who casually has forgotten to say goodbye to Cleopatra, soothes her by saying he is going to send her a "beautiful present from Rome": Mark Antony (242-43). The queen's pride in her country instantly vanishes as soon as Caesar mentions the name of her new guardian, who, this time, can even be her lover. Shaw's ideal hero Caesar ensures that the order he has established in

this land will be kept by his own people, not only by appointing Rufio, a Roman general he brought with him, as a governor, but also by sending Antony to rule.

By presenting his own version of the characters before his contemporary audience, Shaw fortifies the line between the centre and the periphery while proposing his ideal way to rule those perceived as "inferior." Although Shaw maintains his satiric attitude toward Rome and England as well as Egypt, his rewritten prologue bonds the audience against the Egyptians in the story:

> [Y]e quaint little islanders. . . . Hear me, ye women who adorn yourselves alluringly and conceal your thoughts from your men, leading them to believe that ye deem them wondrous strong and masterful whilst in truth ye hold them in your hearts as children without judgment. (129)

On the one hand, the prologue acts to insult the audience of "quaint little islanders." On the other hand, however, these lines are spoken by Ra, an Egyptian deity, who distances himself from the audience in his foreign attire—"with a hawk's head" (129)—while directly addressing the audience in the second person. Ra's speech draws a line between him and the audience, which bestows a unity among the audience members, who all oppose Ra and the exotic destination he represents. Discussing such a sense of unity, Michael Billing points out that national identity can be formed when there are assumptions about the members in the community, "where the term 'we' is unreflectively used as a signifier of 'us' as members of the nation" (qtd. in Holdsworth 3). When Ra repeatedly addresses the audience in the second person, "ye," the audience takes it as "us," the members of England, as opposed to the Egyptians or other colonized people represented by the foreign god.

After binding his audience together as a representative group of the British empire through Ra's prologue, Shaw then presents an example of an ideal leader for them to emulate

together as a nation. Regarding the presentation of nationhood on stage, Helen Gilbert notes that theatre always becomes “a site circulating representational forms . . . at formative moments in the ongoing narrative of nationhood, a means by which communities register, reiterate and/or contest modes and models of national belonging” (qtd. in Holdswarth 2). Shaw’s play is no exception; *Caesar and Cleopatra* provides the ideal model of a ruler, who can appropriately represent the generosity and superiority of the empire, along with examples of inferior natives in the colonies who are in need of governance. Through this play, Shaw justifies the presence of imperial power, while at the same time offering a model from which his contemporaries can construct an image of an idealized empire, picturing themselves with the potential to hold beneficial dominance over another part of the world.

Cleopatra Empowered: Ahmed Shawqi’s *The Death of Cleopatra*

Taking a scheme similar to the one that Shaw displays in *Caesar and Cleopatra*, Ahmed Shawqi, one of the best-known poets in Modern Egyptian literature, rewrote the story of Cleopatra to propose his own model of national identity. In *The Death of Cleopatra* (1929), Shawqi pictures the contrasting power relationship between the queen and the Roman general (in this case, Marcus Antony). He highlights the queen’s qualifications through her attitude, relationships with her subjects, and figurative languages that create a new image of Cleopatra as a political leader. Similar to Shaw, Shawqi emphasizes her quality by comparing her to her partner, although, in this case, it is the colonized people subjected to British imperialism who gain a voice. While Shaw proposes an image of the ideal imperial leader who rightfully takes power from a struggling nation, Shawqi constructs a counter-image of a competent and dignified Egypt, along with a capable leader, thus annulling the colonialist justification for the invasion.

Before Shawqi's play is discussed in detail, it is important to examine at least briefly the modern history of Egypt in relation to its colonization and independence, so that *The Death of Cleopatra* can be properly located in its historical context. The British colonization of Egypt was not initiated by a military invasion; it began with financial dominance. As Hugh Seton-Watson notes, the economic influence of the West on Egypt was increasing in the second half of the nineteenth century, especially because of Khedive Ismail's "reckless financial policies" (246). With the establishment of *Caisse de la Dette* in 1876, European creditors started to have more control on Egyptian revenues (Seton-Watson 246). In particular, as P. J. Cain notes, Britain played the most prominent role in this process (340). It was "the principal creditor when Egypt subsided into bankruptcy in 1876," and as early as 1880, Britain made up 80 percent of Egypt's exports and 44 percent of its imports (Cain 340). England's political interference in Egypt, therefore, was primarily to secure its economic interests. Britain's military intervention in 1882 was because of—or was justified by—the riots of the anti-European nationalists that could have threatened Britain's revenue, and it resulted in increased political control by the English government in Egypt, commonly known as the "veiled protectorate" period until 1914, when the "veil" was uncovered (343). The colonial relationship between Britain and Egypt after 1882, according to James Whidden, positioned the British as "guardians and protectors of the fellahin, or Egyptian peasantry, against the imagined (and real) tyranny and brutality of Egypt's hereditary ruling classes" (1). However, as Arthur Goldschmidt Jr. notes, Egyptian nationalists resented the fact that Egypt became a tool for the British Empire's interests (59). After all, Khedive Tawfiq sided with the British while the Egyptian cabinet was against them, and was able to maintain his position for that reason as a pro-British government replaced the nationalist one (Goldschmidt 45)—that was, until the outbreak of World War I.

In 1914, as the Ottoman Empire joined the Central Powers, the British Empire declared a protectorate over Egypt (Goldschmidt 64). Thus, the colonization of Egypt was not a simple conflict between the colonizer and the colonized, but a more complicated political situation that included an internal conflict between the pro-European royalty and the anti-European nationalist group. Egypt gained its independence with the Unilateral Declaration of Egyptian Independence in 1922, but the independence was not a complete one. After the treaty of 1922, and even after the treaty of 1936,[45] British forces remained in the country to keep the Suez Canal under British control (Seton-Watson 263). The treaty of 1922 restored Egypt's status as an independent sovereign state, but it still required Egypt to protect Britain's interests (Goldschmidt 71). Further, as Goldschmidt writes, even after political independence, "the country remained almost wholly dependent on foreigners . . . Nearly all public utilities, manufacturing firms, transportation companies, hotels, banks, and insurance companies were owned and managed by foreigners. No Egyptian sat on the administrative board of the Suez Canal Company" (71). The British troops finally withdrew from Egypt in 1956 as the twenty-year period specified in the treaty of 1936 expired, ending over seven decades of military interference since 1882. Whidden suggests that the colonial occupation challenged Egyptians to define Egyptian identity as well as to reform their country both socially and economically (2).

Shawqi's *Death of Cleopatra,* written in 1929—between Egypt's political independence and the complete withdrawal of the British forces—reflects his take on Egyptian identity. The story of Cleopatra acts as a symbolic representation of the most famous Egyptian queen, while also mirroring the similarities of Egypt's historical and political situation with the Egypt of Shawqi. Once again, Egypt was under the political and military influence of a foreign power

[45] The treaty of 1936 allowed the British force in Suez Canal zone as well as in Cairo and Alexandria for twenty years (Goldschmidt 78).

even before the official colonization; the Egyptian leader of the time, be it Cleopatra or Khedive Tawfiq, sought help from Europeans, and the colonization of Egypt resulted. Considering these similarities, Shawqi's adaptation of *Antony and Cleopatra* can be read as his strategy to add a resonating power to the story for his audience in modern Egypt.

Ahmed Shawqi, who is known for his neo-classical style of writing, was deeply invested in reviving the tradition of Arabic poetry (Farid 5; Oseni 110). Khedive Tawfiq, who ruled Egypt from 1879 to 1892, sent Shawqi to Europe (Montpellier and Paris, France) for higher education, and soon after his return to Egypt in 1891, Shawqi took a position in the court, serving Khedive Abbas as his "favorite bard" (Oseni 110). M. M. Badawi notes: "He composed panegyrical poems on official occasions such as the anniversary of Abbas's accession to the throne and expressed the Khedive's official poetry in his poems praising the Ottoman Caliph or criticizing British policy in Egypt" (Badawi qtd. In Oseni 111).[46] As the result of British rule in Egypt after World War I, he was sent into exile in Spain in 1915, coming back to his homeland in 1919. Following his return, he was attracted to nationalism, and "became one of the mouth-pieces of Egyptian nationalists, more especially in the 1919 insurrection by the youths against British imperialism" (Oseni 111-12). It is important to note, however, that Shawqi's nationalism is not the same as the one that surfaced prior to 1882, led by Urabi Pasha. According to Goldschmidt, nationalism does not align with the traditional Islamic concept, according to which nationalism is "a Western import that would divide them [the Islamic community]" (53). He further explains that the nationalist groups in Egypt formed after 1892 can be taken as "affirmations of the originally Western idea that Egypt is a nation-state deserving the primary loyalty of its citizens"

[46] S. Somekh counts Shawqi as the dominant figure of modern neo-classical poetry in Arabic literature in the first three decades of the twentieth century, evaluating him highly for his versatile contribution to a variety of genres and his "stupendous command of language and a captivating sonority" (47). Through more than twenty years of such writing, Shawqi acquired the name of "shair al-Umara (poet of the princes)" in Egypt.

rather than as “movements of resistance by Egyptians” (54). Unlike the one before the beginning of the British protectorate, the nationalist movement that attracted Shawqi was largely based on the Western concept of a nation. As Goldschmidt puts it, “They viewed Egypt as a nation, the world’s oldest, waking up after centuries of sleep” (54). Observing the major events in his life, it is probable that his gratitude and loyalty toward the Khedive, combined with the experience of the exile caused by the British invasion, reinforced his interest in this kind of nationalism, which is evident in his version of the Egyptian queen’s tragedy. In *The Death of Cleopatra*, Shawqi attempts to re-shape the image of Cleopatra, whose distorted representation as an unqualified female leader of Egypt served to fortify the superiority of the West. By modifying a negative historic image, Shawqi offers a sympathetic and respectable national hero around whom people can unite to form an independent nation.

The Death of Cleopatra, written in 1927 and premiered on November 25, 1929 by the Fatma Rushdy troupe, is one of six plays by Shawqi that mainly present Egyptian and Islamic history[47] (Farid 3). Set in about 30 BCE, this four-act play opens right after the Battle of Actium and traces the happenings in the Egyptian royal palace until the death of the queen. Besides the major historical characters (Cleopatra, Mark Antony, Octavius Caesar, and Caesarion), and several supporting characters who have parallels in Shakespeare’s play (the queen’s chambermaids, Antony’s followers, the soothsayer, etc.), Shawqi adds characters of his own creation, such as Anubis (the high priest who also takes on the role of the queen’s adviser), and Xenon (the chief librarian serving Cleopatra’s palace). Also, Shawqi creates Olympus, a Roman physician at the queen’s court, who later works as a spy for Octavius Caesar. The outline of the story follows the well-known plot of the tale, in which the lovers Cleopatra and Antony fight

[47] One of the plays is a comedy set in modern era.

against Octavius's Roman army. After their critical loss in battle, Octavius's army enters Alexandria. Antony commits suicide, after which Cleopatra also kills herself, along with her chambermaids. By altering several details, Shawqi presents a radically different image of the main character, portraying Cleopatra as a capable and respectable Egyptian patriot.[48]

The major tragedy in Shawqi's version stems from Cleopatra's difficult position where she has to agonize between conflicting values: love and duty. According to Ali Al-Ra I, "the theme of Love versus Duty" is Shawqi's characteristic choice, an influence from Pierre Corneille (359). Although this theme is frequently found in the Western canon, it is significant that Shawqi places Cleopatra in the fraught position usually held by Antony in various versions that stem from the same plot. By instilling a divided loyalty in Cleopatra, Shawqi gives the title of a political leader to the queen instead of her Western advisor. Unlike the stereotypical depictions of Cleopatra, which focus not on her duty but rather her lust and pleasure, Shawqi's queen sincerely dedicates herself to both. He tries to demolish the pervasive image of her as a wild seducer, and this effort demonstrates itself in various ways.

Shawqi flips the power dynamic established between the two main characters in the typical Western narrative. On the simplest level, stage time and the number of lines spoken indicate a character's level of dominance in the play. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, despite the fact that Antony dies in Act Four, earlier than Cleopatra, Antony speaks 24% of the lines in the play whereas Cleopatra speaks only 19% (Bate and Rasmussen 2161). Unlike Shakespeare's version, in which Cleopatra first enters with Antony, in *The Death of Cleopatra* Antony does not enter

[48] Jeanette Wahba Sourial Atiya, who translated the play from Arabic to English, assumes that it is likely that Shawqi read Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* in French translation. She adds: "His play is, in certain respects, a response to Shakespeare's: re-writing, correcting and revising it" (6).

the stage until the middle of Act One, Scene Two (53). Here, Cleopatra's lines constitute 38.5% of the entire play in comparison to Antony's 16.6% (see Appendix).

In the aspect of figurative language, Shawqi does not allow Cleopatra to connect to the previously widespread image of the "serpent of the old Nile" (Shakespeare, *Antony* 1.5.26). In *The Death of Cleopatra*, the image of a serpent, when used broadly, describes evil-minded people in general: "ANUBIS. You [serpents] and humans are the same, / For there's evil in you and evil in them" (101). When used more specifically, the image is attributed to her enemy, the Romans, rather than herself: "HABY. After a short while, / Human serpents are to fill the valley of the Nile" (103). On another occasion, Olympus, who spies on Cleopatra and lies to Antony, is called a serpent: "OROS. What poisons have you concealed / From a Queen who has been unaware / Of a neighboring serpent and its snare?" (79). By cutting the connection between Cleopatra and a serpent, and reconnecting the venomous creature to her enemies instead, Shawqi erases the image of Cleopatra as a dangerous seducer, and positions her as a sympathetic victim.

Shawqi's Cleopatra claims her title as a political leader from the very beginning. Even the playscript acknowledges the title; although the list of "Dramatis Personae" indicates the character's name as "Cleopatra," she is often marked as "The Queen" in the playscript. Notably, at her very first entrance on the stage, she is described as "The Queen," and her first lines express her concerns and conscience in regard to the burdensome dilemma after the Battle of Actium. Shortly after her entrance, accompanied by her son (Caesarion), and several followers, she expresses deep remorse as she relates the details of the battle. According to her story, she fled from the battle not because of cowardice, but because of reasoned judgement to save her ship (35). Cleopatra's calculation is that if the two Roman leaders—Antony and Octavius Caesar—fight each other, her Egypt has a chance at independence, with herself alone dominating. Thus,

for the benefit of her own country, she flees from the scene, also lifting the burden of the Egyptian army in the battle: "From the grind of battle, I broke free, / And ended my ships' fear of destruction and captivity" (35). As Maher S. Farid clarifies in the introduction to the play, in Shawqi's view, she was a "great queen" whose action in the Battle of Actium came from her wish to free Egypt from both Octavius and Antony through the conflict between the two (7). Still, as her love for Antony is genuine, Cleopatra regrets that she betrayed Antony during the battle, and asks Anubis to pray "for the forgiveness of [her] sins" (38). Then, she retreats to pray with the high priest. By choosing to begin the play at the moment right after the battle, Shawqi gives her a chance to explain herself and emphasizes her sincere worries about the country as well as her capacity for self-reflection as a leader. Her competence clearly contrasts with the impression of immaturity in Shaw's play, and with the capricious whims of Shakespeare's Cleopatra. In Shakespeare's version, the queen is first seen demanding assurance of Antony's love: "If it be love indeed, tell me how much" (1.1.14). Shawqi's Cleopatra, however, positions herself as a leader who cares and feels responsible to her people even before Antony makes his first entrance.

Shawqi repeatedly demonstrates Cleopatra's queenly potential by calling attention to her tolerance as a ruler. When Haby, an assistant of the high priest who is in love with a chambermaid, Helena, is caught talking behind Cleopatra's back, the queen demonstrates generosity while clearly asserting her authority as a sovereign at the same time:

HELENA. But Cleopatra has her rights, all the same.

HABY. What special rights can she claim?

[Cleopatra enters].

CLEOPATRA. The rights of sovereignty, my boy,

The rights of a protector, young man.

. . .

THE QUEEN. For the girl's sake, I've shut off my ear,

So as to pretend not to hear. (45-46)

Here, Cleopatra's forgiveness is partly an extension of her generosity toward her maid, Helena, but partly also comes out of her awareness of the role: "THE QUEEN. For people like you often erred, / And people like me forgave" (46). Shawqi's queen clearly demonstrates that she perceives tolerance to be a required quality of a ruler. Her tolerance draws a clear distinction from Shakespeare's Cleopatra, who is irascible and temperamental.[49] Shawqi's queen accepts that forgiveness is a part of what the throne entails, displaying her ability to handle an unfavorable situation with maturity.

Instead of abusing her power as a sovereign, Shawqi's Cleopatra recognizes the queen's duty to be a protector, and displays her ability to act as one. "Leave the defense of Egypt to me," she asserts (46). Comparing herself to a "sword," which is way more powerful than a mere "stick" (which indicates other people), Cleopatra claims to be a strong protector of Egypt. This is not an empty boast because she indeed proves her capability—not through the military strength, but through political prowess. As Antony comes back with the news of his interim victory, Cleopatra hints at her political intelligence by clearly stating that she chose Antony (a Roman hero) for the sake of Egypt (Rome's enemy):

CLEOPATRA. *[Kisses him].*

[49] This is exemplified in the scene where she unfairly beats the messenger just because he brought the news of Antony's marriage to Octavia (2.5.60-81).

Now Rome knows

That her enemy, a laurel wreath, bestows

On whomsoever she pleases to choose.

Now Rome is aware that, in battle, her knight

Is, by himself, equal to an army of great might. (54)

Making Antony fight for her is a serious warning against Rome, since Antony is one of Rome's most capable generals. Shawqi frames her as a political leader who strategically boasts the Roman hero's dedication to her. She also exhibits her confidence in her political skills by stating: "For, Oros, war is your art and politics is mine" (56). The weapon she confidently wields is not war; it is politics. Even her sincere love, when articulated with her deliberate rhetoric, can be used for the political gain of Egypt. As a female leader in a time of war, maintaining her romantic relationship with the talented military leader from the opposite side is a political scheme to assure her success as her nation's protector.

Considering her political intelligence, it is not surprising that she correctly predicts the fate of her country. Her fear comes from her care for her country, not from her own weakness: "CLEOPATRA. I fear that after I am departed, / Invaders would unleash their lions in thy [Egypt's] lands" (127). Such worries show that although she is in love with Antony, her major concern is for the fate and future of Egypt. She never forgets her role as a leader, taking the responsibility seriously and correctly predicting what would happen if she fails to protect the country. The queen's prediction about the grim picture after colonization resonates with Shawqi's audience, who know from experience that there is no just reason for imperial rule. In one of his poems, "Qaṣīdah no. 1: A Farewell to Lord Cromer," Shawqi explicitly points out the false claims of the imperial power:

32. How many an imagined favor did you bestow on us,

    Then burden the astute and knowing with reproach.

33. In every Report you say, "I created you."

    Do you deem your Report a Revelation?

34. Is it due to your liberality that schools [in your reign]

    Neglect sciences and teach football?

35. Or [is your notion of] safeguarding Egypt's Justice System

    That you put the judge of Dinshaway in charge of the Justice Ministry?

36. Or does an army count its ruination [at your hand] a favor,

    An army like the army of India, which has become groveling?

37. Look at its young men, how do they rank?

    Are they not inconsequential among the armies?

38. You prevented them from attaining high ranks

    While elevating your own people above them. (Line 32-38, qtd. in Kadhim 3-4)

As Hussein N. Kadhim explains, in these lines, Shawqi attacks Cromer's[50] claim of the benefits England offered to Egypt, especially in "the areas of education, the Justice System, and the conditions of the Egyptian army under British control" (17). Although Cromer argues that colonization brought Egypt "material prosperity and moral elevation," blaming the Egyptians for being "ungrateful," Shawqi's poem responds with the reality that colonizing practices worked to prevent the progress of Egypt in all three areas that Cromer had mentioned. As Shawqi's Cleopatra correctly foresees, the invasion by the West would make her country "collapse to its

---

[50] Evelyn Baring, 1st Earl of Cromer, also known as Lord Cromer, was the consul-general in Egypt (1883-1907) during the British occupation of Egypt.

foundation" (127). Thus, the lines expressing Cleopatra's worry about Egypt have two different functions: they make the story more relevant to postcolonial Egyptian audiences and display the queen's accurate understanding of the political situation.

In addition to the awareness of the responsibility as a ruler and the astute understanding of politics, another important quality Shawqi adds to his Cleopatra is honesty, which makes her trustworthy. While Shakespeare's Cleopatra does not mind dwelling in lies, Shawqi's values truth. One of the most ridiculous moments in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* is the scene where the messenger, abused for delivering the ill news of Antony's marriage regains the queen's favor by flattering her (3.3.7-40). In *The Death of Cleopatra,* the queen seeks truth rather than flattery: "Forget about garnished praise, and false flattery" (71). More significantly, while Shakespeare's Cleopatra actively orders her maid to lie about her death to Antony to ease the situation for herself, Shawqi's never orders anyone to lie and is caught by surprise when she finds out that the lie has been told: "Who falsely lamented my death? Who told you this lie?" (118). Here, it is not the queen but Olympus, Cleopatra's physician and Octavius's spy,[51] who gives Antony false information about the queen's suicide, leading Antony to his death (90-91). Cleopatra's truth-seeking quality contributes to her image as a trustworthy leader while also freeing her from the blame for causing Antony's death.

Throughout Shawqi's play, Cleopatra's qualities as a sovereign paint a sharp contrast to the submissive Antony. This is the very same tactic Shaw uses to elevate Caesar when he portrays Cleopatra with extreme immaturity and incompetency in his play. In Shawqi's version, the power dynamic is concretely set as Antony surrenders entirely to Cleopatra, despite the

[51] "OROS. If you know not, then be aware / That we know that, / On behalf of Octavius, / On her secrets, you spy" (79).

complaints of his own followers. In Act Two, during the feast, Cleopatra openly denies Antony his Roman identity, which he readily abandons:

CLEOPATRA. Antony, you are not a Roman warrior;

Did you not say that you are my soldier?

ANTONY. I did.

I wish I were from Egypt,

For I am your loyal subject. (67)

No longer is Cleopatra viewed as a Roman's "slave" (Shaw 152); instead, Antony willingly gives up autonomy to take the place as her "soldier" and "subject." The destruction of his Roman identity and his willing surrender make him a follower, not a leader. As Ansho, Cleopatra's clown, aptly comments, "The shepherd has become a sheep" (67). At least within the boundary of her court, Egypt has conquered Rome.

Between the two leaders, Antony is clearly the strong military general; however, his mental strength pales in comparison with Cleopatra's. Antony boasts about his honor when, and only when, his fortune shines a favorable light on him. Following his temporary victory against Octavius, Antony dismisses Cleopatra, who has worried that the battle could have led to Antony's captivity: "ANTONY. How can I fall into the hands of victorious foes, / When I have nails and claws?" (54). In comparison, Cleopatra strives to keep her honor even when she is at her lowest point. After the final defeat, the queen consults Anubis as the fate of the country becomes apparent:

CLEOPATRA. I'm not anxious, either my life or my throne, to save,

But I dread that they should drag me as a slave.

> Will I allow the enemy, the crown of Egypt, to tread,
>
> While there's still a single hair in my head? (106)

Cleopatra's commitment to her honor comes after defeat, not, as in the case of Antony, after the victory, attesting to her superior mental strength in a desperate situation. After his disastrous defeat, Antony fails to die with kingly dignity. Not only does he switch his identity back and forth between a Roman hero and Cleopatra's subject, but he also shows less dignity than Oros, his follower, in his final moments. Antony decides to kill himself, fearing what people will say of him: "They will say she killed herself, / But he didn't do the same!" (91). At the same time that he loses the battle (and, based on the false information, his lover), he loses both his confidence and dignity. He is not in a state of mind to reflect on his loyalty or commitment. Even when committing suicide, he takes less initiative than his follower. Discovering Antony and Oros on the ground, one of the soldiers assumes, "I think the master died with his own sword, / And then the slave imitated his lord" (113)—this is the way it should have been although what actually happened was the opposite. As a leader, Antony is supposed to exemplify an honorable death; however, he ends up failing and following his follower.

As she strives to maintain her honor until the end, Cleopatra's death demands more respect than Antony's. The difference in the attitude with which Octavius treats their bodies makes this clear. To check Antony's body, he "*walks forward, and lifts the cover off Antony's face*" (124). When he faces Cleopatra's body, however, he "*kneels by Cleopatra's body*" (159). Since Cleopatra's life is filled with political tactics to protect her country, her death becomes a political action. She plans her death with the dignity, benefitting her country—unlike Antony, who decides to kill himself impulsively and fails to do it properly. The queen says, "When I found that it [life] immortalized its heroes; / I brought them under my domination" (149),

emphasizing her political capability to bind both Julius Caesar and Antony to protect Egypt, as well as assuring her status as a powerful ruler. By doing so, she overpowers the Roman heroes' military achievements, which Rome cherished. In the end, using her death, she succeeds in her final attempt to protect the honor of her throne. Octavius approves:

> CAESAR. By dying you challenged me and defeated my demand:
>
> . . .
>
> You vied with Rome in its high place
>
> And the Caesars in your presence had dragged their chains;
>
> For a time, you handled Antony and Caesar as a plaything,
>
> As magicians handle puppets on a string. (161)

By showing that even her enemy, Octavius Caesar, acknowledges Cleopatra's power, Shawqi flips the stereotypical power dynamic of the story, making Antony and Caesar—rather than Cleopatra—"a plaything," and leaving Octavius "defeated," thus offering his counter-argument against the Western view of this historic incident. Framing Cleopatra's death as a political action to benefit Egypt, as Ali A-Ra I analyzes, is Shawqi's defense of Cleopatra against the "Roman charge" which defines her as a temptress; instead, the poet presents his queen as "an astute leader and dedicated lover of her country, whose suicide is the final sacrifice she makes for her country" (359). She correctly assumes that she will be forced to perform a decorative role to advocate Rome's victory.[52] What she considers is not only her personal reputation, but also the pride of her country (129). As the holder of the throne, she is clearly aware that her position represents the whole country, including its power and history. So, when she decides to commit

---

[52] Shawqi shows that her assumption was realistic and accurate in several places. Two of the examples are as following: "THE COMMANDER. She will be received as a diamond" (139); "CAESAR. Despite her weakness, she has dodged my artful plot; / I wished to have her as a living prisoner, / But an ephemeral corpse is all I've got" (159).

suicide, it is not merely a personal decision but service to her people: "CLEOPATRA. I will die, as I lived for the throne of Egypt, my country" (153). Killing herself is her final attempt to protect her dignity and the glory of the Egyptian crown, and by extension, to protect the pride of modern Egypt, which as a nation inherits this history.

To make his rewriting of the story more effective, Shawqi attempts to connect with the audience through an emotional appeal in addition to the ample displays of Cleopatra's qualifications as a queen. To make it easy for the audience to sympathize with the main character, the author lets her reflect on her unfortunate life, which nullifies the stereotypical image of her as a seductive, irresponsible, and prodigal queen.

CLEOPATRA. As a young girl, I suffered
An extremely poor and wretched life:
I was dethroned and exiled in youth,
And my family faced hardship and strife;
In the school of life, I was lashed with a whip at every turn,
And now I am being lashed by a cruel lesson I have to learn. (150)

By mentioning her "poor and wretched life," she defies the notion of a wanton queen, which would have been an image to distance her from the audience—in particular, those who are going through the financial repercussions of the colonization. Also, by mentioning how much hardship she went through to ascend and maintain the throne, she attests to her responsibility as a sovereign, who, despite failing to protect her country from the external military force in the end, tried her best to save what she could. As Farid notes, Shawqi intends to advocate for Cleopatra as "a heroic figure, worthy of love and respect in death at her own hands no less than in her life" (5).

The author's voice is more distinctively revealed through the high priest, Anubis, who takes on the role of Shawqi's spokesman. As John A. Haywood points out, Shawqi's Cleopatra is a patriot, and Anubis, who advises her into the patriotic path "is possibly the poet's idealized self-portrait" (qtd. in Farid 7). After the tragic fate of the country reveals itself, Haby complains to Anubis for not trying to use his religious power to save them when "our country has been subjected to invasion" (104). Anubis reproaches him: "Where have you been young man? / And where have the country's youth been thence?" (104). Rather than blaming Antony for the outcome of the battle, Anubis acknowledges that "On your behalf, he [Antony] unsheathed his sword, / And plunged into battle, without a word" (104). Through the mouth of Anubis, Shawqi approves the effort of Antony (and of Cleopatra, who put Antony in action), rather than putting all the responsibility for the historic tragedy on Antony and Cleopatra's shoulders. Although they are the leaders, in Shawqi's view the duty to protect the country does not lie solely on them. Rather, the people of the country should also be held responsible for the fate of the country—a message that applies to his contemporary Egyptians, who faced a critical juncture since gaining independence. On the surface, such a message could be taken as an encouraging gesture of active agency for the public; however, considering his previous position as "poet of the princes," it is possible to read Anubis' line as Shawqi's justification for the khedives in modern Egyptian history, especially Khedive Tawfiq, to whom he was indebted.

The author's attitude toward the characters in the play are embedded in the noteworthy metaphors he uses in their speeches as well. The imagery used for Cleopatra links her to strength and pity. Shawqi's Cleopatra is no longer a gazelle or fawn, but instead "the lioness of the Nile" (106), which draws a parallel with Antony, who is called a "lion" (83). She herself also identifies with "the lioness of thy [Alexandria's] forest, a queen, / And the nymph that made thy valley

green" (127), emphasizing her protecting and nourishing power. At times Antony is compared to a "sheep" or "a dog" by unfriendly eyes, taking up the role of prey or pet (67, 78). When Cleopatra meets her downfall, lamenting her desperate situation, she compares herself to "a lily in a pot," which is "[i]mprisoned and estranged by criminal hands" (135). This metaphor reveals the weakness of the defeated queen; however, unlike the case of Antony, referring to herself as a potted flower makes the audience pity her situation, because this is not an external criticism by others. Also, the flower, though confined, is still the same flower yearning for freedom and agency—a flower confined, but not tamed, which, if planted in the fertile earth of new Egypt, will thrive.

Cleopatra, both in history and literature, is a significant figure for Shawqi to portray in order to construct a proud national identity for modern Egypt. As Suk-Koo Rhee observes, the first project undertaken in each postcolonial African country after its independence was to restore the national culture, which the colonizers had distorted and destroyed, as exemplified in the case of Léopold Senghor, Aimé Césaire, or Amos Tutuola (29)—as well as Frantz Fanon and Ngugi wa Thiong'o. Shawqi's attempts, which can be considered in the same light. According to M. M. Badawi, Shawqi's interest in history was evident throughout his career, and one of the reasons for the interest was that the glorious history could bring light to the present-day Egypt:

> Finally, Shauqi [sic.] went to the glorious past of the Arabs or ancient Egyptians for the obvious reason of providing effective and instructive contrasts with the sad present and deriving from it an impetus for reform, improvement and progress. The contrast between the past glory of the Egyptians and their present backwardness is a theme which is repeated *ad nauseam* in the work of Shauqi and indeed of many others. (*A Critical* 40)

For Shawqi, it was important to share a narrative which can tell contemporary Egyptians that their famous queen never lost the dignity and glory of their country. Building on this past glory would ideally enlighten and encourage the contemporary audience to make improvements and strive to rebuild the new Egypt.

Chinua Achebe asserts that it is crucial in a new nation (particularly in Africa) to correct the prejudices the colonizers created about its people. This is because only by defying those prejudices can they regain the dignity they lost under colonialism:

> The worst thing that can happen to any people is the loss of dignity and self-respect. The writer's duty is to help them regain it by showing them in human terms what happened to them, what they lost. . . . After all the novelist's duty is not to beat this morning's headline in topicality, it is to explore *in depth* the human condition. In Africa he cannot perform this task unless he has a proper sense of history. (157, emphasis in the original)

Accordingly, in his piece, Shawqi reveals how the stereotypical images of Cleopatra and Antony in the Western narrative have formed. Cleopatra (and Shawqi) explains that such an unjust reputation is due to the weakness of her military force: "CLEOPATRA. In life and death, the winner is honoured and greeted / But have you seen anyone glorify the defeated?" (120). Because she lost the battle, she is falsely accused, and her reputation is tainted in the story told by the Romans, the winners in the eyes of history.

Indeed, the name "Cleopatra" became a convenient symbol to represent the inferior qualities of female leaders in colonized nations. Explaining why her reputation became so tainted later in history is crucial for Shawqi to establish the dignity of postcolonial Egypt; he can begin to draw a new image only after locating and then removing the roots of the stereotype. Regardless of her true character, Cleopatra's image has been used to serve the colonialist

narrative, advocating for the superiority of the Western male over the Eastern—or at the very least exotic—female. Considering Ania Loomba's observation that "colonial space was sexualized, and women's bodies figured as colonies" (Loomba, qtd. in Eward-Mangione 30), the wide-spread depiction of Cleopatra can be interpreted as the colonial perspective on a colonized Egypt. In the early stages of constructing a newly independent Egypt, Shawqi's play presents a powerful vision of Cleopatra, telling the story of a female leader in the colonized nation's history who overpowers and proves to be more capable than the colonizing male leaders.

In spite of the clear intention and rhetorical schemes, however, Shawqi's elevation of Cleopatra to a proud national representative has its limitations. Although many of Shawqi's writings deal with the history of Egypt and the Arab world, Kadhim adamantly refuses to call the poet a nationalist:

> Shawqī was no Egyptian nationalist. As opposed to the Egyptian poet Ḥāfiẓ Ibrāhīm (1871-1932) who was considered the poet of the people, "the poet of the Nile," Shawqī was of Turco-Circassian extraction. Moreover, he was born to a family with close ties to the Khedive Ismā'īl, and was the Khedive's court poet. In short, he was as far removed from the trials and aspirations of the masses of Egyptians as anyone could be. Moreover, he was not above praising the British occupying power. It was the Khedive Tawfīq in whose service he was who had invited the British forces to invade Egypt and to crush a "genuine national movement against an older alien domination: that of the 'Turkish' ruling class created by Muhammad Ali," that is, the 'Urābī Uprising of 1882. (6-7)

Cleopatra, the character who speaks for the pride and glory of Egypt, is a queen—a distant class from most of the people in postcolonial Egypt. She is a queen who dominates over her people. Furthermore, to save her country, she turns for help to foreign leaders (Julius Caesar and

Antony), not her own people. Shawqi's version of national identity, after all, is highly aristocratic. Still, Shawqi's play has a nationalistic effect because, as Ernest Renan points out, constructing a national identity is not only about sharing common parts but also about forgetting the parts that prevent unity: "l'essence d'une nation est que tous les individus aient beaucoup de choses en commun, et aussi que tous aient oublié bien des choses" (qtd. in Anderson 5). Shawqi makes his audience connect with Cleopatra by highlighting the common part, i.e. nationality, and by not reminding them of the difference, i.e. race, class, or political position. Specifically, he overlooks that Cleopatra attempted to rely on a foreigner to defend the throne and ended up losing the country to another foreigner, which could be seen as a failure and national betrayal by Shawqi's audience, who had recently gained autonomy.

Even if it is considered as a work which demonstrates nationalism, *The Death of Cleopatra* is not free from the common limitations of nationalism. Rhee points out that nationalism has defined itself by marginalizing women, who, together with men, fought for independence while being in charge of the reproduction of their manpower. He goes on to say that despite the fact that women were often used as symbolic signifiers of a nation, their voices were rarely heard inside of the nationalist movement in the past (33). Likewise, in Shawqi's play, although the elevated main character is female, the author instrumentalizes Cleopatra and her femininity to ensure the patriarchal ideal for the nation. In other words, from Shawqi's perspective, to gain the glorified reevaluation, Cleopatra must sacrifice herself—as is often expected in the case of motherhood. Her sacrifice achieves the purpose proposed by the patriarchal authority, represented by the high priest Anubis.

The shared identity of a community is complicated to define and is often not static. As Jen Harvie puts it, "national identities are neither biologically or territorially given; rather they

are creatively produced or staged" (qtd. in Holdsworth 6). Both *Caesar and Cleopatra* and *The Death of Cleopatra* attempt to form identities that fit the political situation of their respective nations. As Nadine Holdsworth explains, "nations and manifestations of national identity are . . . subject to the forces of history, power and politics" (6). England in Shaw's time was at the peak of imperial expansion and was facing conflicts in its colonies; therefore, Shaw stages an ideal example of imperial dominance, which can spread the superior civilization of the empire. Egypt in Shawqi's time was facing the aftermath of colonialism; Shawqi, therefore, provides a retelling of the history which was once a disgrace, but has now been turned into a narrative of glory by him. Both authors alter the well-known characters to offer certain political images that can represent and combine a group of people, demonstrating how literature and literary characters influence a society's shared identity. Both plays, however, reveal the authors' limited vision, as Shaw exposes his unbalanced view on imperialism while Shawqi fails to break out of his aristocratic mindset.

Chapter 4. Postcolonial Staging and the Form of Metadrama

In "The Empire Writes Back with a Vengeance," Salman Rushdie asserts the need to adapt the English language to express the true identity of postcolonial nations, emphasizing the diverse potential of the language:

> The language, like much else in the newly independent societies, needs to be decolonized, to be remade in other images, if those of us who use it from positions outside Anglo-Saxon culture are to be more than artistic Uncle Toms. . . . English, no longer an English language, now grows from many roots; and those whom it once colonized are carving out large territories within the language for themselves. The Empire is striking back. (8)

Taking G. V. Desani's *All About H. Hatterr* as an example, Rushdie confirms the possibility of decolonized language and literature: "the instrument of subservience became a weapon of liberation" (8). The impact of such "striking back" can be especially powerful when it happens in a play in comparison to other literary genres, because a performance of a play enables an immersive experience to the audience, amplifying the author's message. In this chapter, I analyze two such attempts that, with their own English, write back to the "centres" of the English language and canonized literature.

The two plays I discuss in this chapter—Murray Carlin's *Not Now Sweet Desdemona* (1968) and Derek Walcott's *A Branch of the Blue Nile* (1983)—are similar in that they are both from postcolonial locations (one by a South African, another by a Saint Lucian author) and use the metadramatic form. Although the two playwrights in part share a particular dramatic form and the postcolonial context, the plays do not suggest the same solution to the question posed

about their characters; whereas Walcott highlights the need for creating a new story based on a postcolonial nation's own culture and identity, Carlin suggests embracing what the colonial culture thrust upon the colonized by engaging the colonized people's own perspective. In this chapter, I analyze the different messages delivered in the two postcolonial adaptations of Shakespeare, with a focus on the characters' interpretations of the canon, and the way of handling the issue of race within and outside the plays the characters are staging. Such analysis reveals that a postcolonial identity inevitably includes hybridity, which necessitates the individuals' struggle between imposed and indigenous histories; in the process, in addition to time and place, one's race becomes a critical factor in shaping one's personal experience, perspective, and eventually, identity.

The distinctive similarity that Carlin and Walcott's works share is that they both use the structure of a play-within-a-play, either as a formal performance or a rehearsal. Layering a play (or plays) in a bigger frame, David Robert explains, can reveal the otherwise "invisible audience" and "the in/visible distinction between actor and role" (39). In addition, Gerhard Fischer and Bernhard Greiner note that this format's strength lies in exploring "social and historical interaction or exchange" (xii). Due to this characteristic, they suggest, a play-within-a-play has been "an important factor as a structure of mediation between European and non-European theatrical traditions," both "in the context of colonial encounters" and "as a critical postcolonialist discourse" (xiv). In Walcott's piece, the members of the theatre company rehearse and perform four variations of *Antony and Cleopatra*, fighting over their conflicting views on the canon before the audience—Walcott's audience thus accompanies the author as he shapes his conclusion, moving through the four plays-within-a-play. In Carlin's play, the inserted play offers a ground for a discussion; his characters rehearse a scene between Othello and Desdemona, and

the disagreement on the acting style leads to a discussion on their interpretation of the text and their different political positionings. In both plays, the form of metadrama allows the authors to deliver their messages more directly through the characters who comment on the piece they are enacting, while simultaneously allowing the audience to distance themselves from one central narrative, and develop their own alternative critical views on the topics raised.

White Privilege and Black "Tantrums"?: Murray Carlin's *Not Now, Sweet Desdemona*

In *Not Now, Sweet Desdemona* (premiered in 1968 at Makerere University College, Uganda), Murray Carlin, a playwright from South Africa living in Uganda, presents two actors rehearsing Shakespeare's *Othello*. The male character, who is from Trinidad, perceives that Desdemona is the one in power; she forces her decisions on her black husband, Othello, and tries to control him, taking advantage of her superior position as a white privileged insider of the community. The power dynamic of Desdemona and Othello parallels the actors' own relationship; the white female character from Johannesburg embodies Desdemona not only on stage but also in her privileged position in the political and economic contexts of their contemporary society, in which racial discrimination still prevails. Through this metatheatrical juxtaposition, Carlin portrays the racial conflicts in apartheid South Africa and the hybridity of their culture and identity; the male character, who claims that he also was born into Shakespeare's (imperial) language, provokes the female character to acknowledge the racial discrimination in contemporary South Africa. Following his interpretation of the play, he praises the genius of Shakespeare, who "knew everything" (38). According to him, Shakespeare predicted the contemporary racial conflicts which were first brought on by colonial invasion. Despite the unconventional interpretation of the canon, Carlin approves the centrality of

Shakespeare as he attributes the possibility of the male character's radical interpretation to Shakespeare's omniscient insight.

The couple in Carlin's play represent any actors who would play the same roles, and by extension, anyone who is caught in the same kind of power dynamic. Carlin does not bestow any names on his characters but instead refers to them as "Othello" and "Desdemona" in his playscript. Since they are addressed by the names of the characters for which they are cast, they can stand for any two actors who happen to take the roles—even more so if they are in the same social positions as Carlin's characters. From the very beginning, the male character is described as "a negro," "a West Indian," and "a black man" (10-11). The female character, as is later revealed, is from a wealthy family in Johannesburg (43). Their different social positions make them—especially the male character, who is geographically and racially Other both to the location of the play and to the author—parallels to the couple in Shakespeare's play; Othellos in both plays face social discrimination and disadvantage due to their foreignness and darker skin tone, while Desdemonas are from higher social tiers—but being women, they lack the ability to take an active role or adopt direct means to achieve their goals in their respective communities. Racism thus intersects with sexism, making it difficult to decide, in the case of each couple, who holds more power over the other.

The male actor's interpretation of *Othello* and the relationship of the couple in the play mirror the two actors' relationship in their real lives. For one, the female character, like Desdemona in *Othello*, cannot make others obey her orders. However, she can achieve the desired result "through" her partner Othello, whom she can persuade or control by using their relationship. For example, Harry, who is in charge of the lights in the theater, never follows what the female actor asks him to do, no matter how politely she repeats her request; rather, he seems

to provoke her deliberately, dimming the lights whenever she tries to read the script. In contrast, Harry obeys what the male actor says immediately (8-13, 17, 38). Similar to Shakespeare's Desdemona, who attempts to persuade Othello to exert her social influence, Carlin's makes a request through her partner to adjust the lights.

Not only as an individual, but also as a representative of the community, society, or the social system which grants more authority to males, Harry shows the limit of Desdemona's power, no matter how privileged her family background is. With Harry's presence, in addition to the two main characters, Carlin emphasizes the complexity of the problem; where racism intersects with sexism, Othello, who is more socially capable as a male, assumes an inferior position to his partner due to his race. Thus, as Peter Nazareth points out, the conflict presented is "not only one of race but also the battle of man with emancipated modern woman" (28). Analyzing African rewritings of Western canonical works, Jyotsna Singh also discusses Carlin as a writer who pictures "a world of contradictory and complicated racial and sexual politics" (299). She observes that this is the world where "discourses of resistance to racism and sexism often work in *opposition* rather than in *collaboration* with another" (299, emphasis in the original). Considering her white skin along with her economic status, Carlin's female character assumes a more privileged position in comparison with her partner; however, another power hierarchy that places the male character's gender in a position of power clearly exists in their relationship.

As they bring their offstage life onto the stage, the borderline between reality and the theatre becomes blurry. While talking about Othello, the male character loses track and starts to mix up their real lives into what Shakespeare wrote:

OTHELLO. Why won't she marry him, if she loves him?

DESDEMONA. They're married already . . . are we talking about the play?" (34)

He corrects himself at her prompt; however, before long, he brings the fictional character into the real world, comparing Desdemona to the "White Liberals" (37). By "White Liberal," according to Hunt Hawkin and Eward-Mangione, Carlin refers to "a white individual who supports racial equality in a patronizing way" (Eward-Mangione 38). They seem to be sympathetic to those out of power; however, such sympathy cannot grant any authority to those they seem to care about. Commenting on the conversation between the two actors, Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins comment in support of the male character's view: "The South African Desdemona must acknowledge that within a system hierarchised along racial categories, the power of the white woman outweighs virtually all of Othello's military authority" (24). However, it is not perfectly clear if Carlin's female character eventually agrees to her partner's point. After all, she does play along with his idea of the play, and does apologize for "saying some of those things" (but not for some others, leaving the apology unclear [46])); however, she never clearly approves his interpretation.

Labeled as a "white liberal," Desdemona is the embodiment of the contemporary political party of South Africa, or of white people in power who present themselves as a "nicer" sort; in the eyes of the male character, the character is a mirror version of the female actor herself. Thus, it is not clear whether the male character's reaction to her, or her acting, is real or theatrical. Indeed, the reason that Carlin's couple remains unmarried is because of their different races and the expected reaction from the white male, the actress's father, who exerts his authority on the white female in the relationship—mainly in a monetary way in this case: "DESDEMONA. I like you—but my God! Just think what Daddy would say!" (47). Like Desdemona, who has to explain the probability and legitimacy of their relationship in front of her father and the entire court in Venice (with its authority figures), Carlin's heroine worries about her white society's

view of her inter-racial relationship: "OTHELLO. You were afraid they would think you were immoral. . . . With a black man" (58). Considering the social circumstance in South Africa in the 1960s, the female character's worry is not a groundless fear. The Afrikaner National Party's victory at the national election opened a clear path to their apartheid goals, which was to separate South Africans by race, while dividing non-white people further by tribes, repressing the political power of the non-white population. 1949's Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act and 1950's Immorality Act made it illegal for a white person to have sexual relations with someone of a different race. Further, the Population Registration Act and Group Areas Act, along with a series of Land Acts, classified and confined non-white populations within their designated area, placing more than 80 percent of the land in the white minority's possession and leading to the forced removal of more than 3.5 million non-white people from their homelands (*History*). Thus, although the couple in Carlin's play is not physically in South Africa (but supposedly in England), for the female character, who has grown up as a white resident under this apartheid government, an interracial romantic relationship is not a comfortable thing to disclose in public. Ultimately, she has to admit that the racial conflicts have an effect even on their intimate relationship—at least partially.

To Carlin's male character, it seems clear who holds more power. The actor interprets the power dynamic of the two in Shakespeare's *Othello* quite differently from the "traditional" portrayal of them, revealing his view of the power dynamic in his own relationship with the female character. He directs her to act out his version of Desdemona:

> OTHELLO. You must be all over me. You're full of sweetness, you see, but very pressing, overwhelming. You must stifle me. . . . You must be absolutely determined to get your own way . . . This woman is determined to be on

> top. . . . And confident too, that she's going to get her own way—because she's never failed before. That's Desdemona! (24-26)

His characterization of Desdemona is almost directly opposed to the typical representation of Desdemona on stage. His interpretation might sound radical; however, according to Singh, who analyzes how African writers have responded to Shakespeare's *Othello* during the twentieth century, it is not that surprising: "[A] number of African readings and revisions of the play have attempted to alter the European ideological and cultural codes that have discursively and materially produced the black man as a violent 'other' while marking the white woman as his innocent, and often idealized, victim" (291). So, to flip the established formula of violent black male and innocent white female, Carlin's male actor is trying to portray Desdemona not as an oppressed victim but rather as a persistent and overpowering figure who could help depict Othello more as a victim than a violent "barbarian."

The female character, who has embodied "the traditional Desdemona" (20), does not readily agree with the male character's view. Disagreeing, she shares her own views on the two characters, but her interpretation reflects what they are supposed to be, rather than her original perspective:

> DESDEMONA. Desdemona? . . . Everyone sees her in their own way. She's very loving . . . She's very generous . . . she's completely selfless . . . she's beautiful. (27)
>
> OTHELLO. What do you think about Othello?
>
> DESDEMONA. I think what everybody thinks. . . . He's a fine man with a fatal flaw—he's jealous. (27)

Her interpretation is a lot more familiar to most readers and audiences than that of her partner. Carlin's Desdemona, therefore, has "everyone" to support her view; she does not have to explain at length or prove her point because it is already established—that is how it has been for centuries. Her opinion is the mainstream, and because of that, she can easily be understood—which, in a sense, is a privilege. As one who is privileged, she has not felt any need to provide many reasons to support her ready-made interpretation.

This is not the case for the male character. To persuade her—who says "it's what Shakespeare wrote" (28)—to consider his "new" interpretation more seriously, Carlin's Othello explains the situation of the protagonist not only with the textual evidence but also with the history of imperial conquest:

> OTHELLO. The bastion of the Portuguese Empire was built just ten years before Shakespeare wrote the play *Othello*. . . . Yes, the Age of Imperialism had begun. And William Shakespeare—genius that he was—understood and foresaw all the problems of that Age. (31-32)

Although she strongly rejects the idea at first, the male character persistently explains his view of the play. In his description, Desdemona sounds like an obsessed wife who is adamant about keeping her husband in her sight, even violating his work environment (37). In his view, Desdemona's accompanying Othello to Cyprus does not prove her devoted support for him; rather, it becomes a prime example of her strong will to keep her husband under her surveillance, even at the risk of breaking out of the boundary drawn by the sexism of her time. Although Carlin tries to maintain a certain distance, insisting "It isn't what I think—it's what my character thinks!" (2), he still expresses his agreement to the male character's claim:

> I always feel that there is a certain insistence, coming from her, in that scene. She does go on, and on, and on. . . . She is terribly persistent—as if driven by some urge, which is out of her control—an urge to force her husband to accede. (3-4)

In short, Carlin as an author does not identify with the male character, but supports his opinion to some extent. However, as I will discuss later, Carlin's agreement is mainly about his interpretation of the scene and the character, rather than the male character's argument or attitude about the society he lives in.

As a black person from a Caribbean island that was a colony until very recently (1958), the male character had to devise a way to find peace between his own identity and the character he is playing. In an article about a version of *Othello* in which a native Indian actor, Baishnav Charan Adhya, played the lead role (Calcutta, 1848), Sudipto Chatterjee and Jyotsna Singh point out that in the last scene where the bodies of white Desdemona and black Othello lie together in the same bed, the scene that, in the judgment of a Venetian, Lodovico, should "be hid" (*Othello* 5.2.375), "we cannot extricate the tragic resonance of the moment from *the racialized body of the Shakespearean actor, black,* or white-in-black face, who must confront and play the European stereotypes of the "base Indian" and "malignant" Turk at the moment of his horrific suicide" (66, emphasis in the original). Carlin's male character, as in the case of the Indian actor Adhya, has to think of a way to create his own version of Othello, a version that his postcolonial self can accept, while still playing the "radicalized" body created on the basis of European stereotypes. His solution, it seems, is to portray Othello as a clear victim, emphasizing the hero's struggle against the oppression in his marital relationship (and in his society) by creating an interpretation that goes against "what everybody thinks."

To be accurate, however, the male character is not changing any of "what Shakespeare wrote"; he is merely changing how to interpret it, and how to stylize it on stage to express his view. Angela Eward-Mangione recognizes the achievement of Carlin's play, pointing out that Carlin presents the issue of race as "explicit, or as central, to the play's plot" (21). She concludes that Carlin "'wrote back' to the British Empire," using the very same tools that the British Empire used to build a stereotype of "a jealous 'Moor'": literature and theater (21). He indeed writes back to the established view of "a jealous 'Moor,'" or the representation of Shakespeare's Othello, by suggesting an alternative way to see the character; however, I argue that he does not "write back" to Shakespeare, or his status as a global icon. Rather, he is actively advocating the writings of Shakespeare by offering a way to accommodate the views of those who have been marginalized by the canon and the traditional interpretation of it.

Assuming that the male character has correctly judged the power dynamic he and his partner are in, it is noteworthy that the female character follows the male character's direction despite her initial rejection of the idea. She consents to portray the male character's version of Desdemona, and gives it a try, portraying a "pressing, insistent, almost suffocating" Desdemona (39). Eward-Mangione notes the irony of this scene, pointing out that, despite the male character's accusation against Desdemona that she is stubborn and persistent, it is the male character himself who is being more demanding to get his way (45). Although this is a reasonable argument, it is essential to consider the two actors' different positions. Indeed, the more persistent and demanding one of the two in Carlin's play is the male actor, but the female actor already has a certain authority, based on the traditional and pervasive mode of interpretation of the play as well as her social status as a white person. As mentioned earlier, "everybody else" has her back, thinking in the same line with her. Also, having grown up in a

wealthy white family in South Africa, it is probable that she has never felt any necessity to consider an alternative interpretation. She could easily identify with the white character, the white author, and the white interpretation of the piece. In contrast, the male actor had clearly given some thought to the "traditional" portrayal, due to his need to find his own way of negotiating his identity as a black actor who is playing the character of color in a stereotypical representation created and perpetuated by the West.

Racial conflicts are not merely about physical “differences”; they always entail the different positions in social power. The physical difference of Othello, as well as the male character, makes him an evident minority in the community: “OTHELLO. Here stands the only black man on this stage. This stage is full—overflowing—with white people. And Othello is the black man—the only black man (32).” The female character perceives *Othello* only as a universal love story, which had a tragic ending due to the black general’s insane jealousy; the male character insists, however, that the play is pointing to racial conflicts, or at least to their potential. Asking “Why is Othello a black man?” (28), Carlin’s Othello defines Shakespeare’s *Othello* as “a play about War”; “a play about the Color conflict”; “a play about the theme of Race”; and “the first play that ever was written about Colour” (29).

The discussion in the play applies further to the politics and discriminative culture of the real world. Carlin’s male character tells a story to highlight the unfair nature of racial discrimination in South Africa, the home country of the female character. He supposes a situation where the Prime Minister of the country, who was originally a white person, suddenly turns black in one night. As soon as he becomes a black person, his position in society, society’s treatment of him, and even the status of his marriage changes:

OTHELLO. In South Africa, you can't talk about a black Prime Minister—there's no such thing; not even temporarily. No, no, no—in the instant he turned black, he ceased to hold office. . . . Certainly, the moment he turned black he became automatically guilty of a large number of offences. . . . In the instant he turned black, their marriage was null and void. . . . Yes—he became a boy. (49-56)

According to the discriminatory view in apartheid South Africa, the change of skin tone means "ultimate differences," and a "matter of spirit and soul, as well as body," which one cannot pass without noticing (55). He is not only guilty but also infantilized, like many colonized nations.

It is noteworthy that the male character's story locates itself in South Africa, rather than in Trinidad, where he is from. While it is a familiar place about which Carlin can tell a story from his experience, it also is a place where the female character's perspective has been shaped. What the male character does is to create a story which locates itself in a place familiar to his target audience—his partner—to convey a point that is less familiar to her. This is the opposite of what Shakespeare's Othello does to hold Desdemona's attention—in his case, he tells exotic stories from his adventures outside of Venice. What Carlin does through his piece is similar to what Shakespeare's Othello does; however, instead of presenting a story which is exotic due to its location, Carlin makes his male character satirize his (Carlin's) home country, which is made exotic by a narrator who is a foreigner not only to the female character but also to his audience in South Africa and in England.

Even at the beginning of their personal relationship, Carlin's actor "told stories" to catch the attention of his Desdemona—just like Shakespeare's Othello (59). However, soon, the

attention fades. Carlin's male character argues that such a decrease of her interest is due to the fading exoticism as she actually gets to know him:

> OTHELLO. And then you didn't want to see me any more at all. . . . I'll tell you why. . . . I was new here then—and you were remote—strange—and a bit forbidden. . . . But after that, we both turned ordinary—ordinary, if that's the word. Our bodies stopped being strange and became real; . . . There were no more savages, angels and devils. And we became a man and a woman. (60-61)

To this, the female character responds that she is content with being "a man and a woman." This is Carlin's—rather naïve—solution: recognizing others in reality, not in stories. What he suggests is for people to get familiar with each other, thus defying the stereotype and becoming aware of reality. However, this solution, which limits the socially institutionalized matter within the boundaries of individual relationships, does not alleviate the rigid and systemized discrimination while neglecting the intensity of the effect such conflicts cause the marginalized.

It seems that the female character—and Carlin, who sides with her in the introduction to the text—is fed up with the male character's discussion of race and politics ("DESDEMONA. Now—no politics" [15]), regarding it as self-pity. Although the male character tries to point out that, considering her higher social status, the suffering she claims to have been through is not the same as his, she regards his claim as "tantrums" (43), retorting that "*We* have suffered" (43, emphasis in the original). She does not clearly indicate who exactly she means by "we." If, by "we," she means women who are marginalized in a patriarchal society, she indeed suffered a loss of power. Still, by turning away from the topic of the racial conflicts her partner is trying to

highlight, she proves that she is not getting his point, no matter how many times he brings the same topic up in their conversation.

> DESDEMONA. The author did know everything. He saw his Othello—and he saw you—straight through. The Moor! With all his tantrums, and agonizings, and postures, and melodrama. . . He is the Negro! Othello the Moor—and what is he? Another bloody self-pitying, posturing, speechifying, Chairman of the Afro-Asian Delegation! (43-44)

It seems the female character's impatience with the male character's "self-pity" stems from the author's own stance. In the introduction to the play, Carlin clarifies:

> The poisons of race are, still: pity, and self-pity. The blacks must stop being sorry for themselves. The whites must stop feeling false sympathy. Let them each sheer off from this cloying embrace, and have a go at each other, like my two characters. Then the world will be a healthier place. (5)

Carlin also regards the female character, "the white one," as the "healthier of the two," revealing his stance on the political situation in postcolonial Africa (5).

If Carlin is right and the female character indeed is "the healthier," perhaps it is because the society was easier for her to live in. Despite the limited social power due to her gender, so far, the community to which she belongs—whether it be her family or South Africa—has supported her. Such privileged position has exempted her from being serious about racial conflicts, making it hard for her to understand why her partner appears to be so obsessed with this topic. What Rushdie points out about one's perspective on politics in literature can be applied to the different opinions of Carlin's couple:

> In the rich, powerful societies of the West, it is possible to exclude politics from fiction; to treat public affairs as peripheral and faintly disreputable. From outside the West, this looks like the sort of position one can only take up inside a cocoon of privilege. There are very few major writers in the new English literatures who do not place politics at the very centre of their art. (Rushdie 8)

The female character is privileged to say "Now—no politics" (15); she has had enough power to be tired of politics, and in particular racial conflicts. Yet, the male actor cannot stop talking about the "color problem" because it is an oppression very present to him even at this very moment. Acknowledging Carlin's achievement in this play, Eward-Mangione counts *Not Now* as one of the three plays she regards as examples of "writ[ing] back to Shakespeare through identifying and challenging dominant narratives that represent the colonized" (6). Gilbert and Tompkins also argue that *Not Now* "stages a deliberately political act designed to destabilise both imperial power of the invoked canonical tradition and the currency of its associated discourses" (25). However, Carlin's achievement is limited in that he fails to fully understand the needs and hardship of the more marginalized population in a postcolonial nation. His solution, which remains at a mainly individual and emotional level, attempts to ignore the evident discrimination in society—more so if we consider the situation of apartheid South Africa in the 1960s—by naively smoothing out the conflicts which are a much more urgent matter for the marginalized population.

Furthermore, it is hard to say that Carlin is writing back to the canonical author, Shakespeare. Although he disagrees with the "traditional" interpretation of *Othello*, Carlin's male character does not refuse "the national poet." Rather, he embraces Shakespeare and the Bard's language as his own:

> OTHELLO. I come from Trinidad—remember? What language you think they do talk in Trinidad? . . . I was born in the English language, and don't you forget it! I was born in the language that William Shakespeare is talking—and don't you damn well forget it, *darling* . . . Now, I'll tell you some more about the national poet. *Our* national poet, darling. (31)

On one hand, the male character seems to rebel against the center-periphery binary, claiming the author from the centre, Shakespeare, for the periphery. On the other hand, however, he seems to want to be admitted and accepted in the centre, by proving that he, too, can understand the language and culture of Shakespeare, embracing him as "our national poet." Considering that the rehearsal of the two actors is likely to be happening in England, "the 'motherland' of South Africa, Uganda, and Trinidad" (Eward-Mangione 36), not in either character's "homeland," both of them are seeking acceptance in the "motherland," the "centre" of the European culture, through the Bard.

Despite his original interpretation that focuses on the race of the protagonist in *Othello*, Carlin does not show any intention to refute the Bard; rather, like his characters, he views Shakespeare with evident reverence. In his introduction to the play, Carlin claims that "My small play takes the form of a rehearsal of Shakespeare's great one" (1). Arguing that Shakespeare was *aware* of the race conflicts and prejudices (rather than being a part of them), Carlin asserts, "I think Shakespeare knew it (because he knew everything)" (1). He calls his play an "appendix" which shows how Shakespeare already dealt with the conflicts regarding people of color. Carlin's play even seems to be a complimentary lecture to advocate Shakespeare through a character of color—who is convinced that "Shakespeare . . . understood and foresaw all the problems of that Age" (32)—against any claim to charge him with even a trace of racism. After

all, Carlin's new perspective applies to the interpretation and the mode of staging, rather than the play text itself.

The fact that a play is written in the postcolonial context does not necessarily mean that it writes back to "the centre." Neither does the fact that a play is written in an imperial language, such as English, mean that it is intended for the audience in the previously imperial/colonial nation (England). Carlin sets the play in England, casting a white South African female and a brown/black Trinidadian male. The one who represents South Africa is a white person, dependent on wealthy colonial power. "Black skin" is again foreign to the author and the immediate audience in Uganda/South Africa (since the one with the black skin is from Trinidad). Thus, Carlin is "writing toward/in," trying to show that an author outside of England can also understand the Bard, recognizing his "genius."

Cleopatra—Too White or Too Black?: Derek Walcott's *A Branch of the Blue Nile*

Fifteen years after the premiere of Carlin's *Not Now, Sweet Desdemona,* the Saint Lucian poet and playwright, Derek Walcott wrote a play, in which, as in Carlin's play, the actors rehearse and discuss a play by Shakespeare.[53] Derek Walcott's *A Branch of the Blue Nile* employs a metatheatrical structure, presenting a group of actors who stage *Antony and Cleopatra*. Instead of suggesting an alternative interpretation to accommodate a postcolonial actor's perspective, Walcott actually shows the process of adapting and rewriting the play script as the actors move through different versions of it, gradually placing more and more emphasis on their locality. Walcott's play takes place in a previously colonized nation, Trinidad. Unlike

[53] Walcott also had a strong lifelong connection with Trinidad, and founded the Trinidad Theatre Workshop in 1959, which is an interesting connection with the male actor in Carlin's play. As the founding director, Walcott held weekly theatre workshops for more than a decade.

Carlin's play, in which both actors are away in pursuit of their dreams in the "motherland," Walcott's actors are rooted in their own homeland, at least during the period in which the play is set—some of them have been to England and the United States and have returned, while others plan to leave at the end of the play. Set in a small theatre, the troupe consists of Harvey, a white director who has come back from England, and several local actors with varying backgrounds and ambitions. As the play proceeds, it reveals their conflicts and struggles while rehearsing or performing two versions of *Antony and Cleopatra,* and two plays written by one of the actors, Chris. Through the four different versions of the play-within-the-play, Walcott demonstrates the struggle of postcolonial actors to embody the Western canon; in this play, he asserts the need for acceptance of the existing postcolonial hybridity in recognizing one's identity as well as the inevitability of adaptation in the intercultural context, defying the illusion of the "universal canon."

The play presents a Trinidadian actress who takes a journey to negotiate her character while playing a character from the Western canon. Walcott introduces the start of her journey when different perspectives clash against each other: local and "global," represented by a Trinidadian actress of color and a white director who built his experience in England. As soon as the play opens, Walcott introduces the first play-within-the-play; the actors rehearse Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* under the direction of Harvey. Sheila, a talented black actress, plays Cleopatra, and Harvey tries to make her embody the character by bringing up her personal life into the scene, knowing that she and Chris, another local actor in the theatre company, are having an affair. Offended, Sheila retorts:

> SHEILA. [W]hen you turn my name into mud it stays mud, and no magic in any theatre in the world can turn that mud into gold . . . You're a cruel son of a bitch,

> Harvey, if this foreign Method shit was your idea; it's bad Method, anyway, and maybe it doesn't travel. I would like some vestige of my pride left . . . (218)

Harvey's "foreign Method," which is Method acting, does not travel to Sheila, who does not want to be insulted about her own private life. To her, dragging her personal affairs through the "mud" to portray the renowned seducer does not turn her "into gold." Sheila expresses her hesitation, or rather, the fear of losing herself—her pride and self-respect—under the pretense of a successful show. What her white, Europe-based director wants her to be is not what she wants to embody.

Although Sheila tries to "sound like her" (219), her perception of the Egyptian queen seems to differ from her director's and some of the other actors' in the play. Harvey gives directions to Sheila, wanting her to play the character with eroticism, exaggerating the queen's inappropriate affair with the Roman general. Likewise, Gavin, a black actor who has come back after unsuccessfully pursuing his dream of becoming an actor in America, expresses his view on Sheila's portrayal of the queen: "GAVIN. We all thought you were playing the role a bit too decently, like a suburban housewife having a little something on the side, and not the sensual serpent you're supposed to be" (227). The queen, created by a European author, is built on the othering gaze of Europe in his time; it is the gaze that marginalizes Cleopatra based on her gender and race, presenting her as a dangerous seducer, "the sensual serpent," who would lure and destroy even the most powerful Western males.

Harvey, as well as Gavin, is experienced in and thus exposed to the European ways of perception. He has internalized such a gaze, and plays the role of white authority over Sheila's embodiment of the queen. Analyzing the reviews on several productions in Calcutta with local

cast(s) in the early 1800s, Chatterjee and Singh note the impossibility of satisfying the othering gaze with the "authentic" other, pointing out that "the English had to be happy with the black-faced non-Other/Self as the Other" (72). They conclude: "The Shakespearean Moor, despite his complexion, was not dark enough for the Bengali Native to play. This was Shakespeare, after all, and none but the white English could represent Othello in the best possible way" (80). What Othello was to the Bengali actor is, in the different setting more than a century later, what Cleopatra is to the Trinidadian actress; they are "the Other," created by and for a European stereotype, and can never be themselves.

For Sheila, more significant than the geographical setting of the play (that is, the postcolonial Caribbean), her darker skin tone is the factor that contributes to her thinking that she is incapable of playing that role. According to Joyce Green MacDonald, in the postcolonial Caribbean the skin tone of women implies their virtue, "vilifying" and at the same time "idealizing" women of mixed race:

> Women of mixed race were both vilified—their light skin announced their mother's slave history of sexual availability to the males of the white families who had owned them, in effect visibly marking them as the offspring of whores—and idealized, seen as having particular mobility and opportunities to associate with white men, in the new society developing after emancipation. (200).

Considering what happens in *Antony and Cleopatra* and how the play depicts Cleopatra, then, "the sensual serpent" is not fit for Sheila's darker skin tone. Her skin tone is simply not light enough to embody this "vilified . . . and idealized character." In this Caribbean setting, Cleopatra is a character not dark enough for Sheila to identify with because, although Cleopatra is a racial other in the play, she is a creation of a white European author. Ironically, Shakespeare's Egyptian

queen requires the Caribbean actress to play up to the European standard, as signified by the presence of her director Harvey, who is white and speaks with a British accent.

The struggle to find where she belongs is not limited to the theatre space; the on-stage influence of the West is easily found elsewhere in postcolonial Trinidad. Feeling that no matter how hard she tries, she cannot please Shakespeare, or the worshippers of the Bard (284), Sheila decides to leave the stage and join a church:

> SHEILA. But they were right, the stage isn't my place. . . . 'cause the Caroni isn't a branch of the river Nile, and Trinidad isn't Egypt, except at Carnival, so the world sniggers when I speak her lines, but not in a concrete church in Barataria. (284-85)

However, even when Sheila leaves the theatre, she cannot stop acting—more precisely, acting the Western ideas. Not so different from the theatre, where Sheila feels the sense of displacement while playing the Egyptian queen fabricated by the West, the church fails to offer her any escape, let alone an opportunity to find her true identity. Although at a glance the church seems to be the opposite place for her to be, she still "performs" her testimony in front of the congregation, which the priest, Brother John, uses to raise funds. As Marylin, a younger actress with lighter skin tone, jeers, it becomes Sheila's new role to play: "What she got there now? What you got there, Sheila? I see you get a new part. But you still on the Book" (276).

Indeed, Sheila does play a new role, and she is "on the Book." This is a performance directed by Brother John and written, again, by the West. To Sheila, Shakespeare in the theatre and Jesus in the church mean the same—the same Western standard that she should please, following the direction of the successors of the European values, whether it be Harvey or Brother John: "SHEILA. If He gave me His truth, what shall I do with it? And why does He give it to me

through Shakespeare? Maybe Jesus came back and He was Shakespeare (260).” In the end, Sheila admits that “It’s like the theatre (289),” and that “This isn’t my place” (294). Whether it be in the theatre or the church, it does not work for her; they are similar roles with a different audience, neither of which fits her true self.

The other three plays that follow the first rehearsal scene in *A Branch of the Blue Nile* function as the troupe’s exploration to find a way to perform what fits their own identity in the postcolonial context. The first of these attempts, which is the second play-within-the-play, is a peasant play written by Chris, featuring banana trees and Trinidadian dialect (Act 1, Scene 4). This play manifests Chris’s desire to mount what they truly are: “CHRIS. I ain’t care who the arse it is, Shakespeare, Racine, Chekhov, nutten in there had to do with my life, or the life of all them black people out in the hot sun of Frederick Street at twelve o’clock trying to hustle a living” (246). Calling Harvey “Mr. Come-Back Englishman,” Chris makes it clear that his writing is for the madman in the street outside, based on who he really is, rather than who he is expected to be: “His language. Not somebody else’s, not how you think madmen should talk, as if insanity was literature” (247). Chris puts his effort into embodying the “true identity” of the people in their own culture, rather than imitating what the colonizer’s othering gaze has fabricated.

However, this local play does not entirely work as “authentic” Trinidadian either. Pointing out that Chris has to correct Marylin’s dialect—and Chris blames Harvey for “the damage” he caused her—Reed Way Dasenbrock suggests that Chris’s play is not as close to the heart of the actors as Chris expects it to be:

> The play, with fake banana trees and actors in peasant clothing, may represent “the real Caribbean,” but this is as artificial and as far away from the lives of these characters as

> Antony and Cleopatra. The actors seem as out of place in the "native" play as they are in the "foreign," and indeed the two seem to have crisscrossed in their minds. (106-107)

The damage, or the influence, cannot be undone. As much as the previously colonized are distinguished from their former colonizers, they are not the same as those who lived in Trinidad before the encounter with the West. This is precisely the realization that Walcott tries to share.

In his essay "The Caribbean: Culture or Mimicry?" Walcott acknowledges the hybridity in his own identity:

> In the case of my own identity, or my realness if you like, it is an absurdity that I can live with; being both American and West Indian is an ambiguity without a crisis, for I find that the more West Indian I become, the more I can accept my dependence on America as a professional writer, not because America owes me a living from historical guilt, nor that it needs my presence, but because we share this part of the world, and have shared it for centuries now, even as conqueror and victim, as exploiter and exploited. (51)

Through colonization, the two worlds met. Like it or not, the influence persists, and it cannot be removed or ignored. One's identity is not clearly cut into a neat boundary; rather, different—and sometimes opposing—elements coexist to shape one's complex identity.

Furthermore, Walcott suggests that the postcolonial attitude cannot neatly fall into either mimicking or reciting the West. Addressing V. S. Naipaul, who first used the phrase "The Mimic Men," Walcott argues that "The Old World, whether it is represented by the light of Europe or of Asia or of Africa, is the rhythm by which we remember" (53). Walcott questions, "What if the man in the New World needs mimicry as design, both as defense and as lure?" (55), as any animal would instinctively do to adapt and survive in the given environment. He concludes: "The New World originated in hypocrisy and genocide, so it is not a question for us, of returning to an

Eden or of creating utopia; out of the sordid and degrading beginning of the West Indies, we could only go further in decency and regret" (57). Walcott's solution, thus, starts by recognizing their reality as of now, without any denial of the painful history and its residue.

Considering Walcott's view on the existing hybridity in the Caribbean, the third play-within-the-play in Act 2, Scene 1 presents itself as an example of a hybrid adaptation, negotiating the "authenticity" of the canon for the local context. In this scene, Marylin, who succeeds Sheila as Cleopatra after she leaves the stage, tries to play the queen as is written in Shakespeare's text. However, Gavin plays Clown with Trinidadian dialect, making the show a hybrid adaptation of Shakespearean and Trinidadian. This production ends up getting harsh criticism from the Europe-trained critic, who is enraged, insisting, "Certain things remain sacred" (269). Although the show seems to be a failure, Dasenbrock emphasizes the significance of its hybridity, noting that the clown's language, which is distinguished from the one of high class, connected better to Shakespeare's own audience: "The director here is truer to Shakespeare by treating him as a working playwright trying to connect with a largely popular audience than is the critic treating 'the Bard' as someone who can be 'desecrated' as if his works were Holy Writ" (108). Indeed, this hybrid adaptation gestures toward what Walcott himself does with *A Branch of the Blue Nile* to some extent, as he presents the inerasable colonial influence and at the same time the indigenous actors who cannot embody the European creation.

While the third inserted play demonstrates the inevitable hybridity in the postcolonial context, the fourth and final play-within-the-play is a direct reference to *A Branch of the Blue Nile* itself. In Act 2, Scene 8, two of the younger actors in the troupe rehearse Chris's new play, which is no other than the exact replay of their rehearsal scene from Act 1, Scene 1. Chris, who tries to bring Sheila back to the theatre, shows up at the church with this play, which he wrote

from the tape-recorded rehearsal from the day. Thus, the solution Walcott suggests to the previously colonized and (currently) marginalized is to write their own story for the stage as Chris does. Chris titles his play “A Branch of the Blue Nile,” saying that it is not mainstream, and calling it “white” would be too obvious (290). Chris’s play, which is itself a play-within-a-play contained in the bigger frame of Walcott’s metadrama, offers a double-layered lens to look into the conflicts existing in and among the characters and the actors. After seeing her story played on stage, and with the help of Phil, who asserts that God lent her the gift of being an actor “Even in this country. Even here” (312), Sheila finally breathes again, “fill[ing] the lungs of the theatre” (312). In Walcott’s play, the characters, who are at the periphery of the global show business, embark on a journey to face where they are and to decide where to go. Each character’s future is left undecided, but one thing is certain: they could not stay and continue to perform Shakespeare as it is written, which was what they tried at the beginning of the play. Chris’s play is the story of their own theatre group; likewise, Walcott’s *A Branch of Blue Nile* tells a story of the Caribbean actors who are acknowledging and embracing their reality, and continue to do their work from there on—the story of those who, as Sheila does at the end of the play, fill the theatre with their own breath.

Through their plays, both Walcott’s *A Branch of the Blue Nile* and Carlin’s *Not Now, Sweet Desdemona* demonstrate the impossibility of performing a European canon “as it is” in a postcolonial context. As for the ways to negotiate postcolonial identity, especially for those who are embodying characters of color created by a white author, Carlin offers an alternative way to process the play while Walcott suggests creating one’s own narrative using the topic thrust upon oneself. Although the two plays conclude quite differently, both Carlin and Walcott attempt to process Shakespearean plays in the context of the society they and their contemporaries

experienced—South Africa and the Caribbean. Based on their contemporary experiences, Carlin devises a fresh way to stylize the main characters, adapting a nontraditional interpretation, and Walcott shows the process that gradually evolves into a localized rewriting of the canon. Even when all the cast is speaking and acting in the English language, their plays—the presentation of the plays—have to change. They cannot perform them without adapting, be it either the words in the script or the style of expression.

The process of adapting, accompanied by uneasy discussions and inner struggles, becomes a tough examination of their own identity. As Gilbert and Tompkins note, such rewriting of canonical texts "provides another means of interrogating the cultural legacy of imperialism and offers renewed opportunities for performative intervention" (16). They continue that "[a]s a genre, drama is particularly suited" to this kind of intervention and its expression, because the performance of a play is by nature a reproduction of the original script (18). Going one step further, shaping their writing in the format of metadrama emphasizes the process of rewriting as it happens in front of the audience, sharing the characters' discussion of the given play with them. Carlin concludes his play by dimming the stage and closing the curtain, but "[T]he house lights come up" (63). Walcott ends the play with Sheila alone in the theatre space, beginning her exercises, filling the theatre with her breath (312). Their final focus is on the different sections of a theatre (one in the house, the other on stage); it seems Carlin puts the ball in audience's court, to look into where they are and what happens there, while Walcott leaves hope for the upcoming chapter of the Trinidadian actress's journey on stage. Both for the audience and the actors, as long as Shakespeare's plays mount the stage, the process of readjusting and adapting will continue.

Chapter 5. The Audience as an Agent in Social Critique

From the 1970s onward, theatre practitioners have sought various ways to break away from what Peter Szondi called “absolute drama,” which relies on dialogue, interaction between characters, and an imagined dramatic world clearly separated from the world beyond the fourth wall (qtd. in Jürs-Munby 3). Contemporary practitioners have devised ways to increase the impact of their productions, exploring unique performing styles; two such practitioners are Ivo van Hove, based in Amsterdam (the Netherlands), and Hyun-tak Kim from Seoul (South Korea). Van Hove is a director for Toneelgroep Amsterdam, “the largest theatre company in the Netherlands” (Toneelgroep); Kim leads Seongbookdong Beedoolkee, a small experimental theatre company. Despite the differences not only in their cultural background but also in the scale of the companies and the demographics of the audience, the two innovative directors’ remakes of Shakespearian plays demonstrate a noticeable similarity. Both try to make the canonical pieces of Shakespeare more directly relevant to their target audiences by adapting them to fit better into the society for which they are performing. In this chapter, I will discuss two productions—one from each director—which are adapted from Shakespearean plays and performed in their own innovative styles, maximizing the messages: Ivo Van Hove’s *Roman Tragedies* (2007), and Hyun-tak Kim’s *Oh THe yELLOw* (2016). Both *Roman Tragedies* and *Oh THe yELLOw* exhibit postdramatic aspects, aggressively engaging the audience with their commentaries on contemporary society. While they use comparable tactics to amplify their messages, the depiction of the Others differ in the two productions; in van Hove’s *Roman Tragedies*, Cleopatra’s intersectional otherness is more nuanced, although it remains almost

untouched from the source text, whereas Kim's *Oh THe yELLOw* bluntly stages the racial otherness of Othello to draw critical attention to the topic.

Following the chronological order of these two adapted plays, I will first analyze *Roman Tragedies* before moving onto *Oh THe yELLOw* and comparing the two. For both productions, I will introduce the directors and the theatre companies, then discuss the content and the style of the plays. For *Roman Tragedies,* this chapter will explore Van Hove's strategy in his style and the desired impact before discussing how the production characterizes Cleopatra. As a comparison, the analysis of *Oh The yELLOw* will begin with the production's focus on the racial discrimination in South Korea and the representation of Othello, before examining how its style works to fortify the message of the play.

Mediated Cleopatra: Ivo Van Hove's *Roman Tragedies*

Ivo van Hove, originally from Belgium, has directed at Toneelgroep Amsterdam since 2001. Internationally acclaimed and awarded, including two Obie Awards (1998 and 2005) and two Tony Awards (2008 and 2016) in the United States, he creates works ranging widely from original plays to adaptations of canonical texts. According to Helen Shaw, van Hove's productions display his "hallmarks":

> [T]here is always a slight chill, a filmwatcher's respect for the slicing plane of the proscenium, and a preference for cool grey tones. No matter when his play is set, he loves a narrow suit, and lately he has fallen hard for live video trickery. Not for him is John Gielgud's old dictum, "style is knowing which play you're doing." Instead, van Hove applies an antiseptic *mise en scene*, shoots it from varying angles and then lets the actors

> unleash the mess. Even van Hove's exquisitely determined messes, though, can seem a bit...de rigueur. (57)

Van Hove exhibits most of the summarized features in *Roman Tragedies.* This unusual play is one of his two marathon adaptations of Shakespeare, along with *Kings of War* (2015).[54] Van Hove first staged *Roman Tragedies* at the Holland Festival in 2007 (Toneelgroep), and since then, the show has had world-wide tours, including stops in Braunschweig, Wroclaw, Zurich, Vienna, Avignon, Montreal, and Quebec City (Billing 415).

Roman Tragedies invites its audience into a unique theatre experience from the very top of the show. The play, which Peter Kirwan calls "an endurance challenge," adapts *Coriolanus, Julius Caesar,* and *Antony and Cleopatra* into one six-hour-long production without any intermission (478). As the audience members take their seats, they are met with a spacious proscenium stage featuring scattered couches, numerous TV screens sporadically positioned, and a giant center screen that displays "God, I'm glad I'm not me. — Bob Dylan" above the stage.[55] On stage right are large signs reading "Makeup," "Video" as well as a first aid booth (with a green and white cross symbol). On the opposite side, a booth marked "Bar" is set up. Up center, where some of the couches are laid out, there are two glass walls with a middle alley—this is a reserved place for the characters' deaths.[56] A woman, *Coriolanus*'s Virgilia, sits on a couch at the front of the stage. As the piece begins, percussion instruments at both stage-left and right make loud shattering noises, accompanied by busy strobe lights. A red "ticker" at the bottom of the

---

[54] This four-and-a-half-hour performance adapts *Henry V, Henry VI,* and *Richard III* into one.

[55] The stage descriptions are from the video clip provided by Toneelgroep Amsterdam. It was filmed during the opening night, 2007.

[56] Peter Kirwan calls the spot the "no-go area" as the otherwise freely ranging audience cannot go in or walk through this particular spot. This is "the place where people went to die, whether dragged in forcibly or entering willingly" (480). In this production, a death of a character is signaled by a freeze-framed image of the character, lying down on the sliding podium between the glass walls.

center screen states: "Oorlog Tussen Romeinen en Volscen <493 BC> [War between Romans and Volscians]"—and so the play begins.

Although the unusual duration is often what the reviewers mention first about the production, van Hove's innovation goes further than the mere length. Natalie Corbett and Keren Zaiontz comment that the "true experimentality" of this play is his attempt to highlight "the dangers of (and desires for) distraction in a hypermediated world" through active audience experience (300). *Roman Tragedies* employs the freedom of the audience in choosing where to be during the show, along with simultaneously streaming media—devices which are often used in postdramatic theatre. Since van Hove presents a coherent plot filled with dialogue and verbal communication, the production is not technically classified as "postdramatic";[57] however, the style and strategies he brings into the play can be discussed on the basis of the postdramatic theory of Hans-Thies Lehmann. One such feature is the rhizomatic experience that the production offers to the audience. Van Hove effectively breaks the boundary between the stage and the audience by actively inviting the audience onto the stage. Members of the audience are encouraged to visit the Bar, walk around the stage, or sit on the couches on the stage while the actors proceed with their roles. As the audience watch the production from their various vantage points about the stage, Kirwan observes, "the action [is] never directly visible to all audience members at any one time" (478). As in postdramatic theatre, where the audience are "free to position themselves wherever they wished . . . everyone create[s] their own narrative through the performance but no one [is] ever able to totalize it" (Jürs-Munby13). By giving the audience freedom to choose from where they would like to watch, van Hove insists on the audience's active participation in the construction of the show.[58] Because the audience members have to

---

[57] Christian M. Billing indicates that in this production, "The emphasis throughout was on clear storytelling" (418).
[58] Yet, Corbett and Zaiontz point out that the participation of the audience is "entirely proscribed" in van Hove's

create their own narrative from various points of view, such performances reply to Jacque Rancière's call for an ideal theatre: "What is required is a theatre without spectators, where those in attendance learn from as opposed to being seduced by images; where they become active participants as opposed to passive voyeurs" (4). Although van Hove's actors are producing one coherent plot based on multiple dramatic texts, the positioning of the audience is likely to generate its own ruptures in the plot as viewers move around, and even leave the scene for a moment.

The postdramatic quality of *Roman Tragedies* becomes even more prominent when the distinctive intermediality of the production, which broadens the potential of interpretation, comes into consideration. According to Freda Chapple and Chiel Kattenbelt, intermediality concerns the relationship between different media: "When two or more different art forms come together, a process of theatricalization occurs" (Chapple 20). It is noteworthy that intermediality is different from multimedia. As Peter Boenisch clarifies, intermediality does not merely mean the presence of multiple numbers of media (Boenisch 103). Whereas the existence of various methods in "processing, transmitting, and storing information" suffices the definition of multimedia, intermediality moves the focus from the specific function of each medium to the meanings that are found "inter" media: "[I]ntermediality as a concept . . . is an effect performed in-between mediality, supplying multiple perspectives, and foregrounding the making of meaning rather than obediently transmitting meaning" (Boenisch 103). As intermediality redefines media based on the influence that is generated between different media, it "leads to a fresh perception" (Kattenbelt, qtd. in Nelson 19). The audience, in turn, must engage in a more active

---

show. The audience can move during specified times only and they can only observe from proximity while not allowed to intervene, being "visible yet silent observers and not participants" (302).

interpretation to grasp the meaning that is "in-between," rather than absorbing a clearly projected message.

Van Hove complicates the view of the audience with the live-streamed images on the center screen, which sometimes are identical to the TV screens around the stage, while at other times different images appear on each. For example, when Cassius and Brutus discuss their battle plans against each other in their camps, there are at least four different media at work simultaneously:

1) The action is happening on the stage.
2) On the center screen, the audience can see the characters in both camps on opposite sides of the glass walls, as their images are put side by side using split screens.
3) A camera angle includes a TV screen up stage, on which a boxing match is being broadcast.
4) During the argument between the two camps, a news ticker runs across the bottom of the center screen explaining how Octavius, seen next to Antony, was adopted and acquired his political power.

The audience is thus provided with four media outlets to observe and process during this scene, each conveying a connected but different point, adding layers to the interpretation. It is almost impossible for them to scrutinize all sources of input with ample attention. This sort of inundating "maximalist aesthetic" overwhelms and distracts the audience by the sheer amount of information, which is van Hove's way of reflecting contemporary society through Shakespeare, as it is equally full of incessant "narratives" of political leaders (Bassett 44). The distraction and confusion caused by the amount of information, Natalie Corbett and Keren Zaiontz suggest, make the events on stage hard to understand at the time they are happening for the audience

without expert knowledge (302). As a result, the audience is challenged with a gap in their understanding—not due to lack of information, but an abundance of it. According to Boenisch, "intermedial performances derail messages by communicating gaps," and as a result, "intermedial effects ultimately inflect the attention from the real worlds of the message created by the performance, towards the very reality of media, mediation and the performance itself" (115). Van Hove's audiences, accordingly, are encouraged to build their own perception on how the situation on stage is "mediated," rather than understanding the lines and narrative of the play accurately.

Although van Hove does not let his audience take a part in the show's action, he tasks them with multiple layers of active observation. For instance, the audience is required to read the ticker on the screen while at the same time watch the actors on the stage to better process what happens in the production. The information on the ticker performs three main functions. First, it fills the gap by providing explanations for omitted sections of the plays, mostly war scenes or character backstories. Secondly, the ticker displays countdowns to the deaths that will occur on stage. Before the action moves to the third part of the production, concerning *Antony and Cleopatra*, the ticker hurriedly foretells the upcoming deaths:

> 5 min tot dood van Cassius. [5 min. to the death of Cassius.]
>
> 15 min tot dood van Brutus. [15 min. to the death of Brutus.]
>
> 120 min tot dood van Antonius. [120 min. to the death of Antonius.]
>
> 140 min tot dood van Cleopatra. [140 min. to the death of Cleopatra.][59]

Having already observed such countdown announcements with the deaths of Coriolanus and Caesar earlier in the play, the audience can wait for the rest of the play with a "bottomless

---

[59] Shown one line after another.

appetite for celebrity death" (Shaw, H. 62). With the countdown, these deaths are not something that will surprise or touch the audience; rather, they are something expected and predicted according to a precise timeline. When a death finally takes place, the ticker—performing its third function—provides the year of birth and death, along with the characters' full names and the freeze-framed image of the body on the center screen. As the ticker summarizes what happened—and in the case of the countdown, what "will" happen—in a brief and factual manner, it mirrors breaking news headlines that might appear on tickers on metropolitan skyscrapers. As Kirwan notes, the production's approach "reconstitute[s] history as current news" (478). Such an approach brings the stories taken from more than two thousand years ago to the present, enabling the audience to vividly experience not only the events but also how they are made into news coverage, caught in captions and still images.

While the ticker summarizes "factual" information, the screen shows framed images from the live events. Allowing the audience to witness how the live event can be mediated into pixels from a certain angle, van Hove demonstrates how the media plays a critical role in manipulating the public perspective. Helen Shaw points out the carefully thought-out theme of "the political impact of the media" in the play, relating that "politics and news coverage, in fact, were what prompted *Roman Tragedies*" (61). Indeed, van Hove devised the production to resemble what happens in every day's news and politics, using the lack of an intermission for six hours and the unique setting, where the audience are allowed to move around and take their own preferred spots from which to watch the performance:

> The world goes on continuously. News happens at the same moment, yet at a different moment. That was when I took the decision to have no intermission, because we now

> have twenty-four-hour politics. Decisions are made when someone is sleeping. You are bound to miss something. (Van Hove, qtd. in Shaw, H. 61)

One misses something either by choice or by limitation. If one decides to see the production from a certain position or to leave the spot for a break, he or she will miss some aspects of the actions due to that choice. Wherever one is stationed, however, the media will manipulate him or her to see certain images, or prevent him or her from seeing certain aspects of the scenes. Such power of manipulation is amplified if one is seated on a couch up stage and relies only on a TV screen to catch what happened on down stage; however, even if some audience members place themselves near the actors for a closer observation, they are bound to miss some part of the action and be forced to rely on the mediated information to some extent, proving the media's dominant influence on public perception. What van Hove stages, thus, is a sample of what we experience in everyday life. As Corbett and Zaiontz point out, *Roman Tragedies* portrays our desire to know every detail about public figures (302). Based on such a desire, media outlets produce overflowing amounts of information which are delivered to us relentlessly; however, this delivery opens a door to media's manipulating power, as well as exposing ourselves to be an object in the streams of mediation, as is represented by the audience sitting on van Hove's stage, who are visible on the screens along with the actors. Hence, in van Hove's words, "*Roman Tragedies* are not realist theatre, but a theatre of reality" (qtd. in Corbett and Keren 302).

Van Hove succeeds in offering an unforgettable experience of witnessing the mechanism of politics and media's manipulative role; ironically, however, the last third of the production highlights the production's manipulation of Cleopatra's image, as it embeds her intersectional "otherness" as a racial and gendered "Other." As the cast of *Roman Tragedies* is not multiracial, and as the scenery and costumes are contemporary, van Hove's Cleopatra—played by Chris

Nietvelt—does not have any overt physical difference from other characters in the play. In a director's note, van Hove evaluates that Shakespeare's history plays do not express any opinion to favor one side but focus on portraying the process of the events to reveal "the human side of politics" (Van Hove "Roman" 56). However, even if van Hove never intended it to be so, his production is not free from biased portrayal. Despite many changes in the style and casting,[60] the stereotypical gaze that exoticizes the Egyptian queen remains unchanged from Shakespeare's, since *Roman Tragedies* frames her as an unprofessional, irrational, and sexual figure.

Although the actors are not physically different, the characters' behaviors and their use of the space distinguish Cleopatra's world from the rest.[61] Her "Egypt" is separated from its Roman counterpart as she takes her spot on a couch on one side of the stage with her maids and starts drinking. Despite her role as a political leader and a queen, Cleopatra's portion of the play is the most private and domestic in comparison to the two previous sections (*Coriolanus* and *Julius Caesar*). She enters in a sleeveless slip to complain to Antony, who is ready to depart for Rome at the news of Fulvia's death. After a brief argument, they kiss and passionately roll onto a couch. The first appearance of "the queen" leaves an impression of a wild and bold lover in the mind of the audience, singling her out from the world of political leaders. In his director's note, van Hove clearly affirms Cleopatra's possession of political power. To him, Cleopatra is an amalgam of political leaders like Volumnia (Coriolanus's mother, who acts as his advisor in military and political actions) and Antony's wives, Fulvia and Octavia, in that she "manages to bring her personal and political personae together in her role as a leader and leads out of passion

---

[60] He cast several female actors for the roles of male politicians such as Octavius and Cassius.

[61] The use of scenery further strengthens such distinction. Christian M. Billing observes that after the battle of Actium, on the screen, "[a] shot of Vladimir Putin was followed by one of a woman in a hijab" (433), contrasting the supposedly opposing cultures. Also, although the stage was equipped with up to eight clocks during an earlier part of the play, in the scene with defeated Antony and Cleopatra, only two clocks remain, which are "simply labeled 'DAAR' [over there] and 'HIER' [here]" (434), showing the clear separation between the two realms.

and a firm faith" (Van Hove "Roman" 58). However, what happens on stage reveals a different view. Cleopatra's Egypt during Antony's absence is full of alcohol and emotion, which contrasts with the rationality and tactics observed in the world of Octavius. Cleopatra and her maids dance with abandon, accompanied by drinks and the music of the Red Hot Chili Peppers (with their music video on the center screen), while a pack of excited people joins the party. The party, however, is soon interrupted by the Messenger from Rome, telling Cleopatra the news of Antony's marriage with Octavia. As in Shakespeare's play, Cleopatra is infuriated by the news, and physically attacks the Messenger. Further, van Hove's Cleopatra becomes even wilder, releasing an animal-like scream before wailing. Although the Messenger moves away from Cleopatra, the queen pursues her, running all the way to the top of the stairs in the auditorium. The audience members respond to this "comic" choice with laughter. The queen of Egypt now embodies an image of a hysterical and ridiculous woman, taking her another step away from the image of a leader with political power.

Rather than her political position or power, what is more emphasized in *Roman Tragedies* is the image of Cleopatra's sexual attraction. This is exemplified in the scene where Cleopatra, in tears, approaches the Messenger from behind the couch. Cleopatra bends forward to speak privately, while the camera zooms in on Cleopatra from the back, broadcasting the image of her slip-clad bum directly to the giant center screen. To compare, the media presents press conferences or bureaucratic meetings in the scenes with Roman politicians, but they capture Cleopatra's private life and body, resembling paparazzi looking for sensational gossip.

Even after she changes her attire to a formal trouser suit, she still fails to demonstrate her political leadership. She does not present a public face to the audience, and the media focuses on the intimate relationship between Antony and Cleopatra, featuring Cleopatra as either a wild

lover or a domestic supporter—one, however, leads everything in the wrong direction. Although such a portrayal is inherent in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, van Hove takes a step further and underlines his heroine's irrationality in some scenes. When Enobarbus advises the queen to stay behind, thinking that her presence will affect Antony negatively in the war, Shakespeare's Cleopatra insists on her decision to join Antony. Although it later proves to be the wrong choice, the queen shows her reason behind the decision: "A charge we bear i'th' war, / And, as the president of my kingdom, will / Appear there for a man" (3.7.16-18). As she is the sovereign of the kingdom, and also the financial sponsor of the war, she finds enough reason to be on the battlefield. Van Hove's Cleopatra in a business suit plays this scene by licking the face of Enobarbus, who shouts out words of warning; Enorbarbus is humiliated by Cleopatra, suggesting that rationality has been usurped by her desire in this realm. In this Egyptian kingdom, where Cleopatra and Antony mark the boundaries by laying claim to couches on each side of the stage, Charmian, the maid, comfortably lies sideways on an elevated podium further upstage, while Antony's Roman general is on his hands and knees downstage, showing a sharp contrast. Such a physical position, which places Cleopatra's world above Antony's, visualizes the underlying dynamic in which Antony abandons his Roman self for the sake of his seducer. The seducer, however, positions herself as a supporter, willingly bestowing her power on Antony. As Antony gets up to dress for his business, Cleopatra helps Antony put on his suit, getting down to her knees. Physically lowering herself and voluntarily taking a supportive role, Cleopatra symbolically lowers her Egypt in front of her lover. Antony, blinded by love and tainted by Egypt, heads to the "Bar" on stage-left and takes a drink with Ventidius, while Enobarbus betrays him for Octavius.

Cleopatra is further distinguished from Roman political leaders in her last scene. Toward the end of the play, unlike the death of Roman leaders such as Caesar, Brutus, or Antony, Cleopatra's death is deprived of mourning, and instead disrupted by an attempt to revive her, emphasizing the objectifying view of the West. Soon after the ticker announces her death, "Cleopatra 69-30 BC," Octavius runs in, urgently calling men into the scene. A team of medics comes in, hurriedly approaches the body, and performs CPR to revive Cleopatra. Unlike those who first stood before the bodies after the death of Caesar, Brutus, or Antony, Octavius is solely interested in the political value of Cleopatra (alive) as a war trophy to bring back to Rome. Although it fails, the hurried attempt to deny her the chosen suicide signifies that she is denied the respect as a leader but instead regarded as a decorative tool to frame the political success of Octavius.

The othering gaze on Cleopatra is not only cultural but also gendered. Despite the casting of female actors as male characters, their characterization inherits the biases of patriarchy and masculinity. This tendency is evident when compared to the female characters, such as Cleopatra and Octavia, who present stereotypical femininity. The camera catches Cleopatra laughing while holding the skin around her eyes with her fingers to prevent wrinkles, making it inevitable for the audience to witness the shallowness of the queen, obsessed with her looks. Along the same lines, Octavia is also depicted as passive and superficial when she first appears and is introduced to Antony as a bride. As Christian M. Billing observes, this scene shows Octavia's image, which does not correspond with the description that compliments her:

> Here, a huge image of Smulders [who played Octavia] was projected onto the screens as Octavius offered her sister. It showed Octavia, looking vacant, chewing gum and applying makeup as her unsurpassable beauty and political importance were discussed.

> The roving camera following Smulders from the hair and makeup station to the downstage acting area revealed an unsteady walk that made her seem inebriated—a political whore, self-medicating with alcohol to get her through a scene she was about to play on camera on a world stage. (432)

Despite the beauty praised on the stage, her first introduction to the audience hardly imprints her image as "virtuous," unless vacuity and passivity are taken as laudable attributes of beauty. Differentiated from the male characters played by female actors, the female characters in this production are marginalized in the masculine world of politics. Billing indicates that van Hove cast female actors in "powerful male roles," as in the case of Octavius, played by Hadewych Minis, to channel female leaders in contemporary politics, "such as Angela Merkel and Hillary Clinton" (433). Still, those powerful males played by women closely follow the codes of the masculine political world, keeping a clear distance from the stereotypically "feminine" characters such as Cleopatra and Octavia. As Billing aptly puts it, "Minis' Octavius did not present an alternative to patriarchal oppression—she embodied it" (433). The females—or "feminine" qualities—in *Roman Tragedies* remain as "Others" in the world of political leaders.

Granted, van Hove's focus was not on the culturally biased or gendered gaze upon Cleopatra; rather, his goal was to provide a commentary on the complicated dynamics of politics and its use of the media, which manipulates public perception. He achieves this goal through the innovative style of the production, leading the audience to experience such manipulation as they observe the live action and mediated image simultaneously from various points of view. However, what sticks in the mind of the audience could be the image of Cleopatra generated by the show, which perpetuates the othering gaze on a non-western culture, and on females. Applauding "the power of the actor" in the production, Helen Shaw recalls one of the

aforementioned scenes: “[I]t seems unlikely that I will ever forget how Cleopatra (Chris Nietvelt), while coaxing her messenger into insulting Antony’s hated wife, laughed and laughed. Since Cleopatra is always mindful of her beauty, Nietvelt held the skin around her eyes tight as she cackle[d]” (63). At the end of his review, Billing also notes that instead of deeper consideration on the prompted questions after the curtain call (e.g. “Are the media feeding mistrust of politicians?” “Is politics war?” “Are politicians actors?”), he was “left with the imprint on [his] mind’s eye of some of the most visually stunning theatrical spectacle I have seen in a decade” (439). Although he does not specify what the “spectacle” is, the visual impact would certainly include the stereotypically mediated image of Cleopatra, inherited from Shakespeare and amplified by van Hove.

Considering his view explicated in the director’s note, it seems that van Hove did not intend to belittle Cleopatra; however, *Roman Tragedies,* as a kind of media itself, delivers a picture of Cleopatra as a hysterical and unfitting ruler, leaving a biased impression in the mind of the audience. This reveals that, while mediation of a message can be manipulated with a clear intention, at the same time, it can carry an extra meaning that has never been intended when the creator is not sensitive enough to catch all that is being conveyed in the process. Even with the innovative staging and cross-gender casting, the stereotypical image of Cleopatra that frames her on the basis of her gender and culture is ever more present in van Hove’s production, more emphasized by the comparison between the white male political leaders who share the stage. However, despite the imprinting image of Cleopatra as the Other, there is little scholarship that points out the problem of such a portrayal which could perpetuate the derogatory attitude towards femininity and foreignness. In addition, the biased image, which is mediated through the show, will affect the audience’s perception without their noticing it, more so because this image

has been widely reproduced for centuries in Western culture. Detecting the underlying bias in a widely received idea requires a thorough inspection. Therefore, to make the audience recognize what lies behind such a conventional depiction of a marginalized character, some creators employ a radical emphasis and bring stereotypes to the surface—as is exemplified in Hyun-tak Kim's *Oh THe yELLOw*.

Othello among Us: Hyun-tak Kim's *Oh THe yELLOw*

Counterpointing van Hove's *Roman Tragedies*, where a physically nondistinctive actor played the character of the Other with nuanced marginalization, Hyun-tak Kim's *Oh THe yELLOw* gained more attention because it cast a physically distinctive actor to play the "Moor." Kim, the playwright and director for the production, titled his play by hypothetically extracting "yellow"—implying East Asians—from the source text, *Othello*. Through his adaptation, he strives to point out and problematize our—South Koreans' in particular—discrimination against those with "darker" skin tone (Jang). Premiered in May 2016 in Seoul, then enjoying another round of runs in the following month, the play was often introduced to South Korean audiences as a work about "the racism within us" (Jung).[62] Kim's adaptation stands on the same line with van Hove's production in that it effectively uses postdramatic techniques to leave a stronger impact on the audience, and also in that it modifies the source text to bring it to the "here and now," making it more identifiable for the audience. Unlike van Hove, however, Kim's attention is strictly focused on the issue of the racial Other; his production localizes Shakespeare's *Othello* to address the discriminatory gaze on foreign bodies in South Korea.

---

[62] Seongbukdong Beedoolkee planned to remount *Oh THe yELLOw* in March 2020, this time without any racially distinctive actor in the cast; unfortunately, however, the program was canceled due to COVID-19.

From the very beginning of the production, Kim makes it clear that this production calls attention to the racially discriminated Other by bluntly addressing the issue. The theatre space of Seongbukdong Beedoolkee, Kim's experimental theatre company, is a small black box in a half-basement, with a bare, empty stage and several rows of folding chairs for the audience. At the beginning of the performance, the lead actress of this theatre company, Mee-ok Kim, comes in to greet the audience:

> Hello! Welcome to *Othello* by Theatre Company Seongbukdong Beedoolkee. . . . First, please make sure to turn off your cell phones. Second, after the show starts, you are not allowed to take any photographs. Third, (*toward an empty seat, where Anupam will sit later*) Uh? Othello! (*applause*) That useless bum! How on earth could he be nominated for the best actor's award? As I said before and will say again, I hate that nigger. What's more, he's from Africa. By all means, I will ruin him. How? (*putting on the costume for the first scene as the lights dim over the house and the stage*) It's simple. All you have to do is to spread a bad rumor all over the world and provoke relatives and friends around.
>
> You see? Well, then shall we start this lustful and disgusting play? (1)

With her prologue, *Oh THe yELLOw* takes the audience into its bold social commentary on racial discrimination and prejudice.

Theatre Group Seongbukdong Beedoolkee was founded in 2011, and its director, Hyun-tak Kim, is highly invested in aggressive adaptations of canonical plays that show his original and creative interpretation. Their major pieces include *Medea on Media* (2011), *Death of a Salesman* (2011), *The Maids* (2011), and *Hedda Gabler* (2014), to name a few. Having garnered national awards and acclamation at international theatre festivals, Kim's adaptations are often

recognized as innovative and experimental. In an interview, Kim explains that he tries to push his work further from the source text:

> I make adaptations that go further away from the original piece. If we say the original text is at the center of a circle, I try to use the centrifugal force, going as far as possible away from the center. The further you can go, the deeper the root of the original piece proves to be, I think. I find various motives in a piece and select the concept that best reflects the original. (Jang)

Kim values the impression and experience that the audience can walk out with, so that the message of the performance can influence the way they perceive and act in their own life. For this reason, many of his productions prioritize a strong and penetrating theme that connects the motives in each scene, instead of a clearly narrated plot.

One of the characteristics of Kim's productions is his use of intense physical movement. Using actors' bodies to an extreme degree, Kim intends to maximize the experience of the audience. In Kim's version of *Death of a Salesman*, for example, Willy Loman continuously runs on a treadmill for most of the show. Kim says he followed his instinct and, as a way to let the audience sympathize more with the character, he directed Willy to run for the entire hour to vividly show his sweat, saliva, and tears (Kim, N.). The audience cannot help feeling the actor's physical exhaustion through the sweat they witness and smell—which the audience will remember as the smell of Willy's agony. *Oh THe yELLOw* is no exception; the actors dance, fight, and run across the stage sweating and short of breath, thus amplifying the emotion with their physical presence. As the actors use their bodies to the extreme, the characters' tension, excitement, frustration, and exhaustion reach the audience, letting them react instinctively before they react logically to the words they hear. Therefore, Kim utilizes the small and confined theatre

space to maximize the production's delivery of the message, instead of letting it limit their performance.

Before discussing specific details of *Oh THe yELLOw*, the production's unique structure should be explained for clarity. *Oh THe yELLOw* is composed of eleven episodic scenes. Although the play proceeds in one direction with a connectable theme, especially for those who are familiar with Shakespeare's *Othello*, each scene is very distinctive in relation to the others. For example, the first scene features a spaceship as its setting, while the following scene takes place on an exotic island where slave-hunting is in progress. Later scenes employ a variety of settings as well, including a bar, a subway, a boxing ring, and even the castle of *Beauty and the Beast.* The scenes do not have any transitions that smoothly connect one to another, although they are linked with the inescapable theme of racism. Cutting the connection between each scene further, all the actors, except the ones portraying Othello and Desdemona, play multiple characters; such multicasting often confuses the audience, making it difficult to figure out exactly which character an actor is playing at the moment. Even with the playscript, it is never easy to find out who is playing whom since it does not show any names of the characters—instead, it shows the names of the actors only. In this chapter, I use the first names of actors as they are written in the script, but for clarity, I also include the name of the characters when they are clearly identifiable.

Kim inflates the discrimination of the foreign hero to make it stand out far more predominantly than in the source text. He cast Anupam Tripathi in the role of Othello to amplify his message of ridiculing blunt racism. The promotion for the play on various media pointed out that this play cast a "black actor" in the role of Othello (Jung). However, although "accused" of coming from Africa in the prologue of the play (1), Tripathi is from India. His place of origin

does not seem to be important for the other characters on the stage, since his "brown" body is considered "dark enough" in the world on stage. In the play, Kim forces his audience to witness the racism on stage by filling the space with an exaggerated contrast. For example, when Anupam takes the order to go to Cyprus and fight against the Turkish army, the play displays a spaceship where a unilateral order is given. In contrast to the other characters who are on chairs miming operating the spaceship, Anupam squat-walks onto the stage floor, continuously mimicking a robot with his body movement. He tries to relate his own experience, but his words are interrupted by the order that completely ignores what he says (2-3). He has no other option than to simply take the order. In this scene, Anupam is visually singled out not only by his different skin tone, but also by the physically lower position he assumes, which signifies his passive position in the power dynamic presented on stage.

Such an obvious contrast in the relationships on stage is depicted more offensively in the following scenes where Anupam reappears as a slave. The scenes summarize and remind the audience of the history of the slave trade. Anupam, who dances onto the stage to the song "Cotton Field," is soon hunted down by another; the audience then witnesses Anupam and the traders. The traders do not spare any insults while humiliating Anupam:

> Seok-joo Sung. If one's white and smart, you can call him a human.
>
> Joo-won Kim. Then, what if one's white but stupid?
>
> Seok-joo Sung. That case probably doesn't even make sense. A white man is unlikely to be stupid.
>
> Min-sung Kim. Well, if one's black and stupid?
>
> Seok-joo Sung. You can safely say that it's a monkey. If it's female, just let it breastfeed its stupid infant.

Song-hee Lee. Then, if one's black and smart, he should get enormous praise, shouldn't he?

Seok-joo Sung. Black and smart… He (*pointing at Anupam*) surely is one such case. (*Sticking his fist out between Anupam's legs*) You can call it a super monkey born with a magic wand.

(*All approach and grope Anupam's body*) (4)

As if categorizing his race as intellectually inferior and comparing him to an animal are not insulting enough, Seok-joo Sung, embodying the slave hunter and seller, presents Anupam as a sexual object; he gestures that Anupam's "magic wand," his sexual organ, is what makes him exceptional ("black and smart"). He could be an object of curiosity but cannot be respected as an individual equal to the rest of them. Interestingly, because the characters' comments on Anupam are overtly racist, registering as objectionable to a politically conscious contemporary audience, the latter are inclined to distance themselves from the racist characters and instead sympathize more with Anupam.

In addition, Kim takes away one of the vital strengths of Shakespeare's Othello: the power of his eloquent speech. Unlike Shakespeare, Kim does not allow his hero any lengthy and affecting speeches—his Othello, Anupam, is not listened to in this play. Shakespeare's Othello suggests: "I do confess the vices of my blood / So justly to your grave ears I'll present / How I did thrive in this fair lady's love / And she in mine" (1.3.125-128). To this the Duke responds: "Say it, Othello" (1.3.128). In contrast to Othello, who gains a chance to speak and successfully persuade the listeners, Anupam loses the right to speak and is forced to passively take the given order. Even when he speaks to protest, he speaks in a foreign language (English), citing a speech by Martin Luther King, rather than his own words (3). By citing King's speech, Anupam

positions himself—a "brown" body in a group of Koreans—as parallel with the resisting Blacks in American history; however, such a positioning is accomplished by referencing what is foreign to himself, rather than by employing his innate words. Using the power of language, Shakespeare's Othello gains Desdemona's love through his story; what Anupam gets in this scene after his speech is humiliation and mere sexual objectification of his body. Shakespeare's Othello is a foreigner who assimilated into white European society, evinced by his eloquent use of language; Kim's Anupam, on the other hand, is never embraced by the community. Kim's choice to take the power of words away from Anupam—and to make him speak the words foreign to himself as well as to the audience—sends the audience an important message: the more Anupam's body and language appear to be foreign, the more the audience themselves becomes closer to the traders, who have a similar appearance and use the same language, despite their detestable behavior.

The discrimination in *Oh THe yELLOw* is not alleviated even when Othello gains Desdemona's attention. Scene 4 depicts a conversation taking place in a moving car between two women, Mee-ok/Emilia and Song-hee/Desdemona, who talk about Desdemona's love for Othello, and her strong attitude against the idea of incest. Although Song-hee/Desdemona mentions how she is attracted to his "dark skin" (5), Anupam's isolated status does not change. Throughout the scene, Anupam is running behind them while the conversation proceeds, signaling them to stop. Song-hee/Desdemona waves her hand at him; however, Mee-ok/Emilia accelerates, preventing him from catching up. Othello, sprinting and sweating, tries to stop the car, but a barricade appears to physically separate him from them (5). Even when he is in love with her, he is not allowed to be inside the boundary with her and her company, symbolically marked by the car and the barricade. She might act kindly, recognizing and waving at him, but

she never shares the same space with him. Although Song-hee/Desdemona speaks as if she could distance herself from racism by being attracted to his different body, she still leaves him behind and does not actively change the situation. No matter how fast he runs, he can never catch the ride.

The play continues to show the discrimination against Anupam in the subsequent scenes, but Kim makes it clear to the audience that the problem is not merely presented out there on stage—rather, it is obviously present in the audience. In the prologue discussed earlier, the suggestion is that Anupam was with the audience at the beginning of the play, since Mee-ok Kim pretends to spot him in the house. Toward the end, he moves to the audience seat and continues to speak his lines from the seat:

> Anupam. (*from the audience seat*) Is there no one, not even a passer-by? Help! Murder! A murder!
>
> Mee-ok Kim (*seated on stage*) It seems there's something happening. That voice sounds serious.
>
> Joo-won Kim. It might be dangerous to go closer. Let's wait till more people arrive. (15)

Kim demonstrates the situation where everyone is aware of something horrifying, a murder, going on and also aware of someone's desperate need for help. However, it is a situation where, despite the apparent awareness, no one is willing to help. Although this scene is palpably more intense, it parallels the previous scene where Anupam had to run behind the car. Even his lover, Song-hee/Desdemona, neither stopped nor got out of the car to change the situation, despite noticing that Anupam was left behind; there is no one who would readily jump in to answer Anupam's plea for help even at the mention of a "murder." There is, however, a significant difference between the two scenes: this time, as the ensemble of the actors, except Anupam, sit

facing the audience—the audience are being watched. When Anupam calls for help, the audience, who are sitting with him, are caught during their "inaction." More importantly, as the actors spread out both on the stage and in the audience, merging the two spaces into one, Kim indicates that both Anupam (or someone who has been mistreated like him), and those who are marginalizing him (either with their action or inaction), are among us.

Racism in Korean society is a relatively new issue. The Korean government used to proudly teach that the nation was a racially homogeneous one, descending from one root. Although the government changed its direction to be more inclusive to accommodate the increasing diversity, negative prejudices against immigrants and racial discrimination are still apparent. The number of incidents where there is discrimination against those who have a darker skin tone, and also against those from less wealthy parts of the world, is notably increasing in Korea. The example of Bonojit Hussain was recorded as the first case in Korea in which a verbal insult resulted in legal punishment.[63] In 2009, a middle-aged man insulted Hussain on a bus for having dark skin. Both in Korean and English, the man continued to swear at Hussain, and when Hussain's friend tried to help, the man insulted her for being with a "black bastard" (Ahn). It is interesting, even disturbing, to see how many Koreans identify themselves as a "superior" race, distancing themselves from those with darker skin tones, even though they are all regarded as "Asians" in Western eyes.

Making a satire out of such a phenomenon, Kim gives an interesting direction regarding the costuming of the actors. Kim demonstrates South Korean society's discriminatory attitude by exaggerating Othello's—or Anupam Tripathi's—physical difference through the makeup. The stage direction says: "*The Korean actors put on white-face makeup with the exception of the one*

[63] As of 2020, in South Korea, a law that concerns hate crimes specifically does not exist despite the clear presence of racism, which occasionally is manifested in a form of violence (Ha).

female actor who wears yellow makeup and blond wig. The Indian actor wears makeup darker than his skin tone" (1). According to Kim's interview, his play asks: "Are we considering ourselves as 'white'?" ("Passionately"). With the actors' distinctive makeup that divides them into either white or black, the audience is asked with whom they identify—white or black? —when all the actors, in reality, are Asians. Intended or not, as the show proceeds, the makeup slowly erodes due to the sweat, and the actors become more similar to each other, becoming more "yellow."

Placing more weight on his message, Kim demonstrates how our vision can mislead us into a wrong decision—as happened to Shakespeare's Othello, who required "ocular proof" (3.3.363). At the beginning of scene 10—this is the scene where Anupam called for help from the house—three characters with black masks, three others with white makeup, and Song-hee/Desdemona are sitting on the stage. This is when Anupam moves to the audience seat (Anupam then keeps speaking his lines from the audience seat while the scene proceeds). A gunfight takes place, and two of the actors remove their masks. The group kills the last one wearing a black mask, then removes the mask from the body, only to discover that they have attacked the wrong person:

> *The actors recognize Anupam among the audience and are surprised. They go to Myung-seop, uncover his mask, and wipe the makeup off to recognize him. They show embarrassment to see Myung-seop's bare face.* (16)

After the murder, the actors actively wipe off their whiteface makeup, and show their relief in realizing that all of them are the "same kind." In this scene, the characters decide on their attitude depending on what is covering their faces. They were hostile to each other when the colors of the

makeup and the masks were representing their identity, but when their bare skin is revealed, they change their attitudes toward each other.

Such a solution for the conflict, however, does not apply to Anupam. Encouraged by the peace earned on the stage, Anupam confidently wipes off his darker makeup, standing up from the seat. However, "*sensing that he is still not perceived as the same race in the eyes of the rest, his confidence gradually disappears*" (17). With or without the makeup, on stage or in the audience, the tragic hero of the production is evidently left out because he still "looks" different. According to the study by Jong-gab Kim and Seul-ki Kim, South Korean society tends to identify someone as "foreign" based on their racial traits rather than cultural ones (92-94). They warn that such an attitude, which focuses more on "what one looks like" rather than "what one acts like," shapes racial stereotypes, preventing multicultural understanding (102). Hyun-tak Kim points out the stereotypical tendency in the scene after the murder on stage. After the white makeup and the masks have been removed, the house lights come up on the audience seats. Then the actors on stage greet the audience as their "friends" and "hometown people," apologizing for not recognizing them more quickly (16). By addressing the audience as one of them, the actors make it clear that their discriminatory attitude, which is exaggerated enough for the audience to recognize as wrong, is present in their shared "hometown." Considering the dominant numbers of South Koreans in the audience, this "hometown" can also be interpreted as South Korea in a broader sense. Scanning the audience seats, it does not take them long for the actors to single out Anupam sitting among their "hometown people." As the "ocular proof" ruined Othello's judgment, the visually apparent difference, combined with the accumulated social stereotypes, is barring Anupam—or any other victims of racial discrimination represented by him—from the community.

To convey his message with greater impact, Kim confronts his audience with postdramatic techniques, focusing on performativity rather than a dramatic plot. Fragmented scenes, actors with multiple roles, and a playscript based on the name of the actors (not the characters)—all these let the audience depend more on the image and impression from each scene, rather than on a synthesized storyline. According to Hans-Thies Lehmann, in postdramatic theatre "[s]ynthesis is sacrificed in order to gain, in its place, the density of intensive moments" (83). By destroying a connected plot, Kim is able to create each scene with a combination of significant pieces of literature, social settings, and historical events. Connecting the scene with a piece of knowledge that the audience can recognize, this brief production can deliver a larger variety of messages to the audience than what the words spoken by the actors could do within a short period of time.[64] Kim distinguishes his work from a story-based delivery: "[m]y text presupposes a performance. It gains its power only when it is performed. If you could imagine the performance only with the text, then, for a performance text, it would be a problem" (Jang). It is interesting that Kim did not encounter postdramatic theories until Patrice Pavis pointed out the postdramatic aspects in one of Kim's productions after he staged several productions in that style. For him, the style emerged not from any prior theoretical base, but from his search for the ways to let the audience feel the performance in the most effective and provocative manner (Kim, N.).

In addition to the fragmented rhizomatic structure, Kim's use of language evinces another postramatic aspect of the show. In the play, Anupam uses both Korean and English; towards the end, he delivers his speech, speaking the syllables entirely backwards in each line (18). Lehmann's concept of "polyglossia" can be applied effectively here. "Polyglossia," meaning the

---

[64] The entire performance runs for about an hour.

existence of multiple languages in a performance, emphasizes the situation where "the word does not belong to the speaker. It does not organically reside in his/her body but remains a *foreign body*" (147). Anupam Tripathi acts in Korean, revealing his foreign accent, while also saying some of his lines in English, including the aforementioned quotations from Martin Luther King's speech. Further, he distorts his final speech, which is in Korean but backwards, making it feel foreign to the audience. Anupam's speech in distorted Korean is even translated line by line by another actor, deceiving the audience as if the language were not theirs. The audience is made to feel the distance from their own language, which they think they have owned.

From its opening prologues to the postdramatic delivery of the messages, Anupam's positioning in the audience, and its final address to the audience, Hyun-tak Kim's version of *Othello* continuously emphasizes that both Othello and his abusers are among us. At the top of Kim's script there is an epigraph: "The performance lets you watch the long history of black and white flow as it would do on a movie screen. That, sadly, exists in our present as well" (1). *Oh THe yELLOw* is not a production that the audience can watch on a flat screen, but one that the audience has to experience by being in the middle of it. The members of the audience are appalled by the actors' exaggeratedly discriminatory words and actions; however, they cannot help processing the situation where they are indeed the neighbors and accomplices of those on the stage. Kim's Othello speaks for the "Others" not only in the theatre space, but also in the community of the audience, and in South Korean society at large. Offering neither praise nor a critique of the source text, he uses the power of the canonical text to comment on the contemporary racial issues in South Korea.

Jürs-Munby asserts that "performance has the power to question and destabilize the spectator's construction of identity and the 'other'" (5). As members of the audience decide

whom to identify with and whom to keep a distance from, and feel the presence of the performers through a more instinctive and direct connection, they work to generate their own interpretation of the self and the surroundings. Such a process happens with greater force when audience members become the "emancipated spectators," actively creating their own narrative and perception inspired by the performance, instead of passively observing a representation beyond the fourth wall. Van Hove and Kim make different decisions in adapting their source texts. They had different goals and backgrounds—one worked with a large theatre company while the other worked with a small one; one went for lengthened and connected narrative while the other went for short fragmented scenes; one invite the audience to roam onto the stage while the other let the actors cross the boundary to be merged with the audience. Despite such differences, they have a common scheme: both of them attempt to actively engage the audience, making them experience what they are commenting on in contemporary society. In this sense, they share the "how," although the image that remains in the mind of their audience could be quite different.

Conclusion

"His characters are not modified by the customs of particular places, unpractised by the rest of the world; by the peculiarities of studies or professions, which can operate but upon small numbers; or by the accidents of transient fashions or temporary opinions; they are the genuine progeny of common humanity, such as the world will always supply, and observation will always find."

Samuel Johnson, *Preface to Shakespeare* (1765)

This dissertation project embarked with the following questions: What is the significance of staging and watching Shakespeare in 2020? Why are 400-year-old plays still relevant to a contemporary audience? Further, what is the meaning of performing Shakespeare today in places where his works are considered "foreign"? The universality found in Shakespeare's plays has been praised by many scholars, including Ben Jonson, who wrote the preface to the first folio, Samuel Johnson, a part of whose *Preface to Shakespeare* is quoted above, and all the way down to Harold Bloom, the author of *Shakespeare: the Invention of Human*. This universality, which enables the audience across time and place to connect with his work, however, must be questioned as it is not an identically accepted concept everywhere. To be precise, his universal quality could serve Jonson, Johnson, and even Bloom despite the difference in the time periods, mainly because they share similar views as Anglophone white men in the West. Although Shakespeare's work is widespread, being almost ubiquitously and continuously performed to this day, what the audience in each specific venue connect with in his plays can differ, making it impossible to determine what a "universal quality" means. Indeed, contrary to Johnson's praise,

his characters have been relentlessly modified by both intracultural and intercultural writers. Furthermore, it is precisely this adaptability which increases the potential of Shakespeare for the contemporary global audience in the twenty-first century.

As discussed in the previous chapters, the writers of the adaptations and intertexts found various things to update and refocus in Shakespeare's plays. In the plays discussed in this project, emphasis was laid differently depending on the purpose of each author, but my discussion highlights race and gender as the main issues, while revealing the influence of sociopolitical contexts on the rewritings. For this reason, the selected plays are intertexts (and mostly adaptations) of *Othello* or *Antony and Cleopatra*, i.e. the two Shakespeare plays in which the protagonists are racial and cultural Others. When the concept of intertextuality is applied broadly, including that of the non-literary "text," all eight plays under review here have an intertextual relationship not only with Shakespeare, but also with the historical, regional, and political contexts of their contemporary audiences. As the previous chapters compared each pair in detail, I will explore in this closing chapter the plays in a broader frame, dividing them based on the source text, and according to the major distinction in their social contexts: intracultural versus intercultural.

Considering that a performance identical with one staged during Shakespeare's own lifetime cannot exist, every performance after his time—and in some cases, the ones altered during his own lifetime—has a part readjusted, including the choices made through directing and translation. However, the plays discussed in this project have more deliberate alterations to the source texts regardless of their intracultural or intercultural relationships. In both cases, the authors of the intertexts repurposed Shakespeare to publicly express their views on social issues. To revisit the intracultural rewritings, Dryden's *All for Love* (1678) speaks for his pride in the

literary heritage of England, while revealing a masculinist view that reaffirms a rigid gender hierarchy. The play can also be interpreted in relation to England's political circumstance of the time, serving as an analogy of a romantic relationship with a foreign woman pursued by the monarch. Similarly, Shaw also uses the well-known characters from Shakespeare's plays to propose an ideal leadership for the empire in *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1899), while justifying the presence of it, revealing his idealistic imperialist stance. Pix, whose *The False Friend* (1699) is more loosely related to Shakespeare's *Othello* with intertextual echoes, employs female characters with distinctively greater agency, opening a possibility for a new model of a gender role presentation on stage. In this play, the agency of the female characters stands out more clearly because the characters recall the weighted male characters from Shakespeare's play, as is indicated in the term "female Iago," referring to Pix's Appamia. As for the intercultural rewritings, in Shawqi's *The Death of Cleopatra* (1929), the established narrative about the famous queen becomes the precise target to reverse in support of the nationalism rising in modern Egypt. Carlin, who observed discrimination in South Africa, tries to find a way for a peaceful coexistence of different races through *Not Now, Sweet Desdemona* (1968), while Walcott explores the hybrid identity in a postcolonial context through the struggling actress in *A Branch of the Blue Nile* (1983). Ivo van Hove employs three Shakespeare plays to invoke the influence of media and the mediated nature of political scenes in *Roman Tragedies* (2007), while Hyun-tak Kim's *Oh The yELLOw* (2016) uses the discrimination Othello experiences to warn about racial conflicts that have been often ignored in South Korea. The playwrights' purposes, contexts, and even their attitudes towards the Bard vary greatly, but they all use Shakespeare and his canonical fame to amplify their messages.

Both Dryden and Shaw explicitly mention Shakespeare in their accompanying materials. Although Dryden maintains deferential attitudes towards the Bard's genius, he asserts that the way of delivery should be updated for the audience of the more refined age. Shaw, interestingly, criticizes that Shakespeare's compelling way of delivery misguides the reaction of the audience by elevating an unworthy character to the position of a tragic hero. Despite their varied views on what Shakespeare's strengths and defects are, both Dryden and Shaw confidently take the Bard into their hands and reshape his work to meet their own standards and purposes. Pix's *The False Friend* is also an intracultural piece, but as it is an intertext, which lacks a direct enough connection to be an adaptation, its relationship to Shakespeare is less evident. Still, she takes a similar approach in that she employs recognizably similar characters and settings from Shakespeare's work without expressing much pressure to respond to the Bard's canonical authority.[65]

As the intercultural rewritings selected for this project are not homogeneous, it is not appropriate to define them under a narrow rubric. The five intercultural adaptations I discuss are all from different countries, varying in sociopolitical contexts as well as languages (English, Arabic, Dutch, and Korean). Although the playwrights face the same pressure as they adapt a global canon from an imperial power that is not their own, their reactions varied. Shawqi's follows the usual expectation for a postcolonial adaptation of the Western canon. Responding to the nation's historical context at an early stage in modern Egypt, he deliberately uses Shakespeare to "talk back" to the established image of Cleopatra, which is rampant in Western literary tradition, by recreating Cleopatra as an honorable and worthy queen. Carlin actively

[65] Although Pix does not specifically mention Shakespeare in *The False Friend* and its accompanying essays, considering that she maintained a humble position when she mentioned Shakespeare elsewhere, it is also possible to suspect that she chose not to express a clear connection to his play to avoid direct comparison and criticism due to her fragile status as a female playwright in the early modern England.

approves the genius of the Bard and suggests reinterpreting and coexisting with the canon rather than confronting it. Although his solution cannot be an answer to systemic and institutional racial discrimination, considering the situation in apartheid South Africa in particular, for Carlin, portraying an interracial couple in a favorable light in itself could be taken as a weighted decision. In comparison to Carlin, who asks to stop blaming each other and pursue a peaceful coexistence, Walcott's solution begins with recognizing the reality, including the damage of colonialism and the confusion of identity. Walcott acknowledges the impossibility of pursuing what is purely local after the touch of colonialism and explores the hybrid reality with the local self at the center. Van Hove and Kim's plays are further distinct from the other three intercultural adaptations in that they do not directly deal with colonialism as a major theme.[66] Van Hove highlights the impact of media, which relentlessly delivers the current political events from their particular angles. Kim enlarges the locality of the play, using Shakespeare's characters to expose the racism in contemporary South Korean society. Along with varied sociopolitical contexts, all five plays have distinctively different target audiences, contributing to their particularities.

Among the eight selected plays, five are adaptations of *Antony and Cleopatra* while three are linked to *Othello*. Although *Antony and Cleopatra* name both protagonists in the title, the spotlight in the adaptations shows the clear choices of the respective authors. Both Shaw and Dryden focus on the "hero" rather than the Egyptian queen to express their own political ideals.

---

[66] Van Hove and Kim are distinctive from other playwrights in the innovative format they use in the plays. Both of them more deliberately use diverse intertexts. Van Hove combines three plays of Shakespeare, while also actively using historical records to supplement the flow of the play. Kim uses not only Shakespeare's play, but diverse genres such as music, speech, and other recognizable cultural references. Their productions in 2020 continue to show their social engagement as well as intertextual format. Van Hove's *Re:Creating Europe* (premiered in 2016), which was live-streamed in May 1st, 2020, combines speeches and texts which played important roles in European history. Kim, in replacement of a restaging of *Oh THe yELLOw*, which was cancelled due to COVID-19, staged 3-part *Covid-19 Emergency Project—Immunity Rehearsals*: *I. Isolation Menagerie* (May 26th – June 7th, 2020; an adaptation of *Glass Menagerie* by Tennessee Williams), *II. Study of Directing and Acting for Bertolt Brecht's Alienation Effect—With a Focus on Corona Virus* (June 30th – July 12th, 2020), *III. Wild Documentary: Theatre* (August 13th – 23rd, 2020).

Dryden, notwithstanding his title, favors masculine friendship over heterosexual love, and attempts to picture Antony as a tragic hero trapped in the dilemma between duty and love. Shaw deliberately highlights Caesar, using Cleopatra as a supplementary tool to elevate the rightful hero.[67] Van Hove attempts to include the image of female political leaders in his play, but when it comes to Antony and Cleopatra, it is evident that Antony gets more attention as a prominent political leader, whereas Cleopatra is featured rather domestically, appearing more strongly as Antony's love interest than an equally influential political leader. In contrast, Shawqi and Walcott, the two intercultural adapters, put Cleopatra at the center of their plays. Shawqi, as is noticeable from Cleopatra's increased proportion in the line counts as well as the title, makes the queen the singular heroine of the play, and puts her in the heroic position that challenges her to agonize between duty and love. Walcott follows the troupe's journey, but focuses on the actress in the role of Cleopatra in particular, investigating a postcolonial Caribbean actress's way to process an Egyptian female character fabricated by a European male writer. Through the collective journey of the other members of the theatre company who direct, compete with, and help Sheila, Walcott expands her struggle to all those who are left with the remnant of colonialism and the desire for pure locality. The social and historical contexts and target audiences of the intercultural adaptations, who have been regarded as the Other by European standards, contribute to the light shed on the Other on stage.

The plays by Pix, Carlin, and Kim all have intertextual relationship with *Othello*: Pix's as an intertext, and the other two as adaptations. Pix's unique quality comes across in her depiction of gender dynamics and female agency. Her portrayal of race revealed through a minor character

---

[67] It is also important to remind that the particularities should come from a thorough understanding of the contexts, not from cultural appropriation. For instance, although both Walcott and Shaw depict the encounter of different cultures in their plays, Walcott does so with an understanding through his experience whereas Shaw's portrayal of Egypt is a stereotypical caricature.

is rather stereotypical despite some progressive details, but these do not gain much attention in the play. Instead, her female characters who wield stronger agency and power than their male counterparts are noteworthy, although the ending restores the patriarchal order to conform to the social expectations of the time. Carlin presents the power dynamic between genders as well, but in his case, it is brought to stage intersectionally with the racial conflicts. Although the female character's gender confines her power in public, being a white person and wealthy, she holds a certain social power over her male partner from Trinidad. The couple's conflict is closely interrelated with the political situation in apartheid South Africa and the postcolonial Caribbean. Unlike Pix and Carlin, Kim's play excludes the discussion of gender, and instead solely focuses on the racial discrimination against Othello. As Othello's position as the Other is vastly exaggerated in this play, Othello is either excluded or sexually fantasized, making a romantic relationship with him impossible.

Shakespeare is a name recognized around the world, and his work is read, performed, echoed, and adapted continuously. To measure the significance of Shakespeare's intertextuality, it is, ironically, necessary to consider how central Shakespeare is in the recreated work. Referring back to the scholars mentioned in the first chapter, such as Daniel Fischlin, Mark Fortier, Dennis Kennedy, and Parmita Kapadia, who all pointed out the adaptability and malleability as a characteristic of Shakespeare's work, it is appropriate to say that Shakespeare's universality is perpetuated when the particularities added by adapters based on their specific contexts come to the center of the piece, instead of the Bard's canonical authority. Ultimately, to contemporary adapters, Shakespeare became a tool. Although first disseminated as an imperial tool, centuries of discourses have accumulated due to Shakespeare's ubiquity (rivaled only, within the Empire, by the King James Version of the Bible). Such accumulated discourses and texts in turn ensure

the vast size of the potential range of intertextual networks for creative connections and interpretations among contemporary creators and audiences in the twenty-first century, leaving it solely as their decision to choose how and for what to use this complicated yet potent tool.

Appendix: Line Count of *The Death of Cleopatra*

Character	Act 1	Act 2	Act 3	Act 4	Sum	%
Cleopatra/The Queen	261	83	169	379	**892**	**38.53131749**
Mark Antony	79	66	240	0	**385**	**16.63066955**
Haby	165	0	36	58	**259**	**11.18790497**
Anubis/The Priest	40	0	157	55	**252**	**10.88552916**
Xenon	100	0	0	0	**100**	**4.319654428**
Helena	46	3	0	50	**99**	**4.276457883**
Oros	6	20	0	73	**99**	**4.276457883**
Octavius Caesar	0	0	35	43	**78**	**3.369330454**
Ayyaas	0	30	0	37	**67**	**2.894168467**
Ansho	28	26	0	4	**58**	**2.505399568**
Dion	49	0	0	0	**49**	**2.11663067**
Charmion	24	0	0	25	**49**	**2.11663067**
Olympus	0	13	14	18	**45**	**1.943844492**
Hebra	0	32	0	0	**32**	**1.382289417**
Guard	0	0	1	25	**26**	**1.123110151**
The Commander	0	0	0	26	**26**	**1.123110151**
First Soldier	0	0	25	0	**25**	**1.079913607**
Second Soldier	0	0	17	0	**17**	**0.7343412527**
A Roman General	0	16	0	0	**16**	**0.6911447084**
Group of people outside	13	0	0	0	**13**	**0.5615550756**
Lisius	12	0	0	0	**12**	**0.5183585313**
Paula	0	10	0	0	**10**	**0.4319654428**
Another General	0	10	0	0	**10**	**0.4319654428**
A Roman Commander	9	0	0	0	**9**	**0.3887688985**
Achilles	0	7	0	0	**7**	**0.3023758099**
Third Soldier	0	0	7	0	**7**	**0.3023758099**
The Soldier	6	0	0	0	**6**	**0.2591792657**
Voice(s)	0	5	0	0	**5**	**0.2159827214**
Another Roman Commander	3	0	0	0	**3**	**0.1295896328**
Crier	0	3	0	0	**3**	**0.1295896328**

Ganimese	0	2	0	0	**2**	**0.08639308855**
Third General	0	2	0	0	**2**	**0.08639308855**
Group of Egyptians	0	1	0	0	**1**	**0.04319654428**
Caesarion	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
The Eunuch of the Palace	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Sum	**841**	**329**	**701**	**793**	**2664**	**115.075594**

Works Cited

Achebe, China. “The Role of Writer in a New Nation.” *Nigeria Magazine,* vol. 81, 1964, pp. 157-160.

Ahn, Soo Chan and Ha Nee Kim. “Stinky Racism in Korea.” *Hangyerae 21*, vol. 773. 13 August 2009, http://h21.hani.co.kr/arti/society/society_general/25561.html.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities.* Verso, 2006.

Atiya, Jeanette Wahba Sourial. “Introduction.” Shawqi, pp. 3-13.

Badawi, M. M. *A Critical Introduction to Modern Arabic Poetry.* Cambridge UP, 1975.

_____. Editor. *Modern Arabic Literature.* Cambridge UP, 1992.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. U of Texas P, 1981.

Bamber, Linda. *Comic Women, Tragic Men: A Study of Gender and Genre in Shakespeare*. Stanford UP, 1982.

Bann, Stephen. “Introduction.” Barthes, pp. 3-6.

Barthes, Roland. “The Discourse of History.” Translated by Stephen Bann. *Comparative Criticism,* vol. 3, 1981, pp. 3-20.

Bassett, Kate. “Ivo Van Hove Staging Shakespeare: World Enough and Time?” Bennett and Massai, pp. 42-46

Bate, Jonathan and Eric Rasmussen. *William Shakespeare Complete Works*. Macmillan, 2007.

Bennett, Susan and Sonia Massai, editors. *Ivo Van Hove: From Shakespeare to David Bowie*. Methuen Drama, 2018.

Bevis, Richard W. *English Drama: Restoration and Eighteenth Century, 1660-1789.* Longman, 1988.

Billing, Christian M. "The Roman Tragedies." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 61, no. 3, 2010, pp. 415-439, https://doi.org/10.1353/shq.2010.0006.

Boenisch, Peter M. "Aesthetic Art to Aisthetic Act: Theatre, Media, Intermedial Performance." Chapple and Kattenbelt, pp. 103-116.

Bradley, Gwendolyn. *The Power of Love: Ideological Emotion in Five Seventeenth-Century Tragedies*. 2002. Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, PhD dissertation.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Kipling's 'The White Man's Burden' and Its Afterlives." *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920,* vol. 50, no. 2, 2007, pp. 172-191, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/elt.2007.0017. Accessed 6 May 2020.

British Council. "Shakespeare Performances Recommendation by British Council." *British Council,* https://www.britishcouncil.kr/programmes/shakespeare-lives/productions. Accessed 2 June 2020.

Brown, John Russell. "Foreign Shakespeare and English-speaking audiences." Kennedy D. *Foreign*, pp. 19-35.

Bruhn, Jorgen et al, editors. *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*. Bloomsbury, 2013.

Burnett, Mark. "Global Shakespeare and the Censor: Adaptation, Context and Shakespeare Must Die, a Thai Film Adaptation of Macbeth." S*hakespeare Survey 71: Re-creating Shakespeare: Articles from the World Shakespeare Congress*, 2016, edited by Peter Holland, Cambridge UP, 2018, pp. 276-294. Accessed 18 March 2020.

Cain, P.J. and A. G. Hopkins. *British Imperialism 1688-2015*. 3rd edition. Routledge, 2016.

Caldwell, Tanya. "Meanings of 'All for Love.'" *Comparative Drama*, vol. 38, no. 2/3, 2004, pp.183-211.

Carlin, Murray. *Not Now Sweet Desdemona*. Oxford UP. 1969.

Canfield, J. Douglas. *Heroes & States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy.* UP of Kentucky, 2000.

Chapple, Freda and Chiel Kattenbelt, editors. *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance*. Rodopi, 2006.

_____. "Key Issue in Intermediality in Theatre and Performance." Chapple and Kattenbelt, pp. 11-26.

Chatterjee, Sudipto and Jyotsna G Singh. "Moor or less? The surveillance of *Othello*, Calcutta 1848." *Shakespeare and Appropriation*, edited by Christy Desmet and Robert Sawyer. Psychology Press, 1999, pp. 65-82.

Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." Translated by Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen. *Sings*, vol. 1, no. 4. U of Chicago P., pp. 875-893. Accessed 29 Sep 2019.

Corbett, Natalie and Keren Zaiontz. "Appendix 1: Roman Tragedies. The Politics of Distraction: Spectatorial Freedom and (Dis)enfranchisement in Toneelgroep's Roman Tragedies." *Ivo Van Hove Onstage*, edited by David Willinger. Routledge, 2018, pp. 300-309.

Cotton, Nancy. *Women Playwrights in England c. 1363-1750*. Bucknell UP, 1980

Couchman, Gordon W. *This Our Caesar: A Study of Bernard Shaw's* Caesar and Cleopatra. Mouton, 1973.

Cutchins, Dennis. "Bakhtin, Intertextuality, and Adaptation." *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies,* edited by Thomas Leitch. Oxford UP, 2017, pp. 71-86.

Dasenbrock, Reed Way. "Imitation Versus Contestation Walcott's Postcolonial Shakespeare." *Callaloo*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2005, pp. 104-113.

Depledge, Emma. *Shakespeare's Rise to Cultural Prominence: Politics, Print and Alteration, 1642-1700.* Cambridge UP, 2018.

Derrida, Jacques. "'The Strange Institution Called Literature': An Interview with Jacques Derrida." *Acts of Literature*, edited by Derek Attridge. Routledge, 1992, pp. 33-75.

Dryden, John. *All for Love*. Edited by David M. Vieth, U of Nebraska P., 1972.

_____. "Preface." *All for Love*, pp. 12-26.

_____. "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy." *Essays of John Dryden,* edited by W. P. Ker. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1900, pp. 21-108.

_____. "Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*." *Selections From Dryden*, edited by G. E. Hadow. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1908, pp. 121-144.

_____. "To My Dear Friend Mr. Congreve, on His Comedy Call'd *The Double-Dealer*." *Selected Works of John Dryden*, edited by William Frost. Twelfth Printing, 1966, pp. 276-278.

Dustagheer, Sarah and Aleksandra Sakowska. "Introduction: Global Shakespeare for Anglophone Audiences." *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance*, vol. 11, no. 26, 2014, pp. 9-16, DOI: 10.2478/mstap-2014-0002. *Kent Academic Repository*, Accessed 20 March 2020.

Eidson, John Olin. "Dryden's Criticism of Shakespeare." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 273-280. Accessed 30 November 2019.

Elliott, Kamilla. "Theorizing Adaptations/Adapting Theories." Bruhn, pp. 19-45.

Evans, Judith. *The Politics and Plays of Bernard Shaw*. McFarland & Company, Inc., 2002.

Eward-Mangione, Angela. *Decolonizing Shakespeare: Race, Gender, and Colonialism in Three Adaptations of Three Plays by William Shakespeare.* 2014. U of South Florida, PhD Dissertation.

Farid, Maher S. "Introduction," Shawqi, pp. 3-13.

Finke, Laurie A. "Virtue in Fashion: The Fate of Women in the Comedies of Cibber and Vanbrugh." *From Renaissance to Restoration: Metamorphoses of the Drama*, edited by Robert Markley and Laurie Finke. Bellflower Press, 1984, pp. 154-179.

Fischer, Gerhard and Bernhard Greiner, editors. *The Play within the Play: The Performance of Meta-Theatre and Self-Reflection*. Rodopi, 2007.

_____. "The Play within the Play: Scholarly Perspectives." Fischer and Greiner, pp. xi-xvi.

Fischlin, Daniel, and Mark Fortier, editors. "General Introduction." *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the Seventeenth Century to the Present.* Routledge, 2009, pp. 1-22.

Fortier, Mark. "Ch. 138: Translation, Adaptation, and 'Tradaptation.'" Smith, pp. 1046-1050.

Frank, Marcie. "Fighting Women and Loving Men: Dryden's Representation of Shakespeare in *All for Love." Queering the Renaissance*, edited by Jonathan Goldberg. Duke UP, 1994, pp. 311-329.

Fretz, Claude. "How Restoration Playwrights Reshaped Shakespeare's Plays to Fit Changing Political Norms and Theatrical Tastes," *Shakespeare & Beyond.* Folger Shakespeare Library, 5 June 2018, https://shakespeareandbeyond.folger.edu/2018/06/05/how-restoration-playwrights-reshaped-shakespeare-plays/. Accessed 3 February 2020.

Garber, Marjorie B. *Quotation Marks.* 2003.

Gilbert, Helen and Joanne Tompkins. *Postcolonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics.* Routledge, 1996.

Ha, Hebin. "A Foreigner Physically Attacked on Street without Reason [길 가다 '묻지마 폭행' 당한 외국인 . . . 주변 시민들이 '제압']." *JTBC News,* 5 June 2020,

http://news.jtbc.joins.com/article/article.aspx?news_id=NB11953834&fbclid=IwAR3Bp57w682i-XtDRt_lJ9oKn8zU1a_oeZt9E1gIskXg3yUh-47ZeImBc1g. Accessed 6 June 2020.

Habib, Imtiaz. *English Archives, 1500-1677: Imprints of the Invisible.* Routledge, 2008.

Hann, Yvonne. *"Royal Wench": Investigating Gender and Power in the Antony and Cleopatra Plays of the English Renaissance.* 2009. Memorial U of Newfoundland, PhD Dissertation.

Harris, Bernard. "A Portrait of a Moor." *Shakespeare Survey,* vol. 11, 1958, pp. 89-97.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. "'Narcissus in Thy Face': Roman Desire and the Difference It Fakes in *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 45, no. 4, 1994, pp. 408-425. Accessed 25 June 2020.

History.com Editors. "Apartheid." *History.* A&E Television Networks, 7 October 2010, updated 3 March 2020. Accessed 20 August 2020. https://www.history.com/topics/africa/apartheid.

Hoenselaars, Ton. "International Encounters." Smith, pp. 1033-1046.

Holdsworth, Nadine. "Introduction." *Theatre and National Identity: Re-Imagining Conceptions of Nation*, edited by Nadine Holdsworth. Routledge, 2014, pp. 1-16.

Holguin, Marilyn Marie. *Appropriating the Restoration Hero(ine): Intertextuality and the Transformation of Gender Identity, 1677-1759.* 2016. U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, PhD Dissertation.

Hunter, G. K. "Elizabethans and Foreigners." *Shakespeare Survey*, vol. 17, 1964, pp. 37–52.

Huse, Ann A. "Cleopatra, Queen of the Seine: The Politics of Eroticism in Dryden's *All for Love*." *Huntington Library Quarterly,* vol. 63, no. ½, 2000, pp. 23-46. Accessed 13 August 2020.

I, Ali Al-Ra. "Chapter 10: Arabic Drama Since the Thirties," Badawi, *Modern*, pp. 358-403.

Iyengar, Sujata and Miriam Jacobson. "Introduction: Shakespearean Appropriation in Inter/national contexts." *The Routledge Handbook of Shakespeare and Global Appropriation*, edited by Christy Desmet, Sujata Iyengar, and Miriam Jacobson. Routledge, 2019. Published online on 18 October 2019, pp. 1-11. Accessed 3 April 2020.

Jang, Kee Young. "Creating a Play to Make 'Spectator,' not 'Reader': Director Hyun-tak Kim." *Munhwanews,* 30 November 2015. Interview, http://www.munhwanews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=9192.

Johnson, Samuel. *Preface to Shakespeare*. Project Gutenberg, 2004. Accessed 15 August 2020.

Joubin, Alexa. "Global Shakespeare Criticism Beyond the Nation State." *Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance*, edited by Arthur F. Kinney. Oxford UP, 2012, pp. 423-440.

Jung, Yoo Chul. "Theatre Company Sungbookdong Beedoolkee's New Production of 2016, *Oh THe yELLOw* Has Encore Performance from the 14th." *Brain Media,* 6 June 2016, http://fitness.brainworld.com/BrainHealth/17993.

Jürs-Munby, Karen. "Introduction." Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre,* translated by Karen Jürs-Munby, pp.1-15.

Kadhim, Hussein N. *The Poetics of Anti-Colonialism in the Arabic Qaṣīdah.* Brill, 2004.

Kapadia, Parmita. "Transnational Shakespeare: Salman Rushdie and Intertextual Appropriation." *Borrowers and Lenders*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2008, https://www.borrowers.uga.edu/781652/pdf.

Katritzky_M._*Women, Medicine and Theatre, 1500-1750: Literary Mountebanks and Performing Quacks.* Routledge, 2007.

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

_____. “Afterword: Shakespearean orientalism.” *Foreign,* pp. 290-303

Kennedy, Merrit. “Worldwide Celebrations on the 400th Anniversary of Shakespeare’s Death.” *NPR*, 23 April 2016, https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2016/04/23/475392480/worldwide-celebrations-on-the-400th-anniversary-of-shakespeares-death. Accessed 2 June 2020.

Kim, Gyeong Hye. “The Orient and Women in Shaw’s Caesar and Cleopatra.” *English & American Cultural Studies*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2009, pp. 51-70.

Kim, Hyun-tak. *Oh THe yELLOw*. Provided by the author. 2016.

_____. *Oh THe yELLOw*. Performed by Sungbookdong Beedoolkee. Provided by the director. 2016. Videoclip.

Kim, Jong-gab and Seul-ki Kim. “Multicultural Society and Racism: Focusing on Korean Multicultural Films.” *Multicultural Society Study*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2014, pp. 85-105, DOI: 10.15685 / jms.2014.08.7.2.85.

Kim, Na Byut. “Imagination Starts While Reading a Book. ‘Rarely Read through the End: an Interview of Play Director Hyun-tak Kim.” *Newstomato*, 4 July 2013, Interview, http://www.newstomato.com/ReadNews.aspx?no=378768.

Kirwan, Peter. “Review of Shakespeare’s *Roman Tragedies* (*Coriolanus, Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra*) (Directed by Ivo Van Hove for Toneelgroep Amsterdam) at the Barbican, London, 20 November 2009.” *Shakespeare*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2010, pp. 472-82, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2010.527362. Accessed 24 October 2017.

Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre*, translated by Karen Jürs-Munby. Routledge, 2006.

Loftis, Sonya Freeman. *Shakespeare's Surrogates: Rewriting Renaissance Drama*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.

Loomba, Ania. *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism.* Oxford UP, 2002.

MacDonald, Joyce Green. "Bodies, Race, and Performance in Derek Walcott's *A Branch of the Blue Nile*." *Theatre Journal,* vol. 57, no. 2, 2005, pp. 191-203.

Malouf, Michael. "Chapter 25. Empire and Nationalism." *George Bernard Shaw in Context*, edited by Brad Kent. Cambridge UP, 2015. pp. 207-214.

Mann, David D., Susan Garland Mann, and Camille Garnier. *Women Playwrights in England, Ireland, and Scotland 1660-1823.* Indiana UP, 1996.

Marsden, Jean I. "Beyond Recovery: Feminism and the Future of Eighteenth-Century Literary Studies." *Feminist Studies*, vol. 28, no. 3, 2002, pp. 657-662, DOI: 10.2307/3178795.

Massai, Sonia, editor. *World-wide Shakespeare.* Routledge, 2005.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman. "Arcadia Lost: Politics and Revision in the Restoration *Tempest*." *Renaissance Drama*, vol. 13, 1982, pp. 189-209.

Morgan, Fidelis. "Background." *The Female Wits: Women Playwrights of the Restoration.* Virago Press, 1981. pp. ix-xi.

Murray, Barbara A., editor. *Restoration Shakespeare: Viewing the Voice.* Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2001.

Nazareth, Peter. *An African View of Literature.* Northwestern UP, 1974.

Nelson, Robin. "Prospective Mapping." *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*, edited by Sarah Bay-Cheng, Chiel Kattenbelt, Andy Lavender, and Robin Nelson. Amsterdam U.P., 2010, pp. 13-23.

Ochshorn, Kathleen. “Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and the Shadow of a New Empire: *John Bull’s Other Island*.” *Shaw,* vol. 26, 2006, pp. 180-193. Accessed 15 August 2020.

Orkin, Martin. Ch. 142. “Local, Global, and ‘Glocal.’” Smith, pp. 1070-1077.

Oseni, Z. I. “The Portrait of Ahmed Shawqi,” *Iqbal Review*, vol. 28, no. 1, 1987, pp. 107-125.

Owen, Susan J. *Perspectives on Restoration Drama*. Manchester UP., 2002.

Pearson, Jacqueline. “Blacker than Hell Creates: Pix Rewrites Othello.” Broken Boundaries: Women & Feminism in Restoration Drama. Edited by Katherine M. Quinsey. UP of Kentucky, 1996, pp. 13-30.

“Performance guide*.” Passionately Crazy about Performance [공연에 뜨겁게 미치다]*, Broadcast by TBS, 19 May 2016. *Youtube*, posted by Deahyeon Ji, 19 May 2016, https://youtu.be/cEBXFCkiIb0.

Pugh, Patricia. “Bernard Shaw, Imperialism.” *Shaw and Politics*, vol. 11, 1991, pp. 97-118. Accessed 15 August 2020.

Ranciere, Jacques. *The Emancipated Spectator.* Translated by Gregory Elliott. Verso, 2011.

Rhee, Suk-Koo. *Between Empire and Nation-State: Re-reading Literatures in English in a Postcolonial Era*. Hangilsa, 2011.

Roberts, David. “The Play within the Play and the Closure of Representation.” Fischer and Greiner, pp. 37-46.

Rosenthal, Laura J. *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England.* Cornell UP, 1996.

Runge, Laura L. “The Softness of Expression, and the Smoothness of Measure”: A Model of Gendered Decorum from Dryden’s Criticism.” *Essays in Literature*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1993, pp. 197-212. *EBSCOhost.* Accessed 8 June 2019.

Rushdie, Salman. "The Empire Writes Back with a Vengeance." *The Times* (London, England), no. 61276, 3 July 1982, p. 8. Accessed 4 July 2018.

Said, Edward. *Beginnings: Intention and Method*, Columbia UP, 1985.

Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation.* Routledge, 2006.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism.* Westview Press, 1977.

Shakespeare Birthplace Trust. "When Was Shakespeare Born?" *Shakespeare Birthplace Trust*. https://www.shakespeare.org.uk/explore-shakespeare/shakespedia/william-shakespeare/when-was-shakespeare-born/#. Accessed 7 June 2020.

Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Edited by John Wilders. Bloomsbury, 1995.

_____. *Othello.* Edited by E. A. J. Honigmann. Bloomsbury, 1997.

Shaw, Bernard. *Three Plays for Puritans*. Penguin Books, 2000.

Shaw, Helen. "Radical Freedom: Ivo van Hove's *Roman Tragedies*." *TheatreForum*, no. 37, 2010, pp.56-64.

Shawqi, Ahmed. *The Death of Cleopatra*. Translated by Jeanette Wahba Sourial Atiya. The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop, 2006.

Singh, Jyotsna. "Othello's Identity, Postcolonial Theory, and Contemporary African Rewritings of *Othello*." *Women, "Race," & Writing in the Early Modern Period*, edited by Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker, pp. 287-299.

_____. *Shakespeare and Postcolonial Theory.* The Arden Shakespeare, 2019.

Smith, Bruch R. Editor. *The Cambridge Guide to the Worlds of Shakespeare: The World's Shakespeare 1660-Present Vol. II.* Cambridge UP, 2016.

Somekh, S. "Chapter 2: The Neo-classical Arabic Poets," Badawi, *Modern*, pp. 36-81.

Suckling, Norman. "Dryden in Egypt: Reflections on *All for Love*." *Twentieth-Century Interpretations of* All for Love*,* edited by Bruce King. Prentice Hall, 1968.

Suzuki, Mihoko. "Recognizing Women's Dramas as Political Writing: the Plays of 1701 by Wiseman, Pix and Trotter." *Women's Writing*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2011, pp. 547-564, DOI: 10.1080/09699082.2011.6000053.

Taylor, Gary. *Buying Whiteness: Race, Culture, and Identity from Columbus to Hip Hop.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Toneelgroep Amsterdam. Webpage, https://tga.nl/en.

Trivedi, Poonam, editor. *Re-playing Shakespeare in Asia.* Routledge, 2012.

Van Hove, Ivo. *Roman Tragedies*. Performed by Toneelgroep Amsterdam. Provided by the theatre company. 2007. Videoclip.

_____. "Roman Tragedies: 'The Times They Are A-Changin (Bob Dylan).'" Extract from the Director's Notes, translated by Isabelle Groenhof, pp. 56-59.

Vieth, David M. "Introduction," *All for Love*, pp. xiii-xxxiv.

Walcott, Derek. "A Branch of the Blue Nile." *Derek Walcott: Three Plays,* Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1986, pp. 208-312.

Weintraub, Stanley. *Who's Afraid of Bernard Shaw?: Some Personalities in Shaw's Plays*. UP of Florida, 2011.

Whidden, James. *Egypt: British Colony, Imperial Capital*. Manchester UP, 2017.

Wikander, Matthew H. "Reinventing the History Play: *Caesar and Cleopatra, Saint Joan, In Good King Charles's Golden Days,*" *The Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw,* Cambridge UP, 1998, pp. 195-217.

Wilson, Richard. "Introduction. Global Shakespeare: This Wide and Universal Theatre." *Alicante Journal of English Studies*, vol. 25, 2012, pp. 5-17.

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

Young, Sarah. "Hamlet, Lear Line the Thames in London Shakespeare Celebrations," *Reuters,* 22 April 2016, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-britain-shakespeare/hamlet-lear-line-the-thames-in-london-shakespeare-celebrations-idUSKCN0XJ1WJ. Accessed 2 June 2020.