

Introduction

Global Shakespeare: This Wide and Universal Theatre

Richard Wilson
Kingston University
R.Wilson@kingston.ac.uk

What were Shakespeare and his fellows thinking when they called their playhouse the Globe? The name they attached in 1599 to “This wide and universal theatre” (*As You Like It* 2.7.136) has become so familiar that even Shakespeare scholars rarely give its historical significance much thought. Theatre historians have, of course, long inferred that in christening their playhouse the Globe its founders commissioned “a decorative scheme intended to foster an emblematic conception of the theatre as a microcosm... a theatre of the world” (Davidson, 1997: 148-9). But the ways in which the ancient *topos* of the *Theatrum Mundi*, and the Pythagorean metaphor that “All the world’s a stage” (138), resonated with Drake’s circumnavigation of 1577-80, or Ortelius’s cartographic “theatre of the world”, the 1570 atlas *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, remain strangely unexplored. The Dutch mapmaker styled his volume a theatre, however, precisely because he pictured “the round earth’s imagined corners” framing a spectacle within a classical architecture like that of Andrea Palladio’s contemporary Teatro Olimpico: a perspective scene in which the global drama would be acted out according to the unities of time and space.¹ So the frontispiece to the *Theatre of the Lands of the World* has a design based on a proscenium arch, crowned by twin hemispheres, from behind which “will emerge the show of the world’s countries”, as in an actual theatre “actors recite lines and perform actions that add up to a completed whole, the play itself, an analogue for amassed knowledge” (Binding, 2003: 204 & 206). It is not necessary, therefore, to go so far as Frances Yates, who fantasized about the Globe as a cosmic memory theatre, like that in Peter Greenaway’s film *Prospero’s Books*, to appreciate how this

cartographic model for “the idea that the events, features, and phenomena of the created world are infinitely many but all one” (Yates, 1969: 189), worked two ways, and how the roundness of Shakespeare’s theatre and Ortelian cosmography were “dialogically related” (Gillies, 1994: 70):

The Globe Theatre... would have been for Shakespeare the pattern of the universe, the idea of the Macrocosm, the world stage on which the Microcosm acted his parts. All the world’s a stage. The words are in a real sense the clue to the Globe Theatre. (Schulz, 1997: 112)

Whether or not the figure of “Hercules and his load” (*Hamlet* 2.2.345), or Atlas carrying the globe, was the actual sign of the theatre; and whether the Latin motto translated in *As You Like It*, the first Globe comedy —*Totus Mundus Agit Histrionem*— was literally written up over its stage, the name of this circular house implied an entire philosophy of life as a unified play, a humanist concept that in Ortelius’s case biographers connect to his membership of the idealist Protestant sect, the Family of Love. And in one of the few accounts to grasp what was implied in such a name, John Gillies points out that, just as the new geography gained legitimacy from the old idea of the world-as-theatre, theatre acquired a new universalism from its association with contemporary cartography, allowing plays like *Tamburlaine* and *Henry V* to communicate “the exhilaration of both dramatist and audience with the imagined conquest of geographic space”. All Elizabethan dramas were acted within “what was effectively a world map in its own right”, Gillies observes (1994: 90-1). Yet the moment of the Globe, which was in fact the heyday of actual globe manufacture, was also an instant when the concept of earth’s revolving roundness was delivering an unprecedented shock to the European psyche, as the persecution of Shakespeare’s exact contemporary Galileo testified (Binding, 2003: 100). So, when he had Puck promise to “put a girdle round about the earth / In forty minutes” (*Dream* 2.1.175), the dramatist registered how uncanny the notion of the earth’s curvature, and Europe’s consequent relativity, appeared to a generation experiencing the literal *disorientation* entailed by the terrestrial sphere: “that it was possible to travel in a straight-line course” and yet come back to the same place (McLuhan, 1962) For East was West, and outside inside, according to these defamiliarizing planispheres, as John Hale observed in his book, *The Civilisation of Europe in the Renaissance*:

In spite of the prominence subsequently accorded to the political role of Spain, France, and England, neither atlases nor maps showed any bias towards Europe. Devoid of indications of national frontiers, they were not devised to be read politically... In spite of the dramatic power games among countries of the West, the cartographers’ *horror vacui* retained an even-handed deployment of information across the board. Neither cartographers nor traders thought in terms of an economically ‘advanced’ West and a ‘backward’ or marginally relevant East. (Hale, 1993: 20)

In *Shakespeare’s Restless World*, a spin-off of the 2012 exhibition “Shakespeare Staging the World”, British Museum Director Neil MacGregor relates the first English

terrestrial globes, created for the Inns of Court by Emery Molyneux in 1592, to what he terms the sixteenth-century “space race”, and proposes that when such objects “went on triumphant public display” before Queen Elizabeth’s courtiers, “Shakespeare would almost certainly have been amongst them”. So, when Oberon boasts how “We the globe can compass soon, / Swifter than the wandering moon” (4.1.95-6), according to this chauvinistic reading, “Shakespeare’s very English fairies are, in their whimsical, poetical way, restating the nation’s pride” in England’s advance from piracy to paramountcy (MacGregor, 2012: 5-6). Evidently, MacGregor is deaf to the anti-Elizabethan nuance of that “wandering moon”. Of course, the representation of space is never neutral, as Francis Barker noted of Lear’s cadastral map, for the “chart of sovereign possession is always a field of struggle... the focus of power and danger, and site of powered or impotent linguistic performances. The map, and the land it obliquely represents, are caught up in a force-field of language and desire, as well as of possession.” (Barker, 1993: 1). But the identification of Shakespeare’s fairy “roundel” (2.2.1) with Elizabethan empire, as if it is “caught up in the new Protestant future of northern Europe” imaged in charts of Drake’s circumnavigation, misses what makes a comedy like *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* so subversive, which is that it is precisely when Puck puts “a girdle round about the earth” that everything goes pear-shaped (MacGregor, 2012: 28).

At the British Museum the fact that Shakespeare was writing at the moment when for the first time Londoners got “a real visual sense of the whole world, and in particular of the roundness of the world”, is used to associate the plays with a universalism which the Director identifies expressly, at the end of his book, with the global mission of the BBC, as represented in Eric Gill’s 1932 sculpture, above the portal of Broadcasting House, of Prospero and Ariel astride a revolving globe (MacGregor, 2012: 10&285-6, quoting Jonathan Bate). Shakespeare is thus recruited to the museum’s long-term project, attractive to its donors, of validating empire as a necessary phase of globalization. Of course, if we want to see how such an Anglocentric projection of an imaginary universality was prefigured in Elizabethan theatre, we need look no further than the stage of Shakespeare’s precursor, Marlowe, upon which his Tamburlaine operates like some cartographical maniac, whose perpetual motion across a thousand plateaus, and scheme to “make the point” of the meridian himself (*ITamburlaine* 4.4.87), renders all spaces the same, annihilating every cultural difference, “as if to insist on the essential meaninglessness” of geographical distance. Such homogenizing of space, the register, Stephen Greenblatt believes, of “transcendental homelessness”, was surely keyed to the equalizing impact of the pioneer planispheres that Marlowe studied in the office of his spymaster Walsingham (Greenblatt, 1980: 195). But the result is that his plays really do aspire to the false universalism MacGregor attributes to Shakespeare: they struggle to prove that “the essence of what it is to be restlessly human in a constantly restless world” is to speak and behave exactly like the dramatist (MacGregor, 2012: 286):

Look here, my boys, see what a world
 Lies westwards from the midst of Cancer's line,
 Unto the rising of this earthly globe,
 Whereas the sun declining from our sight,
 Begins the day with our antipodes:
 And shall I die with this unconquered?
 (2*Tam* 5.3.145-50)

On Marlowe's stage where everyone speaks the same, globalization means colonization, and universality is conterminous with an Anglo-Saxon imperium. "Give me a map", his buccaneer hero therefore orders, "then let me see how much / Is left to conquer of the world" (123-4). But though the cartographic revolution gave Europeans just such an intellectual edge, in being the first "to imagine the geographical space in which they lived" in terms of rational relations, this came at the cost of a relativity that contradicted their age-old assumptions of spatial priority (Hale, 1993: 20). Thus, despite the will to "Smite flat the thick rotundity of the world" (*King Lear* 3.2.8) with maps, historians insist that the mathematical projection of the globe destabilized, rather than reinforced, a Eurocentric mentality (Greenblatt, 1980: 195). Tamburlaine is therefore never more falsely universalist than when speculating how to "win the world" by circumnavigating "along the oriental sea... about the Indian continent: / Even from Persepolis to Mexico, / And thence unto the Straits of Jubalter" (*ITamburlaine* 3.3.253-6). For this was, of course, the global circuit, from Acapulco to Manila via Gibraltar, completed by those convoys of "embarked traders", grown "big-bellied" on "the spiced Indian air" (*Dream* 2.1.124-5), that Fernand Braudel described as the most complex trade cycle ever known. Yet the historian of the Mediterranean went on to explain how this great wheel of multilateral exchange reduced the Old World to the incidental position of a conduit, as between producing and accumulating countries, Europe and Islam now both came to function as "intermediate transit zones" (Braudel, 1982: 199). In contrast to Marlowe's world-conquerors, however, this intermediacy is precisely what seems to exhilarate a Shakespearean character such as Falstaff, when he plans to traffic between two mistresses:

Here's another letter to her. She bears the purse too. She is a region in Guiana, all gold and bounty. I will be cheaters to them both, and they shall be exchequers to me. They shall be my East and West Indies, and I will trade with them both. (*The Merry Wives of Windsor* 1.3.58-62)

"She is spherical like a globe", jokes Syracusan Dromio of Nell, the kitchen maid, in *The Comedy of Errors*, with genitals like the Netherlands, and buttocks next to Irish bogs, but a face in the image of America, "embellish'd with rubies, carbuncles, sapphires, declining their rich aspect to the hot breath of Spain, who sent whole armadas of carracks to be ballast to her nose" (3.2.113-35). The geographer Richard Hakluyt, claiming to be the only one to compare "the old imperfectly composed and the new lately reformed maps, globes (and) spheres", had just promoted the first English

globes in his 1589 *Voyages*, as “collected and reformed according to the secretest and latest discoveries, both Spanish, Portuguese and English” (Hakluyt, 1927: 242-3). *The Comedy of Errors* was acted in 1592 at the Inns of Court: so beside the very globes it mocks. But Dromio’s jest reveals how rapidly the circular logic of the global economy became public property, and with it an awareness that the exotic and domestic were intimately connected. As Harry Levin footnoted it, this very first Shakespearean reference to a terrestrial globe thereby condenses the theme of the comedy, that the far and the near, home and away, have become uncannily interrelated: “it embodies, on a more than miniature scale, the principal contrast of the play: on the one hand, extensive voyaging; on the other intensive domesticity” (Levin, 1962: xxxii). It is this bilateral exchange that makes Dromio’s gag more than the projection of English colonialism that MacGregor finds it. For, as with Falstaff’s ‘intercontinental’ trading, what we encounter with Nell’s ‘globalization’ is something truly Shakespearean, the realization, analysed by Patricia Fumerton in *Cultural Aesthetics*, that the real savages are to be discovered in Windsor or the City of London, and that the most monstrous Other is the Self:

It was foreign trade —especially the East India Company’s trade in spices— that supplied many of the ornaments, void stuff, and other trivia of the (English) aristocracy as well as an increasing proportion of its finances... What this underscored was that the trade that increasingly supplied the living of the aristocratic ‘self’ was also importing into that self an element so foreign to its self-image as ‘gifted’ that it was conceptually ‘savage’. More accurately, foreign trade exposed the fact that barbarousness had from the first been at the heart of the self. (Fumerton, 1991: 173)

“He does smile his face into more lines than is in the new map with the augmentation of the Indies” (*Twelfth Nigh*, 3.2.66-8), reports Maria of Malvolio’s attempts to “revolve” (2.5.125) his personality; and the allusion to Hakluyt’s travelogue, now “augmented” with a rhumb-lined map of the East Indies, far from being keyed to “the triumph of English seafaring”, as the British Museum claims, reflects the hubris of these global pretensions back on the upstart steward. Rather than heralding “England’s great success” in “plundering and exploration, scientific inquiry and geopolitical manoeuvring”, as MacGregor has it, Shakespeare’s own revolving on the new cartography truly brings the colonial project full circle in this way, by associating it, long before Jane Austen linked the slave trade to Mansfield Park, with the upstairs-downstairs cruelties of the English stately home (MacGregor, 2012: 6&10). Thus, “I can hardly forbear hurling things at him”, says Maria (69); and Sir Andrew: “I’d beat him like a dog” (2.3.126). So, no wonder the author of these comedies loved Montaigne, for he clearly shared the Frenchman’s sense that the atrocities of the cannibals were nothing compared to the violence “we have not only read about, but seen ourselves in recent memory, not among the savages or in antiquity, but among our fellow citizens and neighbours” (Montaigne, 1991: 236). In *The Comedy of Errors* the horror that impels the plot is averted when Egeon is reprieved from execution; but these comic allusions to globalization all foretell the tragic consciousness of dramas like *King Lear*, where as Richard Marienstras wrote in *Le Proche et le Lontain*, “at a time when

newly discovered lands were providing a far distant setting for wild nature, Shakespeare situates it within the bounds of civilised, indeed everyday life”, and in every case, “the near is more dangerous than the far” (Marienstras, 1985: 6):

This is most strange.
 That she, whom even but now was your best object,
 The argument of your praise, balm of your age,
 Most blest, most dearest, should in this trice of time
 Commit a thing so monstrous.
 (*King Lear* 1.1.214-18)

“What, in our house?” (*Macbeth* 2.3.84): Lady Macbeth’s housewifely protest at the murder of Duncan is disingenuous, but this only intensifies the uncanny *homeliness* that haunts these plays, and that so offended Voltaire, where the domestic signifiers of tragedy are Gertrude’s shoes or Othello’s handkerchief. What Greenblatt calls the “Machiavellian hypothesis” about the contingency of all behaviour and beliefs, provoked by the shock of the first New World encounters, seems to be being tested by this writer, not on some stranger in a strange land, as it is by Marlowe, but on the audience, as Shakespeare takes what goes around seriously, and brings the global back to hearth and home (Greenblatt, 1988: 26-33) For rather than projecting onto “the barbarous Scythian” (*King Lear* 1.1.116) the dread that “Humanity must perforce prey upon itself, / Like monsters of the deep” (4.2.50-1), this veritably *revolutionary* thinking locates the terror here and now. So, in showing how the host turns hostile, in dramas where, as Gillies says, it is the alien who is in danger, and “the exotic character who courts our sympathy even as the voyager forfeits it”, Shakespeare “creates his own ‘heart of darkness’”, not in Africa or the Indies, but the European house (Gillies, 1994: 100-6). *Housekeeping*, in the sense of the economics of the hospitality we owe the world, that yet carries the risk of being consumed by it, seems indeed to be far more of a concern here, in response to *circumspection* about the globe, than how much of it is left to conquer, as Julia Lupton deduces: for “whether it is in Capulet’s bedroom, Brabantio’s parlour, Macbeth’s guest suite, or Timon’s banqueting house, hospitality chez Shakespeare” sets the table for our own debates about *polis* and *oikos*, norm and exception, the universal *versus* the particular (Lupton, 2011: 165).

Shakespeare keeps house in settings stuffed with luxury goods from across the world, like those husbanded by the tycoon Gremio in *The Taming of the Shrew*: “Tyrian tapestry... Turkey cushions bossed with pearl, / Valance of Venice gold in needlework... and all things that belongs / To house or housekeeping” (2.1.341-8).² But in *Vermeer’s Hat*, his dazzling book about the way the global economy penetrated Dutch interiors, Timothy Brook points out that these texts record a specific phase of *second contacts* in the development of a world market, the sequel when the age of discovery trumpeted by Marlowe was over, and “rather than deadly conflict, there was negotiation and borrowing; rather than triumph and loss, give and take; rather than the transformation of cultures, their interaction” (Brook, 2008: 21). After the great clash of civilizations, the seventeenth century would be a mercantilist era of tariffs and trade-

offs, recounts Brook, a time for measurement, calculation, and stocktaking that he finds punctually registered in the Shakespearean section of the judicial comedy *Measure for Measure*, dating from 1604, when Pompey disrupts the law court with a Pinteresque monologue relating how the pregnant Mistress Elbow had an inordinate craving to consume stewed prunes:

Sir, she came in great with child, and longing —saving your honour's reverence— for stewed prunes. Sir, we had but two in the house, which at that very distant time stood, as it were, in a fruit dish —a dish of some three-pence, your honours have seen such dishes; they are not china dishes, but very good dishes.

(*Measure for Measure* 2.1.82-6).

Sex, fruit, porcelain, and faïence, the cheap earthenware imitation, form a chain of signifiers, in this Lacanian tale of displaced “longing”, that not only recapitulates the play’s theme of substitution, but enacts the endlessly extended network and deferred gratification of all over-horizon global commerce. No wonder the magistrate Angelo likens its stretched-out duration to “a night in Russia, / When nights are longest there” (2.1.122-3). China only began arriving in Amsterdam in 1602, and its brilliant cobalt blue and lustrous white colouring, with glassy transparent glaze, immediately made this exorbitantly expensive tableware the prime object of consumer desire. “The first Chinese porcelain to reach Europe amazed all who saw or handled it. Europeans could think only of crystal when pressed to describe the stuff”, and so seductive was its sensuous appeal that it instantly became “synonymous with China itself”. Brook sees china, therefore, as a quintessential symbol of Shakespeare’s age of *transculturation*, since it was, in fact, first manufactured as an intercultural crossover by Chinese ceramicists aiming to meet Persian aesthetic and Islamic religious demands. Soon, however, “everyone tried —and failed— to imitate the look and feel” of this *de luxe* item, and the “bazaars were cluttered with second-rate imitations” (which is, of course, the plot of *Measure for Measure*). A decade later, however, the sinologist explains, the delayed pay-off of Pompey’s shaggy-dog story about frustrated satisfaction would not have been so excruciating, for by then Chinese porcelain was pouring into Europe, and as its price plunged, so its transcendental place in the mimetic logic of the fashion system was superseded by carnations, and then maniacally, by tulips (Brook, 2008: 60-3&73-4). By the time William Wycherley wrote *The Country Wife* for Restoration London in 1675, “china” had ceased to signify the exquisitely unobtainable, and had become rakish slang for quick sex. But Shakespeare was writing at precisely *the moment of measure* in the march of globalization, when it remained possible to know the value of everything, yet still to count the cost.

“Go to, go to, no matter for the dish”, Judge Escalus interjects, during the testimony about Mistress Elbow’s prunes. But though Pompey concedes its triviality —“No, indeed, sir, not of a pin; you are therein in the right” (88)— in *Vermeer’s Hat* we come to appreciate how the missing china dish might matter a great deal at the Globe theatre,

as its *objet petit a*, the unattainable focus of a globalized desire. In 1604 *Measure for Measure* was so relevant to the kind of society that was incubating the catastrophic tulip mania, because its entire action concerns absence, imitation, and the “thirsty evil” of consuming “Like rats that ravin down their proper bane” (1.2.109-10). But if Shakespeare’s plays are full of such allusions to the consumerist mimetic desire for fashionable labels and imported luxuries, they are there not as markers of colonial exploitation or trophies of imperial conquest, of “what is “to be a king / And ride in triumph through Persepolis” (*ITamburlaine* 2.5.53-4), but as signifiers of the price we pay, and constraints we confront, with our hunger for universality. How Shakespeare measured the value, yet counted the cost, of that absent but so desirable china dish, or why indeed it mattered to the likes of Mistress Elbow and Master Froth, is in a sense, therefore, the question addressed by the contributors to this volume of essays on his “wide and universal” stage.

The genesis of the core of the present collection of essays was the seminar at the 2011 World Shakespeare Congress in Prague on ‘Global Shakespeare’. This circumstance was apt, since the Prague Congress will be wryly remembered as a kind of academic ‘Fawlty Towers’ for the comical way its grand illusions were undermined by manic organisation and dilapidated accommodation, and for a conference reception at the embassy of the United States from which large numbers of the delegates were excluded, after failing to obtain security clearance in time for the party! Its original occasion thus provided an ironically hospitable setting for addressing the question the seminar considered, which was indeed the limit of Shakespeare’s universality. At a time when globalization was ceasing to equate with Anglo-Saxon capitalism, ‘Global Shakespeare’ was tasked with the question of just how “wide and universal” Shakespeare’s theatre ever was, or would remain. What were the assumptions “hid / Behind the globe” (*Richard II* 3.2.33-4), when Shakespeare named his stage? ‘Global Shakespeare’ invited participants to address this question, or other issues relating to Shakespeare and globalization. Possible themes to be explored therefore included universality, translation, toleration, hospitality, trans-national performance, borders, protectionism, cultural taboos, religious fundamentalism, and the imaginative and intellectual construct of “the great globe itself” (*Tempest* 4.1.153).

The 400th anniversary of the first recorded performance of *The Tempest* offered an appropriate opportunity to examine the ways in which Shakespeare’s plays and poems engage with an emerging global economy. His wordplay on “the great globe” itself suggests Shakespeare was fully conscious of the potential of “this under globe” (*Lear* 2.2.155) as a paradigm for the first global moment of international and multilateral exchange, and was confident that his own writing would “the globe compass” (*Dream* 4.1.95) as part of this revolutionary development. Yet his texts are haunted by anxieties about “th’affrighted globe” (*Othello* 5.2.109) and “this distracted globe” (1.5.97) that hint at awareness of the negativities of a “globe of sinful continents” (*2Henry IV*,

2.4.258). So, to what degree was Shakespeare invoking a world culture when he called his playhouse the Globe? And after four centuries of translation and reproduction in “states unborn, and accents” then “unknown” (*Julius Caesar* 3.1.114), what remain today, or will emerge in future, as the barriers to Shakespearean universality?

The Prague ‘Global Shakespeare’ seminar was asked to revisit these questions in the light of Jacques Derrida’s Bardolatrous enthusiasm that these works offer a virtual ideal for a global community: “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?” (Derrida, 1992: 63). But Derrida then wondered whether it is possible “to gather under a single roof the apparently disordered plurivocity” of the world’s Shakespeare reproductions: “Is it possible to find a rule of cohabitation, it being understood this house will always be haunted by the meaning of the original?” (Derrida, 1994: 22). Between these theoretical parameters, ‘Global Shakespeare’ would therefore also aim to reflect upon the tension between historicist and reception-based criticism in contemporary Shakespeare studies, and the openness of what Robert Weimann has called Shakespeare’s “commodious thresholds” (Weimann, 2000: ch.8).

The participants in the ‘Global Shakespeare’ symposium, and the contributors who now add their essays to the collection, have risen generously to this *inviting* challenge. In the first section, ‘From Universal to Global’, however, they subject the very particularity of Shakespeare as “the man of the Globe” to disintegrating pressure, with Janet Clare flagging at the start that the most powerful trend in late-twentieth-century bibliography was one that revived awareness of Elizabethan dramatic authorship as a collective construct. While it is Thomas Middleton’s co-authorship of *Measure for Measure* or *Timon of Athens* that catches media attention, Clare analyses how the tyro Shakespeare himself contributed to the literary gene-pool, by participating in texts like *The Chronicle History of King Lear*, then resurrected Globe plays such as *King Lear* out of fragments from these early co-productions. Likewise, Jay Halio takes Lear’s question, “Who is that can tell me who I am?” (1.4.205), as the starting-point for a forensic probing of fractured Shakespearean identity. *Hamlet* becomes, in this account, a drama entirely prompted by its opening perplexity: “Who’s there?” Rui Carvalho Homen then analyses the plays as exercises in *akrasia*, the irony of unintended consequences, and proposes that an akratic sense of false consciousness underlies the tragic misfit between outcome and intention in *Othello* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, where characters so clearly act against their self-images and interests. And Krystyna Kujawińska focuses on *The Rape of Lucrece* as a hermeneutic puzzle that enacts the radical subjectivity of history. Finally, Robert Sawyer returns us to collaborative authorship, via the infamous attack on the “Upstart Crow”, to consider how this critique of Shakespeare’s competitive singularity might be viewed as the reassertion by the literary ‘firm’ of Robert Greene & Co. of a fraternal cooperative norm. By deconstructing the metaphysics of presence in concepts of authorship, agency, intention, and univocity, these essays thus all query Shakespeare’s status as the universal

exception, and echo the question his work itself posed at the opening of the Globe: “When could they say... That her wide walls encompassed but one man?” (*Julius Caesar* 1.2.155-6).

In the second part, ‘Globalizing Shakespeare’, the horizon expands to engage with the reception and repurposing of the plays literally across the globe. There is, however, no “global Shakespeare”, it emerges from these essays, as everywhere his work has been acculturated to affirm regional priorities. This “disordered plurivocity” is evident even when Shakespeare has been invoked for universality, as David Gallimore shows in a scholarly account of a Japanese construction that owes most to the local lack of any sense of an individuated self. Ironically, then, the Shakespeare figured by nineteenth-century Japanese translation may be closer to the historical reality than the Bard of Anglo-Saxon individualism, having been inflected by early adaptations such as Dryden’s *All For Love*. No Spanish-speaking Shakespeare film adaptation can, however, ever be deemed faithful to its source, maintains Alfredo Michel Modenessi, a creative misconstrual which runs throughout the history of Mexican cinema. What Spanish translations highlight, in fact, Montalt, Ezpeleta and Teruel propose, is Shakespeare’s scepticism about all myths of identity or origin, encapsulated in the challenge thrown by the Irishman with the unlikely compound Scots-Welsh name, MacMorris: “What ish my nation?” (*Henry V* 3.3.61). If this anti-essentialism has special resonance today for seceding parts of Spain, like Catalonia, that could then be because these texts themselves perform their own linguistic “enfranchisement”, as Alice Leonard argues persuasively, when they run counter to the nation state or global empire they have been made to serve, by opening themselves to so many differentiated idioms, provincial dialects, and foreign languages. Shakespeare may have gone global by going native, this section therefore concludes, but his works “cannot be confined within the weak list of a country’s fashion”, because they are themselves “the makers of manners” (*Henry V* 5.2.251-2).

With Part Three, ‘Staging Shakespeare Globally’, Ann Thompson returns discussion to the material “confine” of the “wooden O” (*Pro.* 13-20), but with the same uncanny sense of transcendence. In an invaluable report from inside the ring on the first years of Shakespeare’s Globe on Bankside, she recalls how the antiquarian illusion that realizing Sam Wanamaker’s dream would restore these Renaissance artworks to authentic conditions and traditional practices was happily frustrated, as a paucity of evidence emancipated a project in danger of suffocating in corsets and ruffs. Thus Thompson relates how the reconstructed Globe became something closer to “this cock-pit” (11) than intended: a post-modern *experience* in which the theatrical event is always bigger than “the girdle of these walls” (19). Such an expansion of meaning renders history *immaterial*. And the occult affinity between pre- and post-modern cultures is similarly implied by Marion Wynne-Davies’s take on Ophelia’s “mairèd rites” (*Hamlet* 5.1.202), in which a 2008 Stratford performance eerily re-enacts the abjection to which the suicide is reduced in the text, but in doing so explores how gender codes can be “enlarged” (208). If Susan Fischer sees the limit of such ‘enlargement’ in the physical inability of a black opera singer to play the Moor in Trevor Nunn’s earlier neurotic

RSC, *Othello* is liberated in a Noh-inspired Japanese-Korean reworking, according to Emi Hamana, by being juxtaposed with shamanistic rites. Thus, in contemporary Asia these plays function as “inter-cultural signs” that perhaps vindicate Derrida’s messianic faith in a Shakespeare who keeps open house for a “new International”.³ Shakespearean “indigenization” has a long history, going back to a Jesuit recital of *Pericles* in Japan in 1619, and traced here by Vikram Singh in colonial Calcutta. But what Singh and these other critics contribute to ‘Global Shakespeare’ is confidence in a living tradition that transcends the authentic or indigenous through its consciousness that “This wide and universal theatre / Presents more woeful pageants than the scene / Wherein we play” (*As You Like It* 2.7.136-8).

Holger Klein sets the terms for the final part of ‘Global Shakespeare’ by extending the authenticity debate to Robert Nye’s novel *Falstaff*, a purported autobiography of the dramatic character. The transposition of genres has always made novelistic treatments of Shakespeare exemplary for those who believe “His thoughts and beauties are so spread abroad that one touches them everywhere; one is intimate with him by instinct”. Of course, Austen spoke for herself when she averred that “Shakespeare one gets acquainted with without knowing how. It is a part of an Englishman’s constitution” (Jane Austen, 1996: 312). But Klein suggests the way Nye’s novel sports its fictive status is in fact indicative of our inter-textual Shakespeare, constituted out of the whole universe of stories with which we are acquainted. José Carlos Samoza is a dark moralist who toys with the murderousness of such fictions, and according to A.L. Pujante, his novel *El cebo* casts Polonius’s line about “your bait of falsehood” as a hook to catch the truth (*Hamlet* 2.1.62) to trail through all 38 plays, a Lacanian *détournement* that treats Shakespeare’s art in the manner of “The Mousetrap”: as a poison to cure. There are precedents for turning *Hamlet* to good account in Spanish fiction, as Jesús Tronch proves with a micro-history of the politics of Pablo AVECILLA’s 1856 imitation, a reprocessing that echoed the Enlightenment campaign to rehabilitate the Black Prince to progressive ends. The universalism in these adaptations recalls Horatio’s effort to “tell the yet unknowing world” what “a wounded name” lives on after the tragedy (5.2.286; 323). And Patrick Hill confirms how like *Hamlet*’s earnest friend novelists such as Ian McEwan and Graham Swift have become, in the seriousness with which they elect themselves the Bard’s inheritors. No work is more alert to the guilt inherent in such a legacy than *The Tempest*, however, and Erin Presley closes “Global Shakespeare” questioning Marina Warner’s ploy, in her novel *Indigo*, to disavow globalization by giving voice to Prospero’s women, notably the witch Sycorax; who is herself a colonizer. But if we are all incriminated in this story of empire, genocide, and slavery, simply by sharing the surface of the earth, this coda suggests, then we all share equally in Shakespeare’s farewell to the planet:

As you from crimes would pardoned be,
Let your indulgence set me free.
(*Tempest* Epi. 19-20)

Notes

1. "Round earth's imagined corners": John Donne, "Holy Sonnet 7", in C.A. Patrides, ed., *The Complete English Poems of John Donne* (1985), p. 438.
2. See Walter Cohen, "The Undiscovered Country: Shakespeare and Mercantile Geography", in Jean Howard and Scott Shershow, eds., *Marxist Shakespeares* (2001), pp. 133-135.
3. Derrida, op. cit. (note 32), p. 29 et passim. For Shakespeare as 'intercultural sign' see also Antony Tatlow, *Shakespeare, Brecht, and the Intercultural Sign* (2001), pp. 1-3.

References

- Austen, Jane (1996): *Mansfield Park*. Kathryn Sutherland, ed. London: Penguin.
- Barker, Francis (1993): *The Culture of Violence: Tragedy and History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Binding, Paul (2003): *Imagined Corners: Exploring the World's First Atlas*. London: Review.
- Braudel, Fernand (1982): *The Wheels of Commerce*, trans. Sian Reynolds. London: Collins.
- Brook, Timothy (2008): *Vermeer's Hat: The Seventeenth Century and the Dawn of the Global World*. London: Profile.
- Cohen, Walter (2001): "The Undiscovered Country: Shakespeare and Mercantile Geography", in Jean Howard and Scott Shershow, eds., *Marxist Shakespeares*. London: Routledge.
- Davidson, Peter (1997): "The Iconography of the Globe". In J.R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring, eds., *Shakespeare's Globe Rebuilt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (1992): "This Strange Institution Called Literature". In Derek Attridge, ed., *Acts of Literature*. London: Routledge.
- (1994): *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf. London, Routledge.
- Donne, John (1985): "Round earth's imagined corners": John Donne, "Holy Sonnet 7", in C.A. Patrides, ed., *The Complete English Poems of John Donne*. London: Dent.
- Fumerton, Patricia (1991): *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gillies, John (1994): *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenblatt, Stephen (1980): *Renaissance Self-Fashioning From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1988): *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hakluyt, Richard (1927): *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffics and Discoveries of the English Nation*, John Masefield, ed. London: Dent. vol. 6, 242-4.
- Hale, John (1993): *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance*. London: Harper Collins.
- Levin, Harry (1962): "Introduction". *The Comedy of Errors*. New York: Signet.
- Lupton, Julia (2011): *Thinking With Shakespeare: Essays on Politics and Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Marienstras, Richard (1985): *New Perspectives on the Shakespearean World*, trans. Janet Lloyd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacGregor, Neil (2012): *Shakespeare's Restless World*. London: Allen Lane.

- McLuhan, Marshal (1962): *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Montaigne, Michel de (1991): "Of Cannibals". *The Complete Essays of Michel de Montaigne*, trans. M.A. Screech. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Schulz, Juegen (1987): "Maps as Metaphors: Mural map cycles of the Italian Renaissance", in *Art and Cartography: Six Historical Essays*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tatlow, Anthony (2001): *Shakespeare, Brecht, and the Intercultural Sign*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Weimann, Robert (2000): *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yates, Frances (1969): *Theatre of the World*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.