Introduction

Tina Krontiris and Jyotsna Singh

T he study of "global" or "worldwide" Shakespeare has been on the critical agenda in recent years and has produced a number of very fascinating publications, including *World-Wide Shakespeares* (ed. S. Massai), *Shakespeare and Appropriation* (ed. C. Desmet and R. Sawyer), *Shakespeare without English* (ed. S. Chaudhuri and C.S. Lim) and *Native Shakespeares* (ed. C. Dionne and P. Kapadia), among many others. Following the current trend, these publications explore the intersections between local adaptation and appropriation, their audiences' cultural and social orientations, and larger, global movements and institutions, such as colonialism, neocolonialism, communism, or Hollywood and Bollywood, to name a few. These and related studies usually work with a conception of audience that is included in and sometimes conflated with the broader category of reception. In some cases a Shakespeare audience becomes identified by nationality—hence we have a German Shakespeare, a Japanese Shakespeare, an Indian Shakespeare and so on. In other instances we have the appearance of "European Shakespeares," defined by the differences as well as the similarities of a common European heritage (see Hoenselaars and Calvo).

Shakespeare Worldwide and the Idea of an Audience attends to this new critical focus on the formation of audiences by emphasizing the dynamic, fluid relationship between any cultural product based on Shakespeare and its targeted consumers, be they spectators in a theater/cinema or readers. It differs from other, related publications in that it insists on viewing "audience" not as a synonym for "reception" but as an aspect of it deserving special attention. It thus encompasses both the concerns of the cultural reception of Shakespeare worldwide and the more specific ones of theatrical reception—how the spectators viewing a Shakespeare performance in the auditorium relate to the conditions outside. Indeed, one thing that all of the essays in this collection have in common is that they address the issue of audience direct-

ly, often focusing on the stage-audience relationship in all its complexity. Our original intent was to collect essays from all areas of audience-targeted Shakespeare material—translations, annotations, adaptations, school editions, cinematic and stage productions—and from a wide range of chronological spans and geographical locations. For practical reasons we were unable to cover all of these areas, yet we think that the material at hand adequately represents the issues involved in discussing audience globally and over time.

In this collection we represent both a local and a "traveling Shakespeare," one who appears in varied cultures at distinct historical moments, ranging chronologically from the sixteenth century to the present and geographically from England through colonial and postcolonial India to nineteenth-century Greece; from early Soviet Ukraine to Communist Czechoslovakia and Communist Poland; from twentieth-century Italy to twentieth-century America, among others. In these journeys, we observe how audiences are mobilized to respond to a rich diversity of aesthetic goals and cultural agendas. The essays in this collection convey a sense of how audiences are formed via ideological and cultural struggles; and even as each of these essays has a relative autonomy, we hope that collectively they will generate a productive dialogue between the different parts, perhaps revealing various kinds of affiliations and schisms between different locations and historical moments. Thus "traveling Shakespeare" serves as a prism through which political movements and cultural formations from the sixteenth century to the present are illuminated.

In following these "travels" of Shakespeare in varied geographical locations, we map different formations of heterogeneity: on the one hand, we account for internal differences that inform audiences at any given time (considering variables such as class, gender, race, and so forth); on the other hand, we consider external factors such as nationalism, geography, war, religion, and economics. In this endeavor we try to understand how "performance texts . . . make themselves available to be 'read'" through the dynamic of the "conditions of reception, spatial and discursive, within and through which audiences perform those readings and negotiate what the works mean for them" (Knowles 20). From this we can extrapolate that reception is a highly mediated phenomenon and that the meaning of any theatrical production is determined via a process of negotiation that itself entails a whole range of factors. The entity called "audience" and its relationship to the performance is a very complex one in any case but especially in the case of Shakespeare.

Audiences in Shakespeare

In speaking about Shakespeare and audience there is no better place to start than the texts of the dramatist himself. Shakespeare never forgot that he is writing for the theater (only for the theater) and therefore never lost sight of those who "heard" his plays. Some of the best insights we have on the stage-audience relationship in the early modern period come from his dramatization of the process of theatrical rehearsal and performance. This is usually done in his favorite structural device—the play-within-the-play. We encounter it in *Hamlet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Taming of the Shrew* (via the framing epilogue) and elsewhere. These are parts of the drama and therefore fictive accounts. Quite often Shakespeare inserts addresses to the actual audience of his plays, usually in the Prologue or the Epilogue, creating a rich array of potentially interactive moments. In *Henry V* the Chorus beckons the audience to suspend their skepticism of dramatic illusion in the unfolding history before them; in *Troilus and Cressida* Pandarus attempts to draw the audience into the world of corporeal corruption by bequeathing them his "diseases;" in *Pericles* Gower serves as a choric observer, who guides and distances the audience's engagement with the mythic tale coming to life on stage; in *As You Like It* Rosalind, speaking as Ganymede in the Epilogue, offers to kiss "as many of you as had beards that pleased me," thus tantalizing the sexual fantasies of the male spectators; and in *Antony and Cleopatra* the Egyptian Queen draws attention to the boy-actor playing her part (when she metatheatrically exposes the moment he will "boy" her greatness), while facing a mob of spectators, thereby eliding the Romans in the play as well as the live audience watching Shakespeare's play.

Here we shall take an example from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. In the Epilogue of this play Puck, alone on stage, addresses the members of the audience and asks them to be lenient in judging the play. If you didn't like what you saw, he tells them, pretend that you had fallen asleep all this while and that "this weak and idle theme [was], / No more yielding but a dream." In any case, he adds, give us another chance and we will do better: "If you pardon we will mend." His promise for improvement (quite conventional) is apparently an important ploy, for he uses the word "mend" or "amend" four times in the course of his short epilogue. In this final metatheatrical moment Puck raises the spectators collectively to the level of a judge: they are the ones who will determine whether there will be another performance. He evokes a relationship with them that is at once interactive and suggestive of interdependence. The suggestion of interdependence is inherent in the eco-

nomic and social structures underlying the apology for a less satisfying product than expected and the idea of "mending," doing better in a system where art is used for entertainment and artists need spectators (patrons) to continue their performances and make their living. The interaction with the spectators attempted by Puck at the end does not give us a picture of the audience's response at that moment. Puck makes the conventional plea for applause and the metatheatrical piece ends there. A bird's eye view of the interaction between actors and audience is offered to us in the fifth act of the play, during the performance of "Pyramus and Thisbie," the play-within-the-play, which is attended by members of the Athenian court and spiced with their comments. Theseus finds fault with, among other things, the actors' way of creating the illusion of moonshine (5.1.237-238);[1] Lysander prompts the Moon to "proceed" (5.1.246); Demetrius commends the Lion for roaring well (5.1.254); Hippolyta expresses her boredom with the whole play and also criticizes the lack of logic in the sequence of events (5.1.241, 300). Although this is only a dramatic (fictive) account, it is still illuminating about the process of making meaning as well as about the kind of interactive relationships that may have taken place in the actual theater for which Shakespeare wrote. As Jean Howard astutely observes, "Shakespeare was partly writing with an eye to the potential responses of the audience; that is, as he orchestrated a play, he was indirectly orchestrating the theatrical experience of the viewer" (6). Theater historians have not ignored this aspect of the dramatist's craft in recreating the composition and behavioral patterns of Renaissance audiences (see Harbage; Gurr). Their inquiries, based also on more factual forms of evidence (stage design, demographics, cultural and religious attitudes etc.) have enabled us to imagine some of the interactive dynamics between actors and audiences—dynamics not only cued into the plays by strategies such as direct addresses and soliloquies, but also shaped by the cultural, religious, and social factors of the time.

The Audience-within-an-Audience: Concentric Formations

A consideration of the play-within-the-play inevitably leads to the idea of an audience-within-an-audience, which is related to other dramatic, theatrical and social structures in the Renaissance. We shall use the term "concentric audiences" to describe groups of viewers within larger groups and especially

---

1. The text we use for our references to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is *The Norton Shakespeare*, 1997.

to indicate the infinite possibilities of the suggested schema. (In geometry concentric circles are necessarily arranged from smaller to larger in infinite progression.) In Shakespeare there are several types of concentric audiences. At the very center of the dramatic construction we find what Sandra Logan calls the "internal mediator," a character who is given a staged audience within the play and implicitly serves as an interpreter for the actual audience outside the play. An example of such a figure is the protagonist in *King Henry V* when he addresses his troops before the gates of Harfleur, aiming through his rhetoric to inspire unity among his socially disparate soldiers. As Logan points out, his speech has a staged audience, which responds to it in a way that shows the dramatist's awareness of the disparity or heterogeneity among members of the actual audience.

Next, and most obviously, we have the play-within-the-play, which is concentrically positioned in relation to the larger play. We analyzed above Shakespeare's use of this structure in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and we mentioned several other instances where Shakespeare includes in many of his texts a play in miniature that has all the attributes of the larger play—a script, a stage space, actors and, of course, an audience in the presence of which it is performed. The play-within-the-play is part of a series of imitations within the same text, between the text and other texts, or between the text and the world (Taylor). By imitating the main play, the play-within-the-play offers an analogous situation to the theater outside the play. On the one hand it reminds the actual spectators that what they see on the stage is fictive, while on the other it suggests that the world of the smaller play, which constitutes a microcosm, forms an infinite number of other plays, other microcosms. It thus implies that if the entire world is a stage (Shakespeare's dictum), it also contains a number of concentric stages, along with their audiences. It is worth reminding ourselves here that the analogical conception of world order, the relationship of microcosm to macrocosm, was central to Renaissance political thought (the family was analogous to the commonwealth, the monarch analogous to the father, and so on). Renaissance cosmology was also informed by the same conception, as indicated by the theory of correspondences (Tillyard 87-100).

In so far as Renaissance theater is concerned, the idea of concentric audiences is best illustrated by the court masque, an extremely elaborate and highly symbolic form of royal entertainment. As Effie Botonaki shows in this volume, the seating arrangement of the audience at such performances suggested quite visibly the idea of an audience-within-an-audience. The king and his guests sat in the State, a raised platform under a canopy facing

the stage where the masquers performed. The State and its royal occupants constituted the immediate spectacle of the rest of the audience, while the elevated structure upon which they sat reinforced the idea of another stage. Suggestively, at the end of the performance, the masquers invited the audience to join them in a dance. This merging of performers and spectators could only be part of an ideal world for, as Botonaki observes, this was not a merging that could take place in the real world outside. The court that staged the masque was a secluded, protected one, not in harmony with the real world that posed a threat to its existence. Therefore, the idea of concentric audiences, as of concentric worlds, does not necessarily imply harmony. The comparison that their analogous positioning invites may in fact foreground disparities and tensions, as well as differences.

Concentric formations of audiences can be observed in more modern times as well, but their relationship to the original performance and to each other is quite different. Hana Worthen provides an interesting example in this volume. Pavel Kohout's *Play Makbeth*, an adaptation of Shakespeare's tragedy, was performed in 1978 in Communist Czechoslovakia by a dissident group of actors in the Prague apartment of the actress Chramostová. This was a "private" performance, visited frequently by the police, who had placed the particular group under surveillance. The audience of the live performance was necessarily small, including only a handful of friends, artists, and other intellectuals who heard about it by word of mouth, but there were other, extended audiences created by the original event. First, the performance was filmed and smuggled to Western countries, where it formed other audiences comprising intellectuals and playwrights who propagated the occasion and the ideas of the dissident performance. Then it was broadcast by an Austrian TV channel, which could be viewed not only by Austrians but also (illegally) by Czech citizens living in border areas. Furthermore, it was brought to the international stage by Tom Stoppard's *Cahoot's Macbeth* and the list continues. This process of (re)producing audiences could go on ad infinitum and could apply, of course, to any theatrical event, especially when it is aided by modern technology, which enables dissemination at a rapid speed. Significantly, in each of the concentric or extended audiences the factors governing the performance and its reception change. Hence spectatorial meaning changes as the performance moves across geographical and cultural borders and through different media (stage adaptation, film, radio, event reports, theater reviews, etc). The one thing all concentric audiences have in common is a reference to the original event and a dialogue that cuts across audiences. Indeed the dialogue created is not linear, between each au-

dience and the center/source, but triangulated and deflected in all sorts of ways, as Worthen shows. In the production or adaptation of Shakespeare the possibilities for establishing dialogical relationships are infinite because of the dynamics of the Shakespearean text.

The Idea of an Audience

So far we have been speaking about audience(s) without a working definition of the term. What is an audience, we might ask? The English word (from the Latin *audientia*) originally meant the act or state of hearing. This explains why in Shakespeare's time one went to "hear" rather than "see" a play. Today, the word audience brings to mind a mass of people gathered together to see or hear a spectacular or oratory performance. By itself, the word does not suggest any kind of a dynamic relationship between the members in the audience and what happens on the podium or stage. The word spectator (from the Latin *spectare*=to watch) also conjures up an image of passivity, as it focuses attention on the ocular object. These terms emphasize either the uniformity or the attentive character of the audience and its passive reception of the performance. Neither of the terms suggests any heterogeneity or dialectical relationship between the two entities, as Makaryk also notes in her essay here. This is highly problematic in our postmodern era, since it is widely conceded that, far from being passive, the spectator is crucially implicated in the making of the performance's meaning.

Reception theorists have explained in various ways what a text is; there is today a rich bibliography on the nature of the literary text and its relationship to the reader.[2] Much of this theory has been applied to the theatrical event, where the fully-fledged stage (script, design, lighting, movement etc) is seen as a "performance text" (De Marinis 47-48) and each member of the audience as the reader or decoder of that text. Like the readers of the literary text, the spectators construct meaning by decoding the performance signs against their individual backgrounds, or what reception theorists call "horizon of expectations." Modern studies of audience have accordingly explored the vari-

---

2. See for example, Umberto Eco, *The Role of the Reader* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979); Stanley Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980.
   Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, translated by Timothy Bahti (Mineapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982); Tony Bennett, "Text, Readers, Reading Formations," *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, vol. 16 (Spring 1983): 3-17.

ous factors that determine spectatorial meaning.[3] Ian Mackintosh in *Architecture, Actor & Audience* examines the effect of theater architecture on the flow of energy between actors and spectators and observes that it is "as much a mystery as is the matter of the play or the art of the player" (172); Daphna Ben Chaim in *Distance in the Theater: The Aesthetics of Audience Response* surveys a number of theories on the concept of "distance" and shows how they have been used to control the spectator's reaction to the performance; Susan Bennett in *Theater Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception* offers a complex conception of the role of the audience in the theatrical event and discusses a wide range of factors involved in forming the horizon of expectations that each spectator brings to the performance. In a more recent study entitled *Reading the Material Theater*, Ric Knowles analyzes the cultural and theatrical/material factors that shape the audience's perception and understanding of a staged play. We shall refer to the above studies and particularly to Knowles, who pays considerable attention to the location and culture where the play is produced (drawing on examples from several English-speaking counties) as well as to the cultural positioning of the spectator. Our purpose is to contribute towards an understanding of Shakespeare audiences at various times, geographical locations and material specificities.

The Formation of Shakespeare Audiences in the Theater

A theatrical audience is formed when a number of individuals gather together in a specific place to watch a performance prepared by a group of people, professional or amateur. Hence audience formation concerns the factors involved in a spectator's decision to attend a particular play. Susan Bennett states that the factors governing a theater group's selection of a play (availability, economics, geography and marketing) "clearly apply, albeit in different ways, both to those producing and those attending theater" (132). She does not, however, show what these "different ways" are or how they change in relation to cultural, historical and geographical context. Shakespeare is mentioned only very briefly in relation to received cultural conceptions (104-105); occasional discussions of him concern primarily the ability of the spectators to perceive the signs during the performance of a

---

  3. The preoccupation with the role of the spectator in the creation of a performance's meaning is not, however, an exclusively postmodern phenomenon. As Makaryk discusses in this volume, Mikhail Zagorsky and Les Kurbas took up the subject extensively in the 1920s.

Shakespeare play (103-104), not what draws them to it in the first place. We need to know how Shakespeare audiences are formed before we discuss their meaning-making process in the auditorium.

One way to think about the formation of a Shakespeare audience is the way Michael Dobson suggests in the first part of his essay here, that is, as a history of the reception process that begins in 1623 with the publication of the First Folio (which directly addresses its readers and urges them to buy Shakespeare's works) and branches out in time globally to include both live audiences and readers of his works, both theater and criticism. In this broad sense Shakespeare is the author who addresses a worldwide audience seven years after his demise to the present time. This is the broad sense of audience, almost synonymous to reception, which has informed the study of Shakespeare's afterlife in many cultures across time, as we explained above. Here, however, we focus on the theatrical meaning of audience and, drawing evidence and ideas from the essays in our collection, attempt to address specific questions. Why do people go to see a Shakespeare play? How does the production of a Shakespeare play interrelate with spatial, geographical, cultural and political conditions? How does the bard's iconicity in a specific culture intermingle with other factors that determine spectatorial meaning?

For the sake of illustration we shall list a number of performances that are mentioned in this volume but are otherwise unconnected. In 1623, the year of the publication of Shakespeare's First Folio, a non-professional performance of *Henry IV*, parts 1 and 2, took place at Sir Edward Dering's house in Surrenden, Kent. It was the first domestic performance on English soil, and the initiative for the performance belonged to Dering himself, who produced the play script with the help of a scribe. The place of performance was the hall of the house and the audience included Dering's family and friends (Dobson). In 1774 a non-professional performance of *The Winter's Tale* was presented by an all-female cast in Salisbury. The performance was put together by Gertrude and Louisa Harris, sisters, who took up the main roles. The place of performance was the Chapel Room in the Salisbury Cathedral Close. The audience included members of the local community (Dobson). In 1848 a professional performance of *Othello*, the first to use an Indian actor in the title role, was staged by an English group in Calcutta. The place of performance was the Sans Souci Theater, established by the English colonials. The audience comprised Europeans and Indians (Bhatia). In 1866 a professional performance of *Hamlet* took place in Athens at the rundown Athens Theater. It was the first Greek production of a Shakespeare play, and it was done by a group of self-taught actors, who also took their

plays to the Greek-speaking communities of the Asia Minor coast. The audience included middle class Athenians and some students but none from the upper classes (Yanni). In 1924 a professional performance of *Macbeth*, directed by Les Kurbas, was staged in the capital of the Soviet Ukraine. The place of performance was the Berezil Artistic Association. The audience was mixed, including peasants, workers and intellectuals from various ethnic and geographical backgrounds. It was unique in that it asked spectators to describe their response in a questionnaire (Makaryk).

Before commenting on the formation of audiences, we should say something about the formation of the theater groups. Even a cursory look at these performances tells us that the conventional divisions of private/ public and amateur/professional are blurred. Edward Dering and the Greek actors are both self-taught. Through practice, they both improve. What makes the Greek actors "professional" is mainly the commercial nature of their enterprise, the fact that they perform for a living. The privacy of Dering's performances, like the privacy of Chramostová's Apartment Theater, is made public through the idea of extended audiences that Hana Worthen explains in her essay. Dering was a dissident, reading Shakespeare's history plays subversively. His performances, which "resembled a semi-public debate" (Dobson), would not stay within the walls of his house but would soon spread to the larger community. Chramostová's performances were videotaped and exported to the West, thus creating other, larger audiences, as already explained. It seems, then, that the categories professional/amateur, private/public and popular/elite, which are institutionally constructed as binaries, in actuality are very much interrelated under specific conditions.

The kind of audience formations we have in the above examples depend on the social, geographical and political context of the productions. In the Surrenden and Salisbury cases Shakespeare is performed not because he is Shakespeare but because of the possibilities that his plays offer in creating a specific atmosphere. Hence it is not his name that would be expected to attract audiences but the occasion itself and the group of performers. The Shakespeare audience here is created or produced by the performers who look for an interesting and tantalizing play, suitable for their purposes, and they find such a play in Shakespeare. In nineteenth-century performances the factors expectedly change. In colonial Culcutta we have a hegemonic culture introducing a hegemonic bard, who has meanwhile become the symbol of European civilization. Attendance at a Shakespeare play here carried a special significance. For the Indians it meant acquiring respectability and acceptance into European culture (Bhatia). For the colonials it was an opportunity to

create bridges: that an Indian actor played the major role was in itself a sign of invitation for collaboration and a symbolic link between the two cultures. In the Greek case Shakespeare could not as yet impart respectability because he entered Greek culture through the popular ranks, through the self-taught actors who were looked-down upon and avoided by the socially superior. Shakespeare could, however, offer a sense of Europeaness to the rising middle classes, the future bourgeoisie, who frequented the performances of his plays (Yanni). In the minds of these people, Yanni tells us, Shakespeare was identified with European modernization against the traditionalism of the East. Hence attending a Shakespeare performance was a kind of initiation ritual into European citizenship. Yet, as Ric Knowles has recently shown, the same performance could mean different things in different geographical locations. When the self-taught Greek actors took Shakespeare to Constantinople, a cosmopolitan city with a vibrant Greek population at the time, a more mixed audience was formed, including spectators from all social and economic strata. The Greeks of Constantinople, part of the Asia Minor diaspora under Turkish rule, went to see Shakespeare because his plays were performed by a company of traveling Greek actors, who symbolized freedom and a connection with the motherland (Yanni). Therefore, it was the Greekness of the company more than the Europeanness of Shakespeare that attracted the audiences to the performances of plays like *Hamlet* and *Othello* in such locations.

The formation of a Shakespeare audience at the Berezil is related to factors like the identity of the theater company and the reputation of its director, who was known for his innovations. The majority of the Ukranians who saw the *Macbeth* production, Makaryk informs us, were familiar with the work of the Berezil; they went to see Les Kurbas' latest creations and to encourage the Art Association he headed. The heterogeneity of the audience of that production is a factor of the political situation (early Soviet pressures for a proletariat-based theater) as well as of the director's efforts to make his performance comprehensible to all and to prove this to the Communist Party (Makaryk). Hence in discussing the formation of Shakespeare audiences within political structures that constrain the theater we necessarily have a change of terms.

Constraints on Audiences: Censorship

Censorship, or the control of plays and performances by a higher political or military authority, is based on the idea that theater is not just a form of entertainment but a social practice that can profoundly affect public sentiment and opinion. And this idea is not a modern invention. In so far as Shakespeare is

2

concerned, it existed in his own time, as both Elizabeth and James tried to place theater under their patronage and control. The mechanism and agencies of censorship in the Elizabethan and Jacobean state have been well documented. We know, for instance, the course of the play scrip from the Office of the Master of the Revels to the playhouse. Less known, perhaps because less verifiable, is the degree of strictness with which censorship was applied or the exact effect it had on play scripts and performances. The consensus seems to be that censorship was not exhaustive and that the censor's rapport with the theater companies was not a cat-and-mouse relationship. Still less known are any possible effects censorship may have had on those who attended the performances. From the available evidence it appears that censorship was a form of control that affected primarily the agents of the performance—the author, the theater company, the shareholders, the actors and the theater manager. When *Richard II* was performed on the eve of the Essex insurrection in 1601, Shakespeare's company was called in for interrogation, but as far as we know, none of those who attended the performance (apart from Essex's supporters) were called to account. In more modern forms of censorship, however, the members of the audience are not considered innocent. Whether under a foreign occupier, a military dictatorship, or any other form of totalitarian government, the spectators are implicated in the production and are therefore subject to prosecution, though to a lesser extent than the performers.

In many situations where censorship is applied the censor does not sit in an office, removed from the place of performance but quite vigilantly watches the performance and "reads" it carefully in order to detect signs or meanings subversive to the ideological system he serves. Thus he becomes a member of the audience, reading in the opposite direction the signs on the stage as well as on the faces of the other spectators. This was the situation in Communist countries of Eastern Europe, represented in this volume by the essays of Irena Makaryk, Anna Cetera and Hana Worthen. Makaryk states that in the early Soviet period theater companies and their directors "were open to attack, dismissal, arrest, and execution," and she illustrates the strenuous efforts of Les Kurbas, director of the Berezil Artistic Association in Ukraine, to prove to the Communist Party that his Shakespeare performances could be attended and understood by a proletarian audience. Cetera comments on the inability of the Polish censoring authorities to control cultural memory and the simultaneous ability of Shakespeare as an Elizabethan "to slip out of the censors' hands." Worthen shows that censorship could take an extreme form in certain phases of Communist rule. The performance of *Play Makbeth* at Chramostová's apartment in 1978 was imme-

diately affected by the entrance of the State Police who actually became its "circumstantial 'audience'."

A performance that takes place under political surveillance does not constitute an exception to the rule of free and independent theater; on the contrary it can illuminate the complex nature of the audience-performance relationship and the infinite possibilities of the negotiating process involved in the creation of meaning. The figure of the censor, whether physically present in the performance or not, becomes part of the signification system. One cannot watch without being watched; one cannot react to what he/she sees without a glance at or thought of the censoring authority. Sometimes what the spectators see on the stage is as important as what they see at the entrance door or outside the theater before and after the performance.

The papers referred to above deal with dissident productions within a totalitarian political system and therefore give us a glimpse of what it means to go to the theater and see a Shakespeare play in extreme conditions. One of the things we observe is that under such conditions the spectators cannot attend a performance in a relaxed manner but must constantly be on the alert, ready to develop strategies that will enable them to decode the performance. The decoding starts even before going to see the play. Take, for example, the dissident performances of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *All's Well That Ends Well* in the early 1970s in Krakow, as discussed by Anna Cetera. The spectators of these performances, most of them students or members of the intelligentsia, knew that Stary Theater where the performances took place was loaded with signification. This theater had participated in the challenging, oppositional theater of the 1950s when strictures had relaxed after Stalin's death, and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, so important to the Poles, had been staged there in a dissident interpretation in 1956. Anna Cetera tells us that in later, stricter times the spirit of the place haunted both spectators and censors. So going to watch a dissident *Dream* at the Stary in the early 1970s was like a trip to the past. Because of what had happened in Polish theater in the 1950s, Shakespeare had remained in cultural memory as a rebel dramatist. This strong, oppositional image of Shakespeare aided the spectators of Stary Theater in approaching the performance of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in 1970 (Cetera).

In such performances the behavioral patterns of the audience, its mood and reactions, develop as a response to censorship. A striking example is the function of silence. In a normal situation, complete silence among the audience could denote variously indifference, stupefaction or bafflement. In the case of the Stary Theater just mentioned, however, silence was a positive

quality and indicated approval. As Anna Cetera explains, silent watching during the performance, like patient waiting before it, signified the desire of the spectators to comprehend and to submit themselves to the performance. Encouraging this attitude, the director usually helped his audience by the addition of extratextual material, such as mimed parts. Such cases prove that censorship does not hamper audience participation but profoundly affects the modes of audience behaviour and becomes, necessarily, a strong mediating factor in meaning making during the performance.

Ironically, then, extreme situations develop people's reflexes. Audiences do not become passive under the gaze of the censor. On the contrary, they engage more intently in the performance, devising ways to participate mentally in the act of dissidence or subversion that the performance constitutes by its very identity (by the place it is performed in, the type of plays it stages, the kind of work the director is known for, the type of audience it attracts). This silent participation strengthens the bond between audience and performance. It is as if there is an invisible "energy flowing" (to use Mackintosh's term) or complicity between the two. This explains, perhaps, the paradox that Anna Cetera mentions, that the theater in Poland flourished at a time it was least expected to do so. Shakespeare here simply provided a link with the dissident past as well as with the idea that ideological opposition and high artistic quality are perfectly compatible.

Audience Response and Ideological Negotiations: Global Contexts

As stated earlier, audience response, despite the immediacy of experience, is a highly mediated process involving a certain dynamic. Nandi Bhatia's description of this dynamic, as it concerns Shakespeare's reception in India, can be applied more broadly to explain how audience experiences both generate and are a part of larger ideological struggles: "The varied colonialist, alternative, nationalist, and commercial investments in 'doing' Shakespeare [in India] have positioned his plays as suitable subject matter for spectators in order to generate responses that simultaneously sustain, elevate and deflate Shakespeare, claim Shakespeare as 'Indian', a prized cultural possession, and an object of viewing pleasure [for example in film versions] that signifies cultural modernity." If Shakespeare is deployed to create these varied effects in Indian audiences, it follows that audience responses are segmented along racial, economic, linguistic, class and caste lines. Such divisions, as articulated in Bhatia's essay, can serve as a useful paradigm that interrogates the commonplace construction of an imaginary

audience's uniform love for Shakespeare's plays, while challenging the traditional notion of the bard's universality, which presupposes a shared set of attitudes, beliefs and values.

Like Nandi Bhatia, Mara Yanni also demonstrates the divisions in the appropriation of Shakespeare across class lines in nineteenth-century Greek productions. Competing claims on the English poet as cultural capital, she informs us, emerged in the struggle involving a European-oriented ruling elite, the traveling groups of low class Greek actors and an emerging middle class audience. While the national project of the Greek state was to Europeanize the nation according to an Enlightenment model, the performative practices of the theater groups drew on the "expressive and affective components of their Greek audiences" to promote a popular aesthetics of tradition and modernity that countered any notion of singular, Europeanized high culture. These practices clearly undermined the Enlightenment rules of order and balance, thus eliciting the contempt of the social elite, who despised the performances of the self-taught actors. Through these cultural struggles, however, as Yani demonstrates in her case study of *Hamlet* productions from 1866 onwards, Greek audiences were educated in "European citizenship." Similar cultural struggles for the appropriation of Shakespeare took place on the Calcutta stage between the elite culture of the rulers and the competing representations of the natives in their production of *Othello*, as Bhatia shows. Interestingly, however, in the Bollywood *Othello*, the non-elite, non-urban masses had their revenge as the setting of the play moves into the native Indian heartland, the staple of the populist Hindi formula films.

Inter-cultural, intra-cultural, or nationalistically inscribed Shakespeare productions and appropriations in these essays clearly indicate that there is no homogenous audience expressing a singular love for the bard. Sonia Massai in *World-Wide Shakespeares* also reinforces the sense of fluidity in the audience's experiences and interpretations of the bard, designating "Shakespeare as a global cultural field" (6). Drawing on theoretical formulations of Bourdieu, she describes this field in terms of a "dynamic interaction between established modes of critical and theatrical production and innovative strategies of appropriation" (6). What she distinctively draws from Bourdieu is the articulation that the "literary or artistic fields are characterized … by the extreme permeability of their boundaries and the extreme diversity of the posts they offer" (Bourdieu qtd. in Massai 6).

Film audiences. In the early twenty-first century, with proliferating appropriations and adaptations of Shakespeare on stage and the media, the flu-

idity and permeability of boundaries between these diverse forms is evident. In fact, to understand the full scope of the heterogeneity of audiences and the conditions of reception that shape the viewers' responses, let us turn to some adaptations/appropriations of Shakespeare on film and television. In an important study entitled *Shakespeare, the Movie*, Lynda Boose and Richard Burt argue that the study of "Shakespeare on film" addresses "the interplay between the discourses of Shakespeare criticism, film studies, performance criticism, and cultural studies," and in doing so raises "questions about Shakespeare's status as legitimating author-function, about the relation between the original and adaptation . . . and about the relation between the popular as hip and popular as politically radical"(1-2). These issues also involve a recognition that a film for the screen or television involves a different kind of negotiation with audiences, and in some sense the construction of a particular audience is structured into a film (in terms of particular demographic groups, for instance) in ways that do not apply to live audiences in a theater.

Several essays in this collection take up examples of film appropriations of Shakespeare as they address some of these issues, namely, the relation between original and adaptation, between ideas of the popular and classical, between urban and rural audiences, between generations—all in relation to the variability of audience responses within different cultural milieus. In doing so, they also point out the permeability of boundaries between illusion and reality which the audiences have to negotiate and find some point of entry into the unfolding actions before them. Mariangela Tempera, for instance, in her essay on Italian re-writings of *Othello* for the screen and television, offers (as one example) a fascinating account of Pasolini's short feature *Che cosa sono le nuvole?* (What are the Clouds?). This 22-minute film, which was shot in one week in 1967, is set in a run-down theater where a company of life-size puppets perform *Othello* in front of "a boisterous, naïve audience." Just as important as the named actors are the extras playing the role of the fictive audience. They are non-professionals, selected in Roman slums to play themselves: a group of urban poor, entire families and others. Initially the fictive audiences of the urban poor are prepared to let Iago the trickster fashion their responses to the play but after the love duet between the newly-wed, according to Tempera, the "'spectators' shift allegiances and do not want any real harm to come to them." While the cinema audience consists of middle class viewers, the fictive audience (played by real slum dwellers playing themselves) points to some interesting class divisions among these two audiences. However, responses in terms of racial

difference are another matter. We learn from the critic that "the totally [racially] homogenous society of the 1960s" probably did not evoke specifically racialized responses to Iago's derogatory, racist slurs in the play in either setting. More importantly, however, the real-life middle class spectators who had gone to see the film probably found "*Clouds* a bit too silly for their tastes, but enjoyed feeling superior to the fictive audience who could not see the blatantly comic aspects of the puppets' performance" (Tempera). Here Pasolini's metadramatic style allows the middle class audiences to see how responses to the film may divide the audiences along class lines.

Nandi Bhatia in her essay on four different appropriations of Shakespeare in this volume discusses another somewhat "extreme" and innovative film adaptation of *Othello*—this time in a Bollywood production entitled *Omkara*. Here the story is completely removed from its European, North African, and Turkish contexts, and Shakespeare's master plot is set in Uttar Pradesh (an Indian province) and transmuted into the local conflicts of clan rivalries and contests over caste and gender. Bhatia demonstrates how local and regional contexts, the familiar fare of the Hindi formula film, are given a global dimension: the film uses its association with Shakespeare to accumulate cultural capital and "relies upon the prior familiarity of spectators with the Shakespearean text for its global success, visibility and marketability." These critical negotiations with the original text—appealing to both local, regional Indian audiences and a global market for Shakespeare—nonetheless finesse an interculturism that evades any acknowledgement of the divisions between audiences in rural and urban areas, as well as between India and the West.

Xenia Georgopoulou explores two film appropriations of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* as they construct audiences within a single generation of viewers in North America, Generation X. The two films are Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* and Lloyd Kaufman's *Tromeo and Juliet*, both produced in 1996. Georgopoulou discusses the appeal of these productions among the "youth culture" of the period and questions the overwhelming popularity of Luhrmann's *Romeo* in contrast to Kaufman's *Tromeo*, which is generally reviewed as a "bad taste flick." She adheres to the few critics who view the former as a conservative idealization of love and value the latter because it challenges the young lovers' parents' bourgeois ideology as well as the mass media through which it is expressed.

As the above evidence shows, the recent proliferation of adaptations and appropriations of Shakespeare on stage and screen have put a dent in the Eurocentric claims of a "classic" Shakespeare with its assumptions on the shared values of a singular audience. What these essays demonstrate is that

the bard's plays can appear in unlikely places and manifestations and can perform a variety of cultural and ideological tasks on a global-local nexus. There can be as many Shakespeares as there are audiences in the world, in differing cultural formations and historical contexts. Thus, while one can no longer predict outcomes of particular productions—progressive, conservative, elitist, or populist—our "travels" with Shakespeare (as we take on the guise of various audiences) can prove richly rewarding.

Works Cited

Bennett, Susan. *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Boose, Lynda and Richard Burt. *Shakespeare, the Movie: Popularizing the Plays on Flm, TV, and Video*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Chaim, Daphna Ben. *Distance in the Theatre: The Aesthetics of Audience Response*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1984.

Chaudhuri, Sukanta and Chee Seng Lim, eds. *Shakespeare without English: the Reception of Shakespeare in Non-Anglophone Countries*. Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2006.

De Marinis, Marco. *The Semiotics of Performance*. Trans. Aine O'Healy. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Desmet, Christy and Robert Sawyer, ed. *Shakespeare and Appropriation*. London: Routledge: 1999.

Dionne, Craig and Parmita Kapadia, eds. *Native Shakespeares: Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*. London: Palgrave, forthcoming.

Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Harbage, Alfred. *Shakespeare's Audience*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Hoenselaars, Ton and Clara Calvo, eds. *European Shakespeares*, special section in *The Shakespearean International Yearbook*, vol. 8. Ed. Graham Bradshaw and Tom Bishop. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Press, forthcoming.

Homan, Sidney. *Shakespeare's Theatre of Presence: Language, Spectacle and the Audience.* London & Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1986.

Howard, Jean. *Shakespeare's Art of Orchestration: Stage Technique and Audience Response*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Knowles, Ric. *Reading the Material Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Mackintosh, Ian. *Architecture, Actor & Audience.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Massai, Sonia, ed. *World-wide Shakespeares: local appropriations on film and performance*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Shakespeare, William, *The Norton Shakespeare Complete Works.* Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.

Taylor, Mark. *Shakespeare's Imitations*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002.

Tillyard, E.M.W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. New York: Vantage Books, 1943.