

Singularities

a transdisciplinary biannual research journal

Vol. 1 Issue 2 January 2014

Postgraduate Department of English

Korambayil Ahamed Haji Memorial

UNITY WOMEN'S COLLEGE

Manjeri, Malappuram, Kerala.

www.singularities.in

Chief Editor

P. K. Babu., Ph. D
Associate Professor & Head
Postgraduate Dept. of English
KAHM Unity Women's College, Manjeri.

Members:

Dr. K. K. Kunhammad, Asst. Professor, Dept. of
Studies in English, Kannur University

Mammad. N, Asst. Professor, Dept of English,
Govt. College, Malappuram.

Dr. Priya. K. Nair, Asst. Professor, Dept. of
English, St. Teresa's College, Eranakulam.

Aswathi. M . P., Asst. Professor, Dept of English,
KAHM Unity Women's College, Manjeri.

Advisory Editors:

Dr. V. C. Haris
School of Letters, M.G. University Kottayam

Dr. M. V. Narayanan, Assoc. Professor, Dept of
English, University of Calicut.

Editor's Note

The Bard refuses to fade away, despite the perception that his influence and others interest in him is on the wane. On the other hand, William Shakespeare seems to be thriving on the post 60s theory backed appropriations, spreading into New Media in varied avatars when the globe celebrates the 450th birth anniversary. From Jess Winfield's 'My Name is Will' to the 'Lion King' which vaguely echoes a Shakespeare plot line, this is what the readers realise. William Shakespeare may not be the 'inventor' of the 'Human' but he still holds the attention of readers, scholars and artistically minded as the facilitator of thoughts and the catalyst of concepts. This is an effort to gauge the academic interactions with the Bard as the world employs the 450th anniversary to further reweigh William Shakespeare's contemporary status.

P. K. Babu., Ph. D
Chief Editor

Contents

1. **Josy Joseph** 07-13
Shakespeare in the 21st Century:
Poetics, Politics, and Prospects
2. **Mary Haritha. M.C** 14-31
Macbeth Retranslations in Malayalam: A Contextual Analysis
3. **Sarah R. Wakefield** 32-37
Teaching Mythology via Titus Andronicus
4. **Saptarshi Roy** 38-43
Old Bard, New Wounds: Shakespeare,
Liberties and Impossible Global Stage
5. **Indrani Das Gupta** 44-50
Gossips and Songs: Emergence of 'Subculture' in Othello
6. **Parvin Sultana** 51-57
Indigenizing Shakespeare: A study of Maqbool and Omkara
7. **Joveeta Justin** 58-64
Renouncing the Bard: Problematizing Shakespearian
Authorship in Roland Emmerich's Anonymous (2011)
8. **Dr. S. Kumaran** 65-70
Lunacy versus Love: An Analysis of Shakespeare's Sonnets
9. **Salu D' Souza** 71-76
The Comparison of Shakespeare's '
The Tempest' and the Unheard Saga of Indian Diaspora
10. **Hyrun Fathima Nousheen** 77-81
Shakespeare's Villains Are Stereotypes:
Progressing Towards Humanness
11. **Azeen Ratheesan** 82-86
As You Like It?:
Shakespeare in the Kerala Secondary School Classroom
12. **Silpa Anand S** 87-89
Echoing the Bard: Shakespearean Allusions in Animated Narratives
13. **Preethi Sara Joseph** 90-94
Rekindling the Old Flame: A New Pedagogy of the Universal Master
14. **Hiren J. Patel** 95-105
Translation as Negotiation:
N.P.Dave's Denmark no Rajkumar, Hamlet (1917).
15. **Manju.V.V.** 106-111
Indianizing the Bard:
A Diachronic Study of Shakespeare Reception in India
16. **Maya Davi Chalissery** 112-115
'I Am A Man More Sinn'd Against Than Sinning': An Evaluation

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 17. Abja G Rasheed | 116-124 |
| Shakespeare's Tragedies Rejuvenated: Manifestations in
Different Theatre Movements | |
| 18. Neelima V. | 125-127 |
| Myriad Shades of Motherhood:
Infanticide as a Maternal Agency in Macbeth | |
| 19. Parvathy. G | 128-132 |
| What's in a Name; Hamlet, The Lion King of Pride Lands
and Romeo and Juliet in Zombie World of Warm Bodies- a Study on
Unconventional Appropriations of Shakespeare in Modern Culture . | |
| 20. Shanu Mary William | 133-136 |
| Shakespeare through the Lens:
A Socio- Cultural Study of Hamlet Adaptations | |
| 21. Shyama Ramsamy & Shashi Kumar S. B. | 137-146 |
| Shakespeare's Appropriations: Polyphony | |
| 22. Sini.K. | 147-150 |
| Comic Anagrorisis in Shakespeare-
A Reading Of Goodnight Desdemona (Good Morning Juliet) | |
| 23. Dr.Abubakkar K.K | 151-156 |
| Enigma in Representation of the Other:
a Critical Analysis of Shakespeare's Othello. | |

Shakespeare in the 21st Century: Poetics, Politics, and Prospects

(Keynote Address delivered at the Two-day National seminar on Shakespeare Continuum, at KAHM Unity Women's College, Manjeri on 12 August 2014)

This year, Shakespeare's 450th birth anniversary is celebrated the world over. And two years from now, we will be commemorating his 400th death anniversary as well. It's the Shakespeare season, so to say. All over the world, there are various programmes and projects underway to mark the occasion. One important global event is the touring Hamlet initiative of the Globe Theatre that will take a stripped-down version of the play to every country in the world. The tour involves a portable set and a 12-person, multicultural cast. Last Tuesday (05 August), there was a special performance inside a chamber in the UN headquarters at New York for some 500 guests, against a backdrop of real world crises in Gaza and the Ukraine (more on this later). The tour's goal is to visit 205 nations and territories in seven continents. It has already performed in places as diverse as opera halls, market places and beaches, hopes to visit all the world's countries, including Iraq, North Korea and Syria. They also hope to perform in the West Bank, though no firm plans have been announced. They will be coming to India as well. The journey began in London on April 23--the Bard's 450th birthday--and has already made stops from Amsterdam to Prague, Cyprus to Ukraine. It concludes at its home theatre on April 23, 2016 - the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's death.

Anniversaries are also good occasions for stock taking. And as part of the process, we need to raise the following questions: What accounts for Shakespeare's preeminence? How did he become the biggest literary icon, the biggest cultural brand in history? Will he continue to be as relevant or influential as before? Where will Shakespeare be in the 21st century?

Let's take the first question concerning his greatness and unique stature. The widely held view is that Shakespeare is the greatest writer ever, and that he was a genius with unparalleled abilities, and that he had an unusual insight into and understanding of what is called 'human nature', and that there is very little in the broad spectrum of humanity that he hasn't touched upon, or possibility of life he hasn't represented. In the range of characters, life situations, emotional states, and knowledge-- bookish or experiential-- he has something or the other for every occasion. This enormous scope, the sheer ability to speak to and for all human beings for all times and for all places is what underscores his universal validity. What I have just outlined is a typical specimen of bardolatry. And it raises a lot of problems too.

By the way, that portmanteau term was coined by Bernard Shaw, with ironic and sarcastic intent. And in the last four centuries, it has been an unending competition among Shakespeare enthusiasts to outdo one another in terms of showering praises on the bard. Ben Jonson began it, and except for a few like Tolstoy, Voltaire, or Shaw himself, most people have subscribed to the consensus. One of my favourite lines of bardolatry is by Edward Gibbon, the great 18th century historian, who referred to "the idolatry for the gigantic genius of Shakespeare, which is inculcated from our infancy as the first duty of Englishmen". Even somebody like Harold Bloom talks about how Shakespeare's multiplicity far exceeds that of Dante or Chaucer. In his book, *The Western Canon* (1994), Bloom places Shakespeare at the

centre of the canon, and argues how the creator of Hamlet and Falstaff, Rosalind and Cleopatra, Iago and Lear, differs in degree as well as in kind. Shakespeare excels all other Western writers in cognitive acuity, linguistic energy, and power of invention. It may be that all three endowments fuse in an ontological passion that is capacity for joy, or what Blake meant by his Proverb of Hell: *exuberance is beauty*". One of the problems here in *The Western Canon*, is that the canon is Western, of course. A few years later, he stretched the logic further, and argued that 'human nature' as we understand it today is a Shakespearean invention. His 800 page book *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (1998) is an attempt to prove it. It's indeed a surprising thought to come from a brilliant theorist who was once an important member of the Yale School of Deconstructionists, who wrote *The Anxiety of Influence*, a book that shaped the sensibility of a whole generation of readers and critics.

Not all theorists would agree with Harold Bloom on the notion of 'human nature', even less on the Shakespearean claim. Shakespeare's universalism, in this sense, presupposes a singular, cogent, consistent human nature valid across time, place, and culture. However, from the middle of the 19th century, if not before, serious questions have been raised about the existence of a 'given' innate, and unchanging 'human nature'. And the advent of theory in the last quarter of the previous century only sealed the argument with irrefutable evidence. The work of philosophers, historians, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists and others has proved that a good deal of human behaviour, morality, religious belief, and social ordering is shaped by our response to local pressures of a more immediate, physical, and material sort, involving economics, climate, history, and the whole complex of culture, including beliefs, practices, and modes of perception.

We now know how ideology works, both in society and on the individual. Since it is impossible to resist our own culture's direct and indirect impositions, we all end up as ideologically constituted subjects. And language perhaps is the most obvious and effective instrument and terrain of ideological subjection. Our way of speaking invariably colludes with the way we see the world, making both (seeing and talking about it) look natural, normal, appropriate etc. One of the arguments of Poststructuralist theory is that in the Western discourse, what is very often paraded as human nature is in reality a Western, European, Christian, Male category. As Terence Hawkes points out in an essay on Shakespeare's afterlife, seen in this light, claims made for Shakespeare's universal qualities, his capacity to penetrate to the core of every aspect of human life, may well come to appear faintly bogus. When, in addition, we take into account the fact that one English-speaking culture or another has for some time possessed sufficient power in the world to insist on widespread acknowledgement of its universality, the whole thing ends up as a 'construct'.

In the last century, two of the most important early names associated with Shakespeare studies were Bradley and Tillyard. (It's a very long list including, among others, Dover Wilson, Wilson Knight, Dowden, Caroline Spurgeon, E K Chambers, E E Stoll.). The defining sensibility was that of bardolatry in general, with Shakespeare's universalist claim intact. However in 1985 came *Political Shakespeare*, a collection of essays that completely changed the way Shakespeare was looked at. This book, edited by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, inaugurated Cultural Materialism, and along with the critical series of *Alternative Shakespeares* (Vol 1 in 1985 edited by John Drakakis), conjoined the world of Shakespeare studies with the rigour and clinical analysis of Poststructural theory. Stephen Greenblatt, the founder of New Historicism, with his significant writings (including

Renaissance Self-fashioning: from More to Shakespeare) contributed to this paradigm shift whereby Shakespeare was contextualised, historicised, and problematised. Suddenly, instead of Universalist claims about transcendent human nature, and in place of global conscience, we began to see the specificities of such variables as gender, race, class, culture etc. Other theorists who helped this paradigm shift include, among many others, Terence Hawkes, Diana Henderson, Leonard Tennenhouse, Graham Holderness, Francis Baker, Peter Hulme, and Patricia Parker.

So much so that after reading a 'political Shakespeare' or any of the many 'alternative Shakespeares', even a Bradley or Tillyard appears very naive. In fact, both Bradley and Tillyard appear particularly naive, not so much for their interpretations or arguments, but for the air of finality and determinism with which they were expressed.

Let's go back to the question raised early: How will Shakespeare fare in the 21st century? Making predictions about the future is always problematic, especially when the present is moving as fast as it does. But it is still possible to recognise signposts and suggest reasonable directions.

Many feel that the prime of his influence has already passed. It lasted for just a century, between 1870 and 1970. Most Shakespeare scholars are realistic about it and democratically admit that he won't dominate or determine the cultural landscape as decisively as he did until now. The reasons: one, the sensibility of the new generation is all the more visual and sensory than literary. And Shakespeare's language will be even further removed from theirs and it will be difficult for them to relate to his lines or diction. Unlike the previous generation, the next generation may not have to compulsorily study Shakespeare. If at all he is there in the curriculum, it may not be to the same extent or nature. Moreover, the culture that encouraged people to memorise whole passages and speeches is no longer there. Any educated person of a previous generation could easily quote several lines from Shakespeare. The new generation hardly knows any.

But that doesn't mean Shakespeare will become irrelevant or insignificant. He will continue to be a major cultural icon, but the terms of engagement will certainly differ. Academic responses to Shakespeare will continue and vary. There will be new discoveries—factual, historical, and textual. More reassessments, readings, editions, etc will happen. Cultural responses will also continue with more adaptations, appropriations, translations, recreations, so on and so forth. The Shakespearean text will continue to find its way to newer forms, such as mobile applications, video games, audio files, advertisements, popular music etc. Shakespeare will be accessed by other means than the printed form, such as movies, ballets, live theatre and Shakespearean tourism and festivals.

It's interesting to recall here the role the academia has played in establishing Shakespeare's cultural pre-eminence. Alan Sinfield has made a brilliant study on this. It is given as one of the essays of *Political Shakespeare*, and has a curious title: "Give an account of Shakespeare and Education, showing why you think they are effective and what you have appreciated about them. Support your comments with precise references." The essay opens with the argument that any social order has to include the conditions for its own continuance, and capitalism and patriarchy do this partly through the education system. Sinfield sees how Shakespeare becomes the keystone that guarantees the ultimate stability and rightness of the category 'literature'. He goes on to analyse all those Shakespeare questions asked at various

examinations and locates an ideological pattern in them.

Talking about education, it is interesting to note that even in prisons, inmates who pursue educational opportunities regularly find lessons about Shakespeare and his plays. *Julius Caesar* is one of the works regularly used in American and European prisons to introduce inmates to literature and learning. The plot and themes involve murder, political treachery and justice—just the things that people in prisons would relate to and be interested in.

Here I want to draw your attention to a brilliant Italian movie made just a couple of years ago. (I watched it last year at a film festival). It's titled *Caesar Must Die*, and is an excellent example of a contemporary appropriation of a Shakespeare text.

The film centres on a production of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* performed by inmates of the high-security wing at a Roman prison, all tough guys serving long sentences for murder, drug dealing and offences connected with the mafia. (What is special about the movie is that it was actually shot in a prison with all the actors being real prisoners.)

The movie begins and ends with the last moments of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, performed on a stage in rough costumes and in colour. In between, it's shot in harsh black-and-white. We see the striking auditions where each prospective actor gives his name, age and address straight to camera twice, first as if he was speaking to customs officers, then as if saying farewell to his family. This is followed by the main actors discovering their characters with the director, who insists on them sticking to their regional accents.

The early parts of the play are shown in rehearsal. But the scenes leading up to the assassination are performed at various places all over the cell block. The grand speeches over Caesar's body take place in the exercise yard with prisoners at the surrounding windows acting as the crowd. This is electrifying stuff. At this point the prison life is inseparable from the play, and the actors merge their roles with their careers as gangsters. When Mark Antony repeatedly speaks about "men of honour", he talks the language of the mob.

The notions of Freedom and incarceration work both figuratively and literally in *Caesar Must Die*, and it is profoundly moving. The convicts are liberated by appearing in the play. They're released into the world of art, they live an alternative life. We see the cast of Italian prisoners share the excitement of the audience at the end. But after the performance the actors are led away one by one to their cells and locked away. This is devastating, and one will not easily forget the line spoken by the convict we've seen playing Cassius: "Since I have discovered art, this cell has turned into a prison." We wonder whether we've watched a complete, newly conceived work of art, a work-in-progress, a documentary or a combination of all these things.

The film exemplifies what Jan Kott's says in his influential book *Shakespeare: Our Contemporary* (1965), about how Shakespeare can and should be effectively used to address contemporary realities. It was Jan Kott's conviction that the Bard spoke more to our times than his. His book gave Peter Brooks the inspiration to imaginatively recreate and relocate Shakespeare texts in both stage and film versions, giving them a contemporary idiom.

Jan Kott's essay on *Hamlet* is titled 'Hamlet of the Mid-Century' and it talks about the way the text reflects the political and philosophical dilemmas of Europe in the middle decades of the twentieth century. Kott refers to a contemporary production at Cracow, just

after the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party and how it was felt as nothing but a political drama, set in a bleak, sinister, politically charged backdrop of crime and intrigue, where everybody distrusted everybody else, and where everybody spied, watched, or inquired about everybody else.

Every Hamlet has a book in his hand. What book does the modern Hamlet read? Kott says that the Cracow Hamlet read only newspapers. (There have been other Hamlets holding a Kafka or Camus.) The political instability in Denmark with Norway and Poland in the neighbourhood adding fuel from either end makes the Shakespearean text a potential playground of International diplomacy and political conspiracy. Terence Hawkes's famous 'alternative' essay on *Hamlet*, titled 'Telmah' also highlights the politically precipitous nature of the play. Hawkes's own collection of essays *Meaning by Shakespeare* (1992) argues, it is we who produce meaning, and not Shakespeare.

Let's make a Jump cut to the present. It's the inside chamber of the UN headquarters at New York, exactly a week ago. 500 plus VVIPs, mostly diplomats and UN officials are watching the touring Hamlet performance of the Globe theatre. With Palestine, Ukraine, Libya and many other parts of the world burning even as they are watching this production, will these diplomats and high officials see any politics in the play?

Let me also say something about how the *Hamlet* text has been appropriated in India. Several texts come to mind. I will just mention two contemporary versions: one, a very successful stage version, and the other an upcoming film.

Rajat Kapoor's *Hamlet: the Clown Prince* is a brilliant theatrical adaptation of Shakespeare's play in the Indian context. The play is about a bunch of clowns trying to perform Hamlet on stage, but they take the freedom granted only to clowns and misinterpret lines, change the order of the scenes, mix up lines from different scenes, and add their own improvisations. What we get is a curious mix of Shakespearean profundity and clownish gibberish; the world's most famous tragedy turned into a hilarious comedy, without losing its moments of sadness. The clown's perspective completely transforms our understanding of the text. The performance stands on its own, but for any spectator familiar with the lines of *Hamlet*, there are many moments of surprise, of brilliant and creative use of the Shakespearean text.

Vishal Bhardwaj's upcoming cinematic adaptation, titled *Haider*, has the backdrop of Kashmiri insurgency. Young Haider is a philosophy student from Kashmir, who returns home from university after hearing that his doctor father has disappeared and his mother is in a new relationship. Later, it turns out that Haider's father had been killed by paramilitaries recruited by the Indian authorities and run by his uncle. Ophelia is a young journalist, Polonius a sinister policeman and Laertes works for a multinational company. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are local men who are paid informants for police intelligence. Set in the 1990s, the most intense years of the Kashmir violence, *Haider* involves the accounts of locals, militants, security forces, and separatists. The film includes graphic scenes of torture in army camps and other human rights abuses by Indian officials and is likely to run into censorship troubles and jingoistic protests. Let's hope this film does a meaningful engagement with *Hamlet*, and fares better than Bharadwaj's earlier adaptations of Othello and Macbeth.

I want to end this presentation by highlighting three points about Shakespeare's

dramatic art which I think are crucial to both its understanding and transference. (Understanding as reader, spectator, learner etc; transference in terms of teaching, performing, adapting etc)

The first point concerns the inherent textuality of Shakespeare's plays, how they are inherently open to so many textual possibilities as well as plurality of meanings. We all know that there is absolutely no certainty about the text of a Shakespeare play, that it is as much an editorial construction as it is original; that often for every word, there is choice of a few others. Taken along with the Poststructuralist notion of the inherent undecidability of anything constructed in and through language, any Shakespeare text becomes a supposition. Anybody who deals with a it (as reader, spectator, student, teacher, performer, interpreter) should therefore avoid taking absolutist or deterministic positions regarding its being and meaning, and be open to and comfortable with other textual possibilities.

The second point is about the performative nature of a Shakespearean dramatic text, the very fact that the plays were written for the stage rather than for the study. Often people assert this fact but fail to realise its implication. The immediate implication is that the meaning of a performative text is provided by the totality of performance, where the linguistic text has only a part to play. Other elements such as the actor's person, tone, tempo, rhythm, body language, emotive gestures, response, action and reaction, theatrical space, music, lighting, stage property etc, also contribute in making the totality of the text.

The third and related point is about stylisation, about the Shakespearean magic of language and rhythm (figurative and prosodic). The fact that this is verse drama of a performative, stylised and rhetorical kind should not be ignored. We are not dealing with an art form that reflects the reality of everyday life. The sense and sentiment may be realistic, but the form is always artistic. It has its own conventions (eg soliloquy), exaggerations and stylisation (figures of speech and rhetoric). The overall theatrical effect should weigh more and not just the profundity of thought in the lines, which is obvious in any case. In Shakespeare, form matters as much as content. There is no meaning without the manner.

References

- Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* New York: Riverhead Books, 1994.
- Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Pine-head Books, 1998.
- Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield, eds. *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism* (1985). Manchester: Manchester UP, 1994.
- Drakakis, John. ed. *Alternative Shakespeares*. London: Routledge, 1985.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare*. New York: Norton, 2004.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Shakespeare and Literary Theory*. New York: Oxford UP, 2010.
- Hawkes, Terence. *Meaning by Shakespeare*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *Beginning Shakespeare*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007.
- Kott, Jan. *Shakespeare: Our Contemporary*. Trans. Boleslaw Taborski. London: Methuen, 1965.
- Loomba, Ania. *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989.
- Loomba, Ania and Martin Orkin. eds. *Post-colonial Shakespeares*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Parker, Patricia and Geoffrey Hartman. eds. *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. New York: Methuen, 1985.
- Wells, Stanley and Lena Cowen Orlin. eds. *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

Macbeth Retranslations in Malayalam: A Contextual Analysis

Macbeth, the shortest (1993 lines) but refined drama by William Shakespeare has had fifteen retranslations in Malayalam. As any diachronic study is closely linked to the spacio-temporal dimensions in which these multiple texts originated, it is necessary to explain the context in which the retranslations of *Macbeth* occurred in Kerala. The word 'context' has the following meanings, 'the circumstances that form the setting for an event, statement, or idea', 'the parts that immediately precede and follow a word or passage and clarify its meaning'. The contexts of *Macbeth* retranslations are examined here by analyzing the circumstances that led to the production of these translations and also the paratexts and appendices. It attempts a contextual analysis of the twelve available *Macbeth* retranslations.

The parameters of context analysis include, the introduction of the twelve retranslations of *Macbeth* in Malayalam in order to analyze the questions of genre (what), period (when), locale (where), horizon of expectations of the reader which includes the intended readership (for whom) and the ideology of the production of a text (how). This would help in undermining the influence of other languages and literary cultures, the presence or absence of the translator in the target culture as well as the linguistic nuances such as the general outline of a text, the archaisms used, and the tendencies of the paratexts in assessing the need for a particular text to be created at a particular juncture of history. Mainly three dictionaries were used for this study, *Sabdatharavali* edited by Sreekandeswaram G. Padmanabhan Pillai, *Kerala Bhasha Nighandu* edited by S. Guptan Nair and *Sanskrit-Malayalam Nighandu* by E. P. Narayana Bhattathiri.

Bashaposhini Text (m kbatt)

The Bashaposhini text was produced in 1903 and its author is unknown. The text seems to follow the same genre of the original. It also includes *an nni*, an introductory feature of Indian drama serving as a request for divine blessings. In Sanskrit drama,

Each play opened with the *sutradhara*'s invocation to the gods. The prayer may have told of the author, and author's work, the actors and their roles or something expository about the play. Occasionally another actor joins *sutradhara* for the prologue; it comes to the end when a character came onto the stage (Kuritz 81).

The Bashaposhini Text follows the ST in act-scene division. However, it has no stage instructions; it can be assumed that it was meant primarily for reading. As a pioneering translation effort in Malayalam, it was meant to be informative than entertaining. It was published in *Bhashaposhini* and the available text consists of only the first three scenes of the first act in *Macbeth*.

Bhashaposhini Sabha was a gathering of the educated elite of time and was initiated by Kandathil Varghese Mappilai. *Bhashaposhini* played a major role in unifying the three different administrative units of Travancore, Cochin and Malabar into a single cultural unit. Mappilai and his friends, as part of their discussions and intellectual competence, used to

conduct literary activities like translation, poetry composition and archiving of old texts. Whether the translator of Bashaposhini Text had translated the entire TT is unknown. The translation was meant to familiarize the reader to the English drama and encourage future playwrights. Rita M, Antony who did research on the topic: “Bhaasha Sahithyapurogathikku Bhashaposhini Masika Vahicha Panku Kollavarasham 1114 vare – Oru Padanam”, under University of Calicut, observes that though the translation lacks literary quality, it can be considered as an early model for Malayalam drama . The available text for the study consists of three scenes only. However, Antony (374) provides the translation of *Mac.I.iv* also.

The language of the text both in prose and verse is not colloquial. Its literary style is archaic and the influence of Sanskrit on the language is evident. The meaning and ideas are mostly conveyed in couplet. This TT indigenizes many ST words, especially proper names.

Cawdor	k t̃r (31)
Norway	n rvve (31)
Ross	r ss (31)
Fife	phayiph (31)
Lady Macbeth.	m kbat mad mma (30)

The pronunciation of the word “cawdor”/k?:d?:(r)/ in the translation, has replaced the vowel sound /?:/ with another vowel /a:/. In the second instance also, of Norway /n?:wei/, /?:/ sound has replaced by /a:/ sound; same as the case in Ross /r? s/. In Fife /f? if/, the vowel sound /?/ is replaced by /a/. And in m kbatmad mma, the pronunciation of Macbeth /m?k'b? / is altered and the word is added. A colloquial usage to indicate “a European lady or a gentle woman” replaces the SL word “Lady”. The word “mad mma” is an honorific term and it is a dialectal variant of the English word 'madam'/mad?m/ signified by the Malayalam term 'amma' (mother).

From the language, it is evident that the Bashaposhini Text is intended for English educated local readers. Stage directions given before each scene are omitted; but are supplemented by the translator's own directions. For instance, in *Mac.I.i*, he describes the place as a forest, while in the ST it is “outdoors”. In *Mac. I. ii*, he omits the place detail given in ST as “a camp”. In *Mac.I.iii*, the translator adds again “forest” instead of “heath”. The place details during the appearance of witches are changed. This can be associated with the cultural shift related to the phenomenon of witch. In the context of Kerala, witch (yakshi) and ghost (bhoota) are associated with forest and palm trees in deserted land. Heath is not familiar to the local reader. So, the replacement of heath with forest can be seen as an act of substitution with cultural equivalent (Sankunni 436, 875).

Since Bashaposhini Text was produced more than hundred years ago when Malayalam language was at a critical juncture of development, archaism and influence of Sanskrit are evident. Some archaic expressions and words are as follows :

ST	TT	Modern Equivalent
-	uraykked (30)	paray
-	ivva??am (36)	itup le

Meet (<i>Mac.I.i.8</i>)	ka?uk da?am (30)	k ?uka
Hover through (<i>Mac.I.i.12</i>)	carikk m (30)	na?akkuka
-	evv ru (37)	etram tram
-	mama (37)	en?e
Foul (<i>Mac.I.i.11</i>)	t (37)	c ttay ya, tinma
-	ettham (38)	eprak ram
King (<i>Mac.I.ii.28</i>)	mah r ?? (31)	mah r j v
Lord (<i>Mac.I.ii.31</i>)	k?it an (31)	r j v

Some TT expressions are added by the translator. Some expressions, for which there are no ST equivalents, are indicated with a hyphen. The ending of sentences seems to indicate the archaic elements in language. Some examples are given below.

Archaic words	Modern equivalent	Meaning
k ka (37)	k uka	to see
uraykka (37)	parayu	tell
cholka (37)	parayu	tell
bhavikka (37)	sambhavikkuka	to happen
p rt l (31)	ka tu	to view
p y n (36)	poyi	went
ceyyuvan (36)	ceyyum	will d
vadipp n (37)	k n	to happen

These linguistic features of TT verb forms throw light on the particular juncture of the language development when Malayalam was simultaneously spreading roots to the common Dravidian mother language (from which other South Indian languages like Tamil, Kannada and Telugu developed) and Sanskrit for its development and survival (Antony, CL 25).

Sanskrit influenced usages and words *tul minaran* (30), *n rav t vikal* (30), *thad yasthiti* (30), *laghubh vadvairicam* (31), *svabh vasan?tasamr?dhadraur?yam* (31) and so on.

The text is produced as an outcome of the intellectual gathering and the translator is not interested in revealing his identity. It is equally probable that he was not confident enough about the TT. He might also have regarded it as an initiative to enrich Malayalam language and to introduce its reader's classical English text into Malayalam and did not want any credit out of it. The balancing of localization or finding cultural equivalence and the highly Sanskritised style is noteworthy.

Vadhyar (a) (m kbet. ?ekesp yar mah kaviyu?e oru n ?akam)

Vadhyar (a) is titled *m kbet. ?ekesp yar mah kaviyu?e oru n ?akam* (Macbeth: A Play by the great poet Shakespeare). It was serialized in *Nasrani Deepika* in 1929. *Nasrani*

Deepika, meant to spread the Christian ideals, started publication by 15 April 1887 from the Mannaman St. Joseph Press at the initiative of Nasrani Jatyaikya Sangham. The text was published two years after *Nasrani Deepika* became a daily in 1927. The translation was conceived as a tool to increase the circulation of the newspaper.

Vadhyar (a) is not open to public access due to technical reasons of the *Deepika Daily*. So the study is based on the portions of text made available to the researcher. It consists of the introductory note, summary of the play published before the appearance of the text and other available portions of the text include: II.iii, III.ii, III.v, IV.i and IV.ii. A criticism of the translation by C. Anthappai was published posthumously. Name of the translator is stated as “oru paṭaya saḥityak ran” ('a writer from the past'). However, in the preface to Vadhyar (b), the translator K Chidambara Vadhyar, reveals that he was the translator of Vadhyar (a). Prose is used throughout the TT, with act-scene divisions and generic features followed by the ST.

The translator adds brief storyline before each scene since it was a serialized publication and its readers had to be reminded of the earlier episodes every time. It is very clear from the lengthy summary attached to the text that the text as well as the recapitulation is meant to familiarize the readers with the ST. On analyzing the available portions of Vadhyar (a), it is noted that there are no drastic changes between Vadhyar (a) and Vadhyar (b). The text seems to be a balance between adaptation and translation. When compared to Bhashaposhini Text, it has more cultural equivalents.

A large portion of the Porter scene which contains many culturally significant words and usages is omitted (*Mac. II. iii. 1-15, 21-34*).

Words indicating archaism are: jhaṭti, haṭṭi, eṭṭi, l kar, naṭṭin, maṭṭi etc. Use of proper nouns especially when others address them is different from the current use of it e.g. m lkam, b nk v. Spelling changes appear with words like mṭgaṭm and the present spelling is mamgaṭm.

The text contains many Sanskritised words and usages. Some of the examples are:

New hatched to the woeful time (*Mac.II.iii.53*)

putiyataramsantr sak ranaga?

amjanikkumennu

You (*Mac.IV.ii.68*)

atrabhavati

Murdered (*Mac.II.iii.84*)

hanikkappeṭṭirikkunnu

Women's ear (*Mac.II.iii.82*)

sthree r tattil

Each way and none (*Mac.IV.ii.22*)

? ?yam nam yirikkunnu

Vadhyar (b) (prataṭparudriyamathava ṭtr ṭaṭhasam)

It is a novel produced in 1933 and follows the plot of the TT. However, all the proper names including the name of places are replaced with indigenous names. The title itself introduces the focus of the story. *prataṭparudriyamathava ṭtr ṭeesaṭhasam* can be

translated as 'The story of Prata[̄]parudr[̄]a or the Women's Escapade'. The gender-bias reflected in the latter part of the title is maintained throughout the text. The highly sanskritised title clearly indicates its upper class readership and didactic tone. The Sanskrit suffix 'yam' is attached to the name 'Prataparudra', the name of the hero of the play. It can have two meanings simultaneously as the tale of Prataparudra (the character) and also the tale of someone who has both with 'prat pam' and 'raudram' (pride and anger). List of dramatic personae is not given with the text. Personal details of the translator are also absent.

ChidambaraVadhyar (1860-1940) was a pioneer who introduced Shakespeare in Malayalam through his translation of Charles Lamb's version of *As you Like It* as *k m k? caritam*, *The Winter's Tale* as *var?ak lakatha* (1883); and *Measure for Measure* as *oru putiyas vitri* (1905). This scholar was a member of the Travancore Curriculum Committee and was well-versed in Carnatic music and Sanskrit.

As a member of the Curriculum Committee he deliberately attempted to create a prose style in Malayalam. The prose of the time was developed by the Christian missionaries who owned printing presses. Vadhyar's prose style reflects an effort to resuscitate the indigenous prose style followed in the art forms like *Koothu*. It is characterized by long sentences and is influenced by the *uchabhasha* (high language) i.e. Sanskrit, rather than the *neechabhasha* (low language) or Malayalam. The influence of *Mahabharata*, *Ramayana* and the bowdlerization of the Porter scene and the witch scenes indicate the text was meant for school.

The text is divided into twenty two chapters. The translator justifies his use of Sanskrit words by saying that the ideas of Shakespeare cannot be rendered into Malayalam and that Sanskrit is more capable for it. He mentions Anthappai's criticism of Sanskrit influence on the translation of Vadhyar (a). Its preface mentions the Malayalam translator of Shakespeare till then. His contribution to Malayalam Shakespeare pedagogy is also significant as he has translated the portions of the great tragedies of *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth* and *Othello*.

The title page acknowledges that Vadhyar (b) is an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. Translator who confesses that he did the translation in order to engage his retirement life also thinks that the prose is more communicative and explains that publishers and distributors also insisted on prose. .

The text begins with a sketch of the geographical area where the story unfolds. Contextual details are added by the translator. The details of the landscape (1, 2), comparisons with situations from *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* (41), description of the Sahadharma (marital duty) (116) and Kshathriya dharma (Kshatriya duty) (19) etc. indicate the author's effort to contextualize it.

There are many significant issues particular to the text like the addition of similes, personifications and culture specific sayings. Some of them are given below.

Archaism	Modern equivalent	English
ik?anam (102)	u?ana?i	as soon as
v g na (69)	v gattil	in hurry

lak? karikkuka (61)	p rt karikkuka	to complete
hañ 1(41)	pe??enn	in a sudden way
ennuvarikil (42)	ennuvann 1	if it happens so

Examples for the influence of other language are given below:

TT word	Language	English
mair yam (41)	Sanskrit	Made by cognoscenti out of the liquid raw material for molasses and dh tak and intoxicants that tradition says cause intoxication if you eat or drink them, which will be inimical to all dharmas

(Haribhadra290)

nantapau?kalyam (22)	Sanskrit	Ecstasy
ghramgamicc lum (109)	Sanskrit	Please go fast
kr seks min ?an(118)	English	Cross examination
? ?yam nam yirikkunnu (106)	Sanskrit	Float upon
?arb r(63)	Urdu/Persian	The Royal Court
tath stu (46)	Sanskrit	Let it be as you wish!

The Young Siward is translated as augrap ??yan meaning, 'the son of ugrap ??yan'. In spite of occasional details added by the translator, Vadhyar (a) and Vadhyar (b) are almost the same in their content (95, 104-109, 50-54). The text is also marked by the dialect of southern Kerala.

R Pillai (makbett)

Translated by K. Ramakrishna Pillai, this text was published by Sahitya Pravarthaka Co-operative Society under the patronage of Kendra Sahitya Academi in 1962. It got public attention because of the publisher and also because of the attempt to translate blank verse. The text followed blank verse almost line by line and this worthwhile experiment resulted in a few artificial constructions . It is a mixture of prose and verse, the genre is the same as the ST. In alternate pages, act and scene markers are provided.

Dover Wilson's introductory note contains the analysis of the two characters Macbeth and Lady Macbeth. It is followed by the list of dramatis personae and the text of the play. It is the first attempt to include the list of dramatic personae in any *Macbeth* translation of Shakespeare. The play, published from Kottayam, has evident dialectal influence of the area. After the text, a glossary is added for each scene.

Jayasree Ramakrishnan states that:

Using poetic prose he makes an attempt to translate the blank verse line by line, thus attaining a structural similarity with the original. The free verse form employed allows full freedom for poetic expression. The lines can be rendered on the stage effectively and they sound like eloquent prose with an underlining rhythmic quality

(Nair, Towards a Malayalee Shakespeare 137)

Unfortunately, the play was never staged, probably because, as Jayasree Ramakrishnan notes, of the then prevalent dominance of Ibsen's plays and ardour for realist drama in Malayalam theatre.

The play has many archaic expressions such as:

ST	TT	Current usage
Continually (<i>Mac.V.i.20</i>)	sad pi (165)	tu?arcay yi
Pillows (<i>Mac.V.i.64</i>)	upadh nam(168)	talayi a
Lie (<i>Mac.V.vii.12</i>)	po?paraccil(186)	ka?amparayuka
First that ever (<i>Mac.V.viii.63</i>)	idamprathamam(194)	?avum dyam

Other language influence consists of both English and Sanskrit:

ST	TT	Language
Brave (<i>Mac.I.ii.16</i>)	samgr madh ran ya(15)	Sanskrit
Brandished steel (<i>Mac.I.ii.17</i>)	kha?gam(15)	Sanskrit
Dark (<i>Mac.I.v.51</i>)	k r??yam(40)	Sanskrit
Gall (<i>Mac.I.v.46</i>)	k k ?am(40)	Sanskrit
Ready (<i>Mac.II.ii.11</i>)	re?y kki (60)	English
Sore labor (<i>Mac.II.ii.41</i>)	addv naklamam(62)	Sanskrit
Bath (<i>Mac.II.ii.41</i>)	majjanam (62)	Sanskrit
Doctor (<i>Mac.V.i</i>)	? k?ar(163)	English
Gentle women (<i>Mac.V.i</i>)	na? (163)	English
Report (<i>Mac.V.i.2</i>)	ripp r??(163)	English
Good night (<i>Mac.V.ii.70</i>)	gu?nai??(169)	English

Since the text does not have a Translator's Preface, its intended readership, contextual details of its production and details of the author are unavailable.

M Warrior (m kkbattu)

The text was published in 1969 by Auroville Publishers, Kottayam. The translator, a poet of classical taste, had attempted many translations of short stories especially of Maupassant. Madassery was also a literary historian, novelist and playwright. Shakespeare was one of his favorite authors .

Immediately after the publication details, the list of dramatic personae is attached and important names are given in Roman script also. After a poem eulogising Shakespeare, a list of his well acclaimed works and a detailed analysis of his life and works are given. *Macbeth* is described in detail, the time and history of the play, the source of the ST, the story

of the witches of Medieval England, the literary history of the play, its background, and descriptions on the major characters and political implications behind the making of the play are explained. In the Translator's Preface which follows, Warriar says that after translating Shakespeare, he thinks that translating *Mahabharata* to be much easier. Three scenes including the dagger scene, ghost scene and the soliloquy after Lady Macbeth's death are translated in both verse and prose. The prose part is added at the end of the play as paratext. He defines his intended readership in the preface. He wants the text to be staged and read by the common man. Without naming anyone in particular, he makes sarcastic comments on those who satirized him.

The meter used in this text is *keka*. It is given in brackets and in bold letters attached to the particular portions (58, 91). Each Act begins with an introduction. His style consists of the mixture of paraphrasing and dialogues. The addition of ellipses (29) hyphens (61- 62) and brackets appear unnecessary and affects the beauty of the text. Brackets are frequently used to indicate synonymous expressions and to explain particular situations. The simultaneous use of English and Malayalam could have been avoided in most of the cases especially as footnotes are generally used. The word 'spur' (*Mac.III.iii.6*), the titling of the sleep walking scene (*Mac.V.i*) are examples for such cases. The blind following of the ST syntax affected the meaning of the TT. The translator acknowledges that certain portions of the Porter scene are bowdlerized when it was republished as textbook (MadhavaWarriar 66).

The text abounds in the use of archaic words and expressions. Some of them are listed below:

ST usage	TT usage	Current usage
-	cemm (112)	nallap le
Bark (<i>Mac.I.iii.25</i>)	?am (35)	va?am
Wrecked (<i>Mac.I.iii.30</i>)	m lupi?an bb (35)	abaddham pa?uka
-	c leyavanu?e (34)	avan?ea?utt

The language of the text is influenced by other languages like Sanskrit, Arabic and English. Some examples are given below:

ST	TT	Language
Aye (<i>Mac.IV.i.134</i>)	aptam yi (112)	Sanskrit
Cauldron (<i>Mac.IV.i.106</i>)	p ?haram (110)	Sanskrit
Brinded cat (<i>Mac.IV.i.1</i>)	pl ? la?rk?am rjj ran (105)	Sanskrit
-	ta?lpatanam (105)	Sanskrit
Toad (<i>Mac.IV.i.6</i>)	durduram (105)	Sanskrit
Harpier (<i>Mac.IV.i.3</i>)	b la p gra-khag ntakan (105)	Sanskrit
Hedge -hog whined (<i>Mac.IV.i.2</i>)	alya v vittu- tray pinn kam (105)	Sanskrit

Pilot (<i>Mac.I.iii.29</i>)	m lumi (35)	Arabic
Spurs (<i>Mac.III.iii.6</i>)	utt jakaka?akam (87)	Sanskrit
Spur (<i>Mac.I.vii.25</i>)	a vaka?akam (51)	Sanskrit
Doctor (<i>Mac.V. i</i>)	? k?ar (131)	English
Tending (<i>Mac.I.v.35</i>)	paricarya (46)	Sanskrit
Killing swine (<i>Mac.I.iii.2</i>)	s karahananam(34)	Sanskrit

The proper noun 'St.Colm's Inch' (*Mac.I.ii.62*) translated as k ?amsiddhan?edv p (33) means the island of saint Colm. Hence the place name is explained rather than translated.

The paratexts are the translation of the songs from the recent editions of the play. These Songs of the witches (given as Appendices III and IV in the text) as well the soliloquies (Appendices I and II) are rendered in prose form.

PPillai(makbet)

The translation of *Macbeth* by Prof. V N Paramewaran Pillai as *makbet* appeared twice in 1971 and it was re-printed in later in 1978, 1985 and 2010. The theatre-oriented text uses simple conversational prose and it's the epitext which provides clear stage descriptions. The text provides details of the other works translated by the translator before the Translator's Preface. The translator who is a scholar and translator gives great importance to the staging aspect of the drama. The preface states that the text was included to the graduate level syllabus of Calicut University.

After the special preface to the fifth reprint, a letter from the critique N.V Krishna Warriar stating that the translation had been useful to his child and encouraged the translator to translate other Shakespearean plays as well. After the list of characters, a historical background of the play titled 'n ?ak rambham' is added.

The text, published by the author, was distributed by NBS, Kottayam. Like ChidambaraVadhyar and K.P. Achuthan Pillai, he also attempts to translate *Macbeth* as part of his personal mission to translate all Shakespearean plays into Malayalam. He also translated *Julius Caesar* and *Othello* and the latter was staged at Pandalam N.S.S. College on 17 Feb.1967 (Nair, Towards a Malayalee Shakespeare 138).

The translator is aware of the previous *Macbeth* translations and regards the translation by K Ramakrishna Pillai as a worthy attempt, although it was not meant to be staged. The Preface compares the problems of translating *Othello* and *Macbeth* and he says that the emotional turmoil found in the latter challenges a translator's ability. He claims that he has tried his best to do justice to the ST as he rendered it for the stage.

The text retains many English words of the original as shown below:

ST	TT	Language
Stool (<i>Mac.III.iv.68</i>)	s?? 1 (73)	English
Doctor (<i>Mac.IV.iii.146</i>)	d k?ar (101)	English
Power afoot (<i>Mac.IV.iii.186</i>)	m rcc (103)	English

Report (<i>Mac.V.iv.7</i>)	ripp r??(114)	English
Wine (<i>Mac.I.viii.64</i>)	vain (40)	English

The text also uses many Sanskritised phrases. Some of such examples are given below:

ST	TT	Current usage
Threw away the dearest thing (<i>Mac.I.iv.11</i>)	trinaivalgga??icc (29)	avaganicc
Proportion (<i>Mac.I.iv.20</i>)	kliptam ya (29)	vyavastitam
Applaud thee to the very Before (<i>Mac.I.vi</i>)	muktaka??am sl ghikkum (113)	nann yianum diccu
	pur bh gam (35)	munbh gam

Sandeepani (m kbatt)

The translation titled *m kbatt* was published by Poorna Publications, Calicut in 1982. The text starts with the following statement: “This is an old story that contains the traces of both history and imagination” (Sandeepani 1). The narrative style is that of a fairy tale. The text, written in standard print language, does not have any act-scene divisions. The text has many printing errors (Sandeepani 70, 69, 50, 37, and 17) and it does not ensure uniformity in the use of proper nouns.

It also uses many English words. Some of the examples are:

ST	TT
-	janaral (8)
Doctor (<i>Mac.V.ii</i>)	? k?ar (59)
Nightgown (<i>Mac.V.ii.52</i>)	?rassi??gau? (62)
Stage (<i>Mac.V.v.25</i>)	s?? j(69)
-	onn m?ivi?an (71)

This translation also uses many Sanskritised expressions. Some of the examples are:

ST	TT	current usage
-	tri?avalganicuko?ru?a (9)	niss ram yika akk kkuka
Enfold (<i>Mac.I.iv.32</i>)	l ?hiccu (10)	ke??ppi?ccu
Double sense (<i>Mac.V.viii.20</i>)	? ? rtthamu?a (73)	dvay tthamu?a

A Pillai (m kbattu)

Translated by K. Achuthan Pillai, *m kbattu* was published in 1983. The first section of the text consists of a lengthy introduction to the text which covers the life history of Shakespeare. Background details, a period-wise publication details of Shakespeare's plays

and the summary of *Macbeth* are included as paratext. The second section consists of the translation and the list of characters. Act-scene details appear in left and right side of each page. The notes given below the page gives a good historical sense of the usages (Achuthan Pillai 80, 85). The text was translated because of the translator's personal interest.

As the TT tries to be very faithful to the ST, the ST syntax and meaning becomes very artificial. An instance is given below:

ST

My plenteous joys,
Wanton in fullness, seeks to hide themselves
In drops of sorrow (*Mac.I. v. 34-36*).

TT

entesamr@dnam ya hl dam,p rnatako??ut nt nniy yitt rnu,v dattin?ebindukka?lsvaya
mnig hanamceyy nsramikkunnu (66)

The translator uses many English and Sanskrit words. Some examples are as follows:

ST	TT	language
Thane (<i>Mac.I.ii.45</i>)	teyin (54)	English
Thumb (<i>Mac.I.iii.29</i>)	amgu??am (57)	Sanskrit
Corporal (<i>Mac.I.iii.82</i>)	daihikam yi (59)	Sanskrit
To hide (<i>Mac.I.v.35</i>)	nig hanam (66)	Sanskrit
-	har?aprakar?hatt ?e (70)	Sanskrit
Against (<i>Mac.I.vi.17</i>)	batal yi (72)	Arabic
Martlet (<i>Mac.I.vi.4</i>)	m r?la??kuruvi (71)	English
		(attached to the Malayalam equivalent)

Archaism:

ST	TT	currentusage
Valor (<i>Mac.I.v.25</i>)	vikramam (68)	dh rata
Hostess (<i>Mac.I.vi.24</i>)	gr?hini (72)	tith ya
Less than (<i>Mac.I.iii.141</i>)	tul m (62)	o??um
Cat (<i>Mac.I.vii.43</i>)	p akan (75)	p cca
Chamberlains (<i>Mac.I.vii.63</i>)	kan?ukikal (76)	paric rarakar

The TT follows act-scene distinction. It is marked on each page. No additional notes are included after the text.

PA. Warriar (m kbet)

m kbet was published by DC in 1984; the text was retold by P A Warriar (1920-85) under the general editorship of Prof. Ayyappa Paniker. It was the first translation among the

Macbeth retranslations to be published on the interest of the publisher. The text was a part of the *Viswasahityamala* project of DC Books to introduce world classics in Malayalam language. The publisher's introduction of the text describes the major characters, preliminary details of the ST author and of the Middle Ages. It seems that the translator is not aware of the previous *Macbeth* translations. The inner cover page states P.A Warriar as the re-teller of the Shakespeare play.

P. A. Warriar who owned *Poompatta*, a children's magazine in Malayalam, wrote many children's books for DC Books . His notable works in simple prose include the retold versions of *Uncle Tom's cabin*, *Kuttikalude Niyama Sabha*, *Sreekrishnan* etc.

Certain portions of the text are translated word for word. Otherwise entire text consists of paraphrasing of the storyline. Point of view of the story is different and it starts from Duncan. Exaggerated descriptions are seen all over the text. No Act-Scene distinction is followed. Print language and the indigenizing tools like the use of dialectal words, loan words go side by side in the narrative style.

Other language influence can be seen in the following chart:

ST	TT	Language
-	vaikhari (41)	Sanskrit
Trumpet-tongued (<i>Mac.I.vii.19</i>)	k haṅjihva (39)	Sanskrit
Offices (<i>Mac.II.i.14</i>)	ph suka?(47)	English
-	niph m (8)	English
-	plaiṅṅukaṅṅmappukaṅṅm (37)	English
Clock (<i>Mac.II.i.2</i>)	cṅ kk (46)	English
Nightgown (<i>Mac.II.i.73</i>)	naiṅṅgauṅṅ (60)	English
Bell (<i>Mac.II.iii.75</i>)	al rambel (62)	English
Sir (<i>Mac.III.i.14</i>)	sar (72)	English
Council (<i>Mac.III.i.24</i>)	kauṅṅsil (72)	English
-	janṅṅm r (83)	English
-	ripp rtuceyy n (85)	English
-	h ṅṅal pp ṅṅ (86)	English
Stool (<i>Mac.III.iv.68</i>)	st ṅṅ(91)	English
Season (<i>Mac.III.iv.143</i>)	s saṅṅ (97)	English
-	karṅṅan (93)	English
-	trikk (111)	English
-	h liṅṅaki (135)	Arabic

Liar (<i>Mac.V.v.35</i>)	kaṭṭasuvar (141)	Arabic
-	sinikk(143)	English
Market (<i>Mac.IV.ii.40</i>)	m rkkaṭṭ(117)	English
Pyramids (<i>Mac.IV.i.57</i>)	piramiṭ (106)	English
	v nṭṭ(38)	Portuguese
	m sa (38)	Portuguese

Archaic expressions used in the text are:

ST	TT	current usage
-	avasaramp rttu (140)	avasaramn kki
-	kala al ya (140)	atiy yi
-	vikaṭṭampiṭṭicca (18)	apakaṭṭampiṭṭicca
-	curam ntunna (33)	k pamm lamas vastan vuka
-	dh saram ya (54)	poṭṭipiṭṭicca
Fool (<i>Mac.IV.ii.27</i>)	vaṭṭkan (116)	ahank ri
-	appan (135)	onninum koṭṭ ttavan

Attempt to add literary grandeur to the TT without following the ST syntax and semantics is observed. It does not follow print language, but intentionally gives it a distinct dialectal colour.

The Paico Text (m kbatt)

m kbatt from Paico classics is an illustrated text, and it is distinct from the other texts taken for the study because of its intended readership and genre. It is an illustrated version of the play *Macbeth* published in July 1985. It was part of a series of Indian comic books published between April 1984 and December 1988 by Pai and Company (abbreviated as Paico) in various Indian languages and in English. The series came out as a part of an association between the academic publisher Pendulum Press Incorporated and Paico, Kochi. These comics became fairly popular among the readers. Paico republished the Classic Series in 1998-2000. It was originally created by Vincent Fago as "Now Age Series" (1970s) for Pendulum Press.

The publishers, state that the Paico classics are meant to familiarize children to the classical works of world literature. Preliminary notes on Shakespeare and his plays are given. The note introduces the readers with the classical notion of tragedy based on the idea of tragic flaw. After outlining the nature of the major characters, it moves on to the notion of the witches in the Middle Ages. The text is rewritten by Rich Margopaulose and the drawings are done by Wikattan. The TT can be a translation of an English comic. Since it is an illustrated

version, pictures are more prominent than the text and it does not follow act-scene division.

One can see English words being used in this translated text. Some examples are:

Thanks sir, the like to you (*Mac.II.i.30*) gudnai??(27)

Chamber (*Mac.I.vii.29*) h ?(26)

Print language is used with certain level of cultural equivalence. Porter scene is bowdlerized and omissions are frequently made. No dialectal influence is evident in this text meant for children across Kerala. Its readers demand clarity in both factual and narrative levels. The use of pictures limits dialogues. A factual addition is made where Banquo is assassinated by two professional killers with the instruction of Macbeth, instead of two persons being used by Macbeth against Banquo in ST (38).

After the play, the characteristics, reputation and greatness of Shakespearean plays are added along with a note on the illustrated depiction of *Macbeth* which they envisioned as an inspiration to read the ST. They also have published illustrated versions of other Shakespearean plays like *Julius Caesar*, *King Lear*, *The Tempest* and *Twelfth Night* etc during the same period.

The paico text uses hand written script as before the advent of computers, the whole process was manual, and letterers used in the original were erased and re-written by hand. Words used as pictures form an important feature of this particular genre (Zanettin 37-40).

V. Nair (makbet)

Venukkuttan Nair's *makbet* was first published in 2000 as part of the complete translation of Shakespeare's works under the initiative of the publisher D.C. Kizakkemuri under the general editorship of Prof. K. Ayyappa Paniker. Originally the text was published as three volumes in 2000. In 2008 each text was published separately and in 2012, thirteen important plays including *Macbeth* were republished.

A final paragraph was added by the publisher in the 2012 edition thanking the general editor and the translators who took part in the initiative. The translators were not acknowledged in the earlier editions of the text. Neither the details of the translator nor any translator's preface, except the one by the general editor, that too only about the life of Shakespeare and his works and some color pictures related to the Bard and theatre of the time, were given. A portion of this preface dealing with the problems and issues in translation, though not in

The translator is P. K. Venukkuttan Nair (1931 - 2012), a playwright, actor and director of *Othello*. He was the vice-president of the Kerala Sangeetha Nataka Akademi and member of the Kendra Sangeeta Nataka Academy. Besides *Macbeth*, he also translated the other major tragedies of Shakespeare (*Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear* and *Antony and Cleopatra*) into Malayalam for the same book.

Act-scene divisions are followed. The general Editor's preface argues that they have chosen simple vocabulary as they meant to stage and also for the ease of understanding of the TT readers who are not proficient in English. The general editor also argues that rather the text should be read in English itself and a translation should not go beyond the ST. He also acknowledges the wrong renderings and decline in poetic quality but justifies it by saying

that at least they made an attempt. A publishing company like DC Books is certainly aware of the previous translations while producing the eleventh translation of *Macbeth* in Malayalam.

Examples for influence of other languages, including loan words, are given below:

ST	TT	Language
Women's breast (<i>Mac.I.v.45</i>)	sthraīnavak ? ja??a?l kk (883)	Sanskrit
Cancel (<i>Mac.III.ii.52</i>)	radd kki (904)	Arabic loan
Harpier (<i>Mac.IV.i.3</i>)	h rppiar (914)	English
Pyramids (<i>Mac.IV.i.57</i>)	pirami?uka?yūm (915) markers	English+ TT plural
Arbitrate (<i>Mac.V.iv.20</i>)	kliptam ya (935)	Sanskrit

This text is also not free from archaic expressions although they are added to evaluate the poetic quality. Some of these are listed below:

ST	TT	Current usage
Battlements (<i>Mac.I.v.38</i>)	pr k ram (883)	k ??a
Shoal (<i>Mac.I.vii.6</i>)	pu?nam (885)	ma alti??a
Aside (<i>Mac.IV.i.146</i>)	apav rya (918)	tmagatam
Confound (<i>Mac.IV.iii.100</i>)	bhan?cc (924)	na ippic
Uncle (<i>Mac.IV.vi.2</i>)	m tul (937)	amm v

PKR Nair (mekb t)

P.K.R. translation of *Macbeth* as *mekb t* was published by Mulberry Calicut in 2000 November. It claims to be the first bilingual edition of Shakespeare in Malayalam (Nair, *Macbeth* 6). The publishers' expect the separate edition of the text also to be commercially as successful as their Shakespeare anthology. The text has a picture of Shakespeare (Nair, *Macbeth* 9) and a translator's preface (Nair, *Macbeth* 11) which includes basic details about William Shakespeare and his literary career and theatre practices of the time in connection with *Macbeth*. Abbreviations used by the translator (Nair, *Macbeth* 29) and the list of dramatic personae (Nair, *Macbeth* 31) are given.

The examples for the use of words from other language include:

ST	TT	Language
chastic with (<i>Mac.I.iv.25</i>)	bhartsiccaka?uka (61)	Sanskrit
Gall (<i>Mac.I.v.46</i>)	k k ?am (63)	Sanskrit
-	i am (65)	Sanskrit
Fear (<i>Mac.I.v.70</i>)	s dhvasam (65)	

The text also uses archaic expressions as the ones below:

ST	TT	Current usage
Thane (<i>Mac.I.ii.54</i>)	kshit an (39)	n ųv ų
Foe (<i>Mac.I.ii.38</i>)	paųųalar (37)	satrukkaų
Cousin (<i>Mac.I.ii.24</i>)	maccunan (37)	aųyan
Thunders (<i>Mac.I.ii.26</i>)	a anip tam (37)	iųminnal
Toward (<i>Mac.I.iv.156</i>)	c re (53)	aųutt
Think upon (<i>Mac.I.iv.157</i>)	pariciųųanam (53)	al cikkuka
Highly (<i>Mac.I.v.18</i>)	ceųųalla (61)	alпамalla

When compared to the earlier translations like the Bhashaposhini Text, the use of archaic words and Sanskrit expressions are more in this. He uses *vanchippattu*, a common metrical pattern in Malayalam and justifies its use in the Translators' Preface. He thinks that it has similar features with the Blank verse and that it is more convenient to reduce the number of lines. Other metrical pattern used in it is *Keka* which along with *Manjari* is accepted as equivalent to blank verse in Malayalam

The translator gives details explaining the context, as in the case of *Mac.I.ii*. In some places he blindly follows the ST syntax leading to the loss of literary quality of TT. Probably influenced by Madassery, the translator uses ' mbari' for the witch. When compared with V Nair, the text is more reader friendly at the lexical and syntactical level. Although he uses ellipses always with verse dialogues, its purpose is not explained (Nair, *Macbeth* 65).

When the versions are compared, it appears that archaic expressions are used in almost all the texts. More loan words appear from English and Sanskrit. Arabic, Portuguese as well as Mappila Malayalam words appear in PAWarrior, marking the linguistic past of the modern Malayalam. It is noted that more English loans appear after 1960s (R Pillai) and reaches its peak during 1980s (P Pillai, Sandeepani and A Pillai). Sanskrit influence, which diminishes after M Warrior, returns to dominance in the latest version (P K R Nair). These lexical peculiarities are not to satisfy the readers and their horizon of expectation, rather reflections of more complex level shifts in internal and external discourses related to the retranslated texts.

Paratext analysis shows that translators are influenced by the publishing industry and by the mass media after 1980s. The publication of the Paico text, PA Warrior and V. Nair are examples. In these texts, the translator was given the least importance when compared to the publisher. The Bhashaposhini text and Vadhyar (a) are part of print media and do not carry the name of the translator. Although the name of the translator is given in all the other texts, they too do not provide any personal details of the translator, except in P K R Nair. Publisher's Preface and their advertisements become epitext in PAWarrior and Paico text.

It is significant to look at the genre, readership and the historical need behind each target text. While the translation of *Macbeth* began as a linguistic need in Vadhyar (a), it became an ideological tool in Vadhyar (b). R Pillai text is a remarkable attempt to render the translation in blank verse and it tries to balance between TT meaning and syntax. M Warrior returns to the Sanskrit influence. P Pillai was meant for theatre in a period where a transition

from musical dramas and mere translations to prose drama (Paniker, Svathanthranathara Ghattam 441). The translations produced in 1980s except A Pillai were meant for children and the translations slightly vary because of adaptations, use more English words and bowdlerization of the text. Bowdlerizing is also found in Vadhyar (b), M Warriar and P Pillai. The latter two were used in college curriculum. M Warriar noted it in the footnote of the non-curriculum edition (MadhavaVarriar 31). V Nair and P K R Nair are also aware of the marketing possibilities of the text (D C Ravi, 4; Nair, P K R, 5). Of all translations, only P K R Nair mentions the different editions of the ST that he had used for translation (Nair, P K R 29).

References

- Antony, C L. "MalayalaBhashayudeUlpathi." *BhashaPadanagal*. 2nd ed. Thrissur: Sahitya Akademi, 2011. 23-27. Print.
- Antony, Rita M. "Bhaasha Sahityapurogathikku Bhashaposhini Masika Vahicha Panku, Kollavarasham 1114 Vare – Oru Padanam." Diss. University of Calicut, 2005. Print.
- D C, Ravi. *Prasadhaka Kurip. Macbeth*. By P.K. Venukkuttan Nair. Ed. Ayappa Paniker. Kottayam: DC Books, 2012. 4. Print.
- George, K.M. *Western Influence on Malayalam Language and Literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1972. Print.
- G. Padmanabhan Pilli, Sreekandeswaram, ed. *Sabdatharavali*. Kottayam: DC Books, 2010. Print.
- Haribhadra, Arya Vimukisena. *Abisamayalamkara with Vritti and Aloka*. Vol. 3. Trans. Gareth Sparham. New Delhi: Jain Publishing Company, 2006. Print.
- K, ChidambaraVadhyar. *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyudeorunatakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 13 May 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 14 May 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 21 May 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 18 July 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 20 July 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 22 July 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 25 July 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 27 July 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 29 July 1929. Print.
- . *Macbeth*: "Shakespeare mahakaviyude oru natakam." *Nasrani Deepika* 19 Aug. 1929. Print.
- . *Prathaparudreeyam athava Sthreesahasam*. Thiruvanamthapuram: GnanaskandaIyer, 1933. Print.
- Kuritz, Paul. *The Making of Theatre History*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1988. Print.
- Macbeth*. Bhashaposhini 7. 1 (1903): 30 -31. Print.
- Macbeth*. Bhashaposhini 7. 2 (1903): 36 -38. Print.
- MadhavaVarriar, Madassery. *Macbeth*. Kottayam: Auroville Publishers, 1969. Print.
- Nair, Jayasree Ramakrishnan. "Shakespeare in Malayalam: A Study Based on the Translations of His Plays." Diss. University of Kerala, 1994. Print.
- . "Towards a Malayalee Shakespeare: The Search for an Ideal Form of Expression." *Shakespeare in Indian Languages*. Ed. D. A. Shanker. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1999. 127-40. Print.
- Nair, PKR. *Macbeth*. Kozhikode: Mulberry Publications, 2000. Print.
- Nair, S. Guptan, ed. *Kerala BhashaNighandu*. Thiruvanamthapuram: Kerala BhashaInstitute, 1997. Print.
- NarayanaBhattathiri, E. P. ed. *Sanskrit-Malayalam Nighandu*. Kottayam: DC Books, 2009. Print.
- ParameswaranPillai, V. N. *Macbeth*. 4thed. n.p: Author, 1985. Print.
- Pillai, K. Achuthan. *Macbeth*. Trivandrum: K. Kalyanikkutyamma, 1983. Print.

- Ramakrishna Pillai, K. *Macbeth*. Kottayam: SPCS, 1962. Print.
- Sam, N. "Pathrapravarthana Mekhala." *Adhunika Malayala Sahityam Prasthanamgalilude*. Ed. K.M. George and N. Sam. 2nd ed. Kottayam: DC Books, 2011. Print.
- Sandeepani. *Macbeth*. Calicut: Poorna Publications, 1982. Print.
- Sankunni, Kottarathil. *Aithiyamala*. 23rd ed. Kottayam: DC Books, 2009. Print.
- Shankar, D.A. "On Translating Shakespeare." *Shakespeare in Indian Languages*. Ed. D.A. Shankar. Shimla: IAS, 1999. 15-28. Print.
- Soanes, Catherine, and Angus Stevenson, eds. *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*. London: Oxford UP, 11th ed. 2005. Print.
- Venukkuttan Nair, P.K. *Macbeth*. Ed. Ayyappa Paniker. Kottayam: DC Books, 2012. Print.
- Warrier, P.A. *Macbeth*. Ed. Ayyappa Paniker. Kottayam: DC Books, 1984. Print. Viswasahityamala. 55.
- Wikattan.illus. *Macbeth*. Cochin: Paico classics, 1985. Print.
- Zanettin, Federico. "Comics." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha. 2nd ed. Abington: Routledge, 2009. 37-40. Print.

Teaching Mythology via *Titus Andronicus*

Of all of Shakespeare's dramas, *Titus Andronicus* may be one of the least taught. Famously slammed by T.S. Eliot as “one of the stupidest and most uninspired plays ever written” (26), this early work nevertheless includes the elements of his best tragedies: vengeance, thwarted love, betrayal, twisted family dynamics, and bloody murders. For today's teenagers, raised on graphic video games and horror films, *Titus Andronicus* can be a welcome change from the plays and tropes most commonly covered in the classroom. They associate Shakespeare with the star-crossed lovers of *Romeo and Juliet*, the conflicted politicians of *King Lear* and *Macbeth*, and the brooding prince of *Hamlet*, characters who may not capture the adolescent imagination in the way that the final scenes of *Titus*, with Tamora unwittingly dining on the flesh of her two sons, can.

This is not to say that *Titus Andronicus* just plays to students' fascination with violence, however. Shakespeare's early tragedy is packed with references to classical mythology, to the point that the “allusive richness accounts to a large extent for the artificial, literary quality that has been noted in the play” (Ettinger 336). While simultaneously introducing the Bard's peerless grasp of the English language, exploring character psychology, and analyzing the revenge tropes that structure the drama, instructors have the opportunity to teach the Roman pantheon and several key myths and students think they're simply having a bloody good read.

The most obvious myth to explore in concert with *Titus Andronicus* is the rape of Philomel from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In the tragic story, King Tereus rapes his sister-in-law Philomel and cuts out her tongue to ensure she cannot name her attacker. The resourceful girl weaves the story of her assault into a tapestry that she sends to her sister Procne. Horrified by her husband's behavior, the queen kills their only son, Itys, and serves his flesh to the unwitting Tereus at dinner. Philomel gets her vengeance, but only at the cost of murder, and in the end, the gods turn all three players into birds.

In *Titus Andronicus*, Tamora, Queen of the Goths, is brought along with three of her sons back to Rome as a prisoner of war. Despite her pleas for mercy, she watches as Titus, lauded general of the empire, sentences her oldest child, Alarbus, to death by dismemberment and fire. Tamora resolves that Titus will pay for the murder and incites her two remaining sons, Demetrius and Chiron, attack Lavinia, Titus's only daughter. Although they, like Tereus in the myth, are motivated by lust, they want to humiliate her husband, Bassianus. As their mother's lover Aaron muses,

This is the day of doom for Bassianus:
His Philomel must lose her tongue today,
Thy sons make pillage of her chastity,
And wash their hands in Bassianus' blood. (II.iii.42-45)

Where Tereus targets Philomel for her great beauty, Lavinia becomes a victim in large part because of her male connections—she is the daughter of Titus Andronicus,

abducted from the Emperor by his own brother Bassianus. Demetrius and Chiron also know their Roman mythology. Taking their cues from Tereus's errors in the myth, they ensure that their victim can neither speak nor write. Lavinia's uncle, Marcus, comes across the ravaged girl in the forest and exclaims,

Fair Philomela, why, she but lost her tongue,
And in a tedious sampler sew'd her mind;
But, lovely niece, that mean is cut from thee.
A craftier Tereus, cousin, hast thou met,
And he hath cut those pretty fingers off
That could have better sew'd than Philomel. (II.iv.38-43)

He also alludes to the “heavenly harmony” of Lavinia's voice as capable of putting to sleep “Cerberus at the Thracian poet's feet” (II.iv.51), which segues smoothly into a discussion of Orpheus. A noted singer who draws inspiration from the sirens, Orpheus uses his melodies to soothe the guard-dog of the afterlife to sleep and later to convince Hades and Persephone to release his beloved wife Eurydice from the Underworld. The god sets a condition, however: the poet must not look back at her until they both reach the mortal realm. The anxious husband sneaks a peek, and his wife vanishes forever. It is a tragic ending for true love.

But the reference to Orpheus is not so much about love but rather the power of voice. Marcus does not know that Lavinia begs Tamora, repeatedly, to be a gentle woman, to call off her sons, to let them murder her outright. The Queen coldly replies that she too wept and pleaded with Titus Andronicus to no avail. In other words, Tamora tried to sing like Orpheus in order to redeem her son Alarbus from death. She actually encouraged the general to emulate Pluto, in a sense, saying,

Andronicus, stain not thy tomb with blood!
Wilt thou draw near the nature of the gods?
Draw near them then in being merciful:
Sweet mercy is nobility's true badge.
Thrice-noble Titus, spare my first-born son! (I.i.116-120)

But Titus has no interest in being god-like; he does not even want to rule on earth. As Nancy Lenz Harvey notes, “It is in Tamora's appeal and Titus' refusal that, according to H.T. Price, the irony of the play is initiated” (29). The Orphic possibility of changing fate and flouting death, purely through the right speech or song, fades like Eurydice.

Other direct allusions to Roman mythology surround Tamora. Aaron, admiring his mistress's powerful new position, opens Act II by musing on her triumph:

Now climbeth Tamora Olympus' top,
Safe out of fortune's shot, and sits aloft,
Secure of thunder's crack or lightning flash,
Advanc'd above pale envy's threat'ning reach. (II.i.1-4)

Only gods and goddesses sit in Olympus, a testament to just how far the prisoner of war has risen. As the scene unfolds, the Queen of the Goths and her lover flirt through allusions to

Prometheus, sirens, Venus, and Dido. Tamora is “This goddess, this Semiramis, this nymph, / This siren that will charm Rome's Saturnine, / And see his shipwrack and his commonweal's” (22-24). As another Semiramis, she will rule for decades after her husband's unfortunate demise; as a siren, she will cause his death personally. Andrew Attin observes, “if Tamora can be compared in the space of twenty-two lines with Jove, Prometheus, and Semiramis (II.i.1-22), the lessons of classical antiquity threaten to dissolve into chaotic uselessness” (339).

Shakespeare's characters seem unaware of the full implications of the mythological allusions they make. For instance, Tamora proposes to Aaron that they enjoy stolen moments in the forest while her new husband hunts:

after conflict such as was suppos'd
The wand'ring prince and Dido once enjoyed,
When with a happy storm they were surpris'd,
And curtain'd with a counsel-keeping cave,
We may, each wreathed in the other's arms
(Our pastimes done), possess a golden slumber (II.iii.21-26)

Dido, Queen of Carthage, found her “wand'ring prince” in the Trojan hero Aeneas. In invoking the famed lady, however, Tamora forgets (or does not know) that Aeneas abandons Dido, who commits suicide in her grief. The “golden slumber” cannot last. No one, particularly a woman, can sing as persuasively as Orpheus that cold arbiters of death are moved to mercy.

Myths of punishment find greater resonance with the vengeful characters of *Titus Andronicus*. In 2.3, Bassianus and Tamora quarrel via another selection from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the story of Diana's punishment of Actaeon. In the myth, the hunter Actaeon stumbles across Diana while she bathes. Incensed by this affront to her purity, the goddess transforms Actaeon into a stag, and his own hunting dogs tear him to pieces. After studying this myth, students can move to a greater appreciation of the irony in the verbal exchange between Bassianus and Tamora:

Bassianus Who have we here? Rome's royal Emperess,
Unfurnish'd of her well-beseeming troop?
Or is it Dian habited like her,
Who hath abandoned her holy groves
To see the general hunting in this forest?

Tamora Saucy controller of my private steps!
Had I the pow'r that some say Dian had,
Thy temples should be planted presently
With horns, as was Actaeon's, and the hounds
Should drive upon thy new-transformed limbs,
Unmannerly intruder as thou art! (55-65)

Bassianus compares the adulterous new Queen to the virgin goddess of the hunt, pointedly

aware that he has caught her in the arms of her African lover and she is far from virginal. At the same time, readers know what he does not, that *he* is the object of a deadly hunt. Tamora seizes Bassianus's mythological metaphor and retorts smartly that if indeed she were the goddess Dian, she would treat him as another Actaeon and change him to a deer. Her words also hold an ironic meaning, for the audience already has learned that her sons Demetrius and Chiron plan to cuckold Bassianus, planting horns on his temples by raping his wife. This myth works in Tamora's favor for once, although she must rely on male proxies to achieve her vengeance. Where Diana directly punishes the spying hunter, the new empress incites her two sons to dispatch Bassianus-as-Actaeon in her name.

Successful in blaming two of Titus's sons for the murder of Bassianus, Tamora does not appear to anticipate any tragedy from allowing Demetrius and Chiron to transform Lavinia into a new Philomel. They cut off her hands, after all, so she cannot weave or write the names of her rapists, and Lavinia has no sister like Procne. Yet just Tamora has blood-thirsty sons to stab and ravish on her behalf, Lavinia has a trio of devoted male relatives—her father, uncle, and remaining brother—to carry out vengeance. For all practical purposes, Titus Andronicus steps into the role of Procne, and when he murders Demetrius and Chiron and bakes their heads into meat pies, he transforms Tamora into Tereus. He informs the two young men that their mother deserves to suffer:

This is the feast that I have bid her to,
 And this the banquet she shall surfeit on;
 For worse than Philomel you used my daughter,
 And worse than Progne I will be revenged (V.ii.92-95)

These mythological allusions lead to intriguing questions and help students explore the ways in which Shakespeare's earliest tragedy uses these figures from myth to provide a deeper level of meaning. An additional, less obvious layer of classical mythology awaits critical attention as well. Although rarely linked with *Titus Andronicus*, two myths—the War of the Titans and the madness of Hercules—offer opportunities for critical compare / contrast.

The War of the Titans

In Greek mythology, Uranus imprisons his own children in Tartarus, the depths of hell, and his wife Gaia charges her son Cronus (Kronos) with revenge. Cronus kills his father and then his own brother to ensure his claim to the Titan throne, and, fearful of a prophecy that says his offspring will overthrow his rule, he swallows his children whole. His wife Rhea makes sure that one son, Zeus, escapes to free his siblings. Because he releases the cyclopes and giants from Tartarus as well, he is able to take down his father after a ten-year war. Students also should know that the Roman god of agriculture, Saturn, came to be identified with Cronus, thanks to the work of Lucius Livius Andronicus, the founding father of Roman drama.

The whole Olympic pantheon starts in a cycle of patricide, filicide, and fratricide—much like the bloody action of *Titus Andronicus*. Students can be challenged to synthesize details from the mythic Titan War with the characters and actions of Shakespeare's play. Sample discussion questions or essay prompts might include the following:

- What is the role of women in the myths? Is Tamora like the earth-goddess Gaia or Rhea? How?
- How is Titus like Cronus? How is Saturninus like Cronus? Who resembles the paranoid Greek Titan most and why?
- In some Roman myths, the god Saturn's female consort is Lua. According to H.S. Versnel, "this goddess embodies one of Saturn's major and original qualities, to 'make loose, set free, liberate' " (183), but she also is associated with Lua Mater, who destroys the weapons of Rome's enemies. How is Tamora like Lua? What does she liberate? Does she destroy enemy weapons?
- What character(s) from the War of the Titans is Lucius most like?
- At the end of the Titan War, Atlas is singled out for special punishment and condemned to hold up the sky. Is there a similar character in *Titus Andronicus*?
- In mythology, the Titans are defeated by the younger generation, the Olympians. How does the end of *Titus Andronicus* reflect a similar change of power?

It also may be worth noting that Lucius, who encouraged his father Titus to murder Tamora's son Alarbus in the first place and in a sense started the chain of vengeance, is the sole Andronici survivor. In order to defeat Saturninus, Lucius allies himself with the same Goths whom Titus battled for ten years, and he is named the new emperor.

The Madness of Hercules

Hercules was born to Alcmena, one of Jupiter's many mortal conquests. Enraged by her husband's infidelities, Juno tried to kill the baby and, when that failed, later drove the hero insane. Hercules murdered his wife Megara and their three sons. To atone for his crimes, he had to serve King Eurystheus for twelve years and complete twelve impossible tasks: his famed labors. In the course of his feats, Hercules inadvertently kills Chiron, a wise, immortal centaur who is a son of the Titan Cronus.

Along with a discussion of Hercules as a hero, these questions might lead to fruitful debate:

- Is the plot of *Titus Andronicus* similar to the struggles of Hercules?
- Who in *Titus Andronicus* is most like Hercules?
- Tamora attempts to push Titus into madness, and he does murder his daughter Lavinia in front of a crowd. Is Tamora like Juno?
- Is there any connection to be made between Hercules's accidental slaying of the centaur Chiron and the fate of Chiron in *Titus Andronicus*?
- Despite killing his family, Hercules generally is considered a great hero of mythology. Do you consider Titus Andronicus a hero? Why or why not?
- Does anyone in *Titus Andronicus* pay for his or her crimes?

My college students have relished *Titus Andronicus* as a means of exploring Greco-Roman mythology far more than a rehash of *The Iliad* or *The Odyssey*. Yes, Shakespeare's tragedy is heavy on the gore, but the weight of classical allusions makes it a worthwhile classroom addition.

References

- Eliot, T.S. "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation." *Essays on Elizabethan Drama*. Houghton MifflinHarcourt, 2014. 3-55. Google eBook. Web. 8 Apr. 2014.
- Ettin, Andrew V. "Shakespeare's First Roman Tragedy." *ELH* 37.3 (1970): 325-341. JSTOR. Web. 9 Apr. 2014.
- Harvey, Nancy Lenz. "*Titus Andronicus* and 'The Shearmen and Taylors' Play'." *Renaissance Quarterly* 22.1 (1969): 27-31. JSTOR. Web. 5 May 2014.
- Shakespeare, William. *Titus Andronicus*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1973. 1065-1100. Print.
- Versnel, H.S. *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion II: Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishing, 1990. Google Books. Web. 5 May 2014.

Old Bard, New Wounds: Shakespeare, Liberties and *Impossible* Global Stage

Even though, definitions of the term ideology have become all the time more challenging, its currency in many topical commentaries on the Bard indicates a particularly attractive development. Shakespearean studies have grown to be part of the study of social caption—of the customs in which individual people are emblazoned by society with roles, beliefs, identities and allegiances. The Bard explores the method in which he is drawn in; and if his standing as sage has diminished, the status of his workings as illuminators of historical processes has variously been enhanced. The creator of Prospero and Jacques might smile, if a little wryly, to see that so much topical literary theory aspires to dissolve the conventional boundaries between verity and fiction, realism and daydream. The influences of Marx, Freud, Saussure, Althusser, Derrida, Barthes, Foucault and others have conspired to make many earlier certainties, facts or beliefs seem, at times, an 'insubstantial pageant', while disconcerting force has been conferred on the pronouncement that: "All the world is a stage.."

The understanding, or rather interpretation (to use the sense in its critical premise) of the works of this genius was a lot unlike in his own days. The audience was a cross-section of London—Puritans only excepted—and what on earth its precincts might be, it possessed the utmost worth of regarding poetry as a normal resource of expression. Poetry, in its own term was far isolated from the lingo of commonplace tongue, and whilst it was delivered by actors, it was proclaimed in such an approach so as to call attention to, rather than to screen the rhetorical diplomacy in employment by the versifier. Robert Bridges accused those dejected beings (called 'the groundlings' at that time) for preventing the Bard from being a grand artiste. As a matter of fact, modern scholars owe them a huge debt of gratitude for demanding of Shakespeare poetry rather than realism, and for forestalling him from lettering the scholastic dramas which were the pride of the Wits—the academic élite of that time.

In present times, especially since the twentieth century, the increase of school and university edification generated such a communal that desires to make out Shakespeare affably performed. Plays uncared for centuries have been revived and rejuvenated, while amateur dramatics transformed therefore—though not got hold of that great level of eighteenth century. It would be inoperative to make believe that the modern playgoer is an idyllic bystander of a Shakespeare play. Having premeditated that subject matter at school, he is to be expected to perceive the drama through the distorting mirror of the detractor. The modern stature has lost the delights of lack of knowledge—the joy, for example, of stimulation with the plot; and, as verse is 'creature from outer space' to him, he will hardly ever clutch the accurate connotation of the more knotty speeches, whether the performers hold forth them so as to communicate disposition rather than meaning or speak the lines as if they were prose. Both schemes, wanting the essential mix together of formality and artlessness, take life of the poetry.

The picture of the modernist does not necessarily mean that the Bard is nothing new to offer now; on the contrary, every new day is bringing with it more and more novel studies related to the poet of Avon. We now know him as a psychological mentor for the

Elizabethans, and perhaps the more complex figure as an illegal food hoarder or tax evader. His persona and creations are equally well under scanner for academicians as they were, while his relevancy is trying to reach out globally from his native 'Globe'. The ever-changing construal of the Bard and his workings are not only transforming the scholarship but also opening new premise and places to land upon—places which were never explored or even thought of beforehand for any kind of activity concerning Shakespeare. A time when the entire world is celebrating the Bard's 450th day of arrival, we are enclosed by questions of our own subsistence that are forcing the desertion of the 'arts'; however this situation is not as much as necessary to make those anxious who are really aflame about the grand rhymester. The passionate populace in every niche and bend of the world are making an effort to accomplish a bit innovative with the Bard, maneuvering his thoughts out of the vestiges; these are not merely activities or conduct to pay homage, but are new-fangled interpretations also. They breed in figure and volume as much as they sprout all over the planet with their space-specific exegesis.

There is a major question that looms large upon us: how on earth an enthusiast should bring Shakespeare to those people who are devilishly death-ridden? There are Lands that are torn apart by severe civil strife for decades, and the cause which may sound as silly as the possession of the salt-fields. Geographies those are so war-ridden that blood and bullet became everyday actuality even for the infants who die fast by starving or by some deadly disease in the arms of their parents. As a matter of fact, what is frequently harsh realism in a developing world, for many in Europe is Shakespeare's world of poetry and metaphor. Life for citizens in these parts of the globe is nearer to the means all human beings have lived until recent times, even if somehow more severe and instantaneous. Diseases here are highly vituperative, wider in scope and more perilous, while Beggars and the disabled are on the street, right in front of others. Thus Death is always at hand, and when people breathe their last, the funeral is least to mention. The grey and muffled Occidental hemisphere in comparison looks wrapped in cotton wool—by screens, walls and windows, at the same time as westerly thoughts and language are copiously constrained by euphemism and political correctness. The affairs of state are vicious in worlds 'on the rise' in matters of life or death, and despots like Robert Mugabe or Mobutu Sese Seko escalate and plummet like Shakespearean kings and lords. There are others who have begun their tenure fighting fit and afterwards, like Macbeth, became mistrustful autocrats. The tribalism of Montagues and Capulets is straight away decipherable, so is the authoritative enchantment like that of Prospero domineering the spirits of air, earth, water. So, for an answer, Shakespeare needs no explanation, neither any context settling in these parts of the globe.

In an alternative picture, recently, under an initiative from the Globe theatre, a troop from the newborn nation state South Sudan performed Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* following the good guidance of actor Francis Paulino Lugali whose booming tone of voice yelled in Juba Arabic at the very core of the Globe: "All these people have come from the newest country in the world, and this country is South Sudan!" A sad pleasantry with reference to a British sovereign who says no to forfeit an accolade to the Romans, *Cymbeline* contains a loving filament filled with con and trouncing running all the way through. In a significant reading of the entire state of affairs, Dominic Gorgory Lohore, who delivered a unassailable act as the conceited Cloten, weighed the tribute against the oil—which is at this moment craved by apiece nation—and the naive but uncontaminated romance to the spirit of an

toddler national territory. “Petrol is there... but human beings are unique. They can do anything with the petrol, but the heart is the very important thing,” Gorgory Lohore believed.

Not that people from developing nations come to London or Europe to give testimony to their love or interpretations of Shakespeare, but the Bard also reaches them equally well. The present century has seen a volley of strife—be it civil or international, and under 'watch' by UN 'peace keeping' programme. But one way or another, topics like Shakespeare still inspires a few dozen at least. To brood over his philosophy and act upon them are still in the veins of humanists who do really care for humanity itself and at large; the result is the performances at those places where one would generally expect the march of military boots if not gunshots. In war-torn Bosnia, U.S. College graduates brought Shakespeare, with the aim to fetch in concert Muslims and Catholics—trying to rub out the scars of their country's blood-spattered civil hostilities. Former Dartmouth students with Professor Andrew Garrod steered the youthful Bosnian performers to dramatize Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, an account on the subject of vengeance and lenience. In excess of a decade after the finish of its civil war, Bosnia is at a standstill divide between ethnicity and religion. With the multiethnic actors ranging from ages 14 to 24, productions like such proffer one of the few prospects for juvenile Bosniak Muslims and young Croat Catholics to draw closer simultaneously.

A further classic example of this shifting phizog of Shakespeare is the performance of *King Lear* by a group of Syrian refugee brood in a place unbelievable and farthest even from imagination—the desert camp at Zaatari in Jordon. For those 100 children constituting the dramatis personae, it was their introductory brush with the loftier arts of Shakespeare—despite the fact that they were already “steep'd in” tragedy and heartbreak themselves. “People get opportunities in life, and you have to take advantage of them,” Mr. Azzam, the father of a child-actor, significantly opined. “She got a chance to act when she was young, so that could make it easier for her in the future.” The refugees who had fled the civil war in Syria had seen their homes destroyed, or had lost relatives. Many had difficulty in sleeping or jumped at strident sounds; in this secluded, treeless camp, a lay of lack, insecurity and tedium. Parents and aid workers feared that Syria's war threatened to erupt a mislaid generation of children who are pockmarked by violent behaviour and let pass imperative years of schooling; issues as vital as that might be disadvantageous for them, and will go behind them into later life. The *King Lear* show, the winding up of a venture that took several months, was one endeavour to wrestle any such kind of peril.

Lear was written by the Bard in the immediate upshot of the Gunpowder Plot, a 'terrorist' plot with latent September 11 penalty. Nawar Bulbul, a Syrian actor (who as a director sliced into it bits of *Hamlet* too) had expressed it straight: “The show is to bring back laughter, joy and humanity”. Bulbul opted for *Lear* as he dreaded “a play about the bombs that fell on people's heads in Syria would not interest” kids who have grown to be world-weary by the bereavement and demolition. “I focused on the comparison between lying and telling the truth,” Bulbul said. “Children should be playing with toys and learning science, arts and music”. “When I first came here,” he went on, “children were using the language of war ... tanks, bullets and bombs. That's changed now. To me, this is an achievement.” Here, we must silently listen and feel the voice of Bushra Nasr, 13, who played Lear's eldest daughter Goneril: “The play brought joy to all of us,” while Weam Ammari, 12, who played ill-treated daughter Cordelia brightly rejoined: “My role was not easy at first because I had to

...speak classical Arabic... But now, everything is smooth and I have a lot of friends. It makes me feel much better. I do not feel lonely any more in this place.” Before moving on a confident remark of Bulbul also calls for mention: “Performing Shakespeare's play in the heart of Zaatari is a different kind of a revolution against politics and society.”

It is not that folks in this modern century compellingly fashion acquaintances between the works of the Bard and the ongoing socio-political issues, and these are for no reason a new thing too. Shakespeare could have attended to stories of war and death from the English who had been skirmishing on the Continent in the 16th century, and as a consequence we obtain from him more than a few immortal lines related to mortality and massacre. He has written extensively on the ravages of war, and both the aggressor and the opponent are poetically justified. At the blockade of Harfleur, the soldier Boy desires to be far-flung from scuffle: “Would I were in an alehouse in London! I would give / all my fame for a pot of ale, and safety”. Henry's saunter throughout his camp on the eve of Agincourt (in concealing outfit) stirs up some justly current manifestations on warfare. The warrior Bates proposes that if the king had approached on his own to Agincourt, he would be securely ransomed “and a many poor men's lives saved”. The uniformly distraught soldier Williams points that if the English cause is doubtful: “...the king himself hath / a heavy reckoning to make, when all those legs, and / arms, and heads, chopped off in a battle, shall join / together at the latter day, and cry all 'We died at / such a place'; some swearing, some crying for a / surgeon; some upon their wives, left poor behind / them; some upon the debts they owe; some upon their / children rawly left...”

Death was eternally in attendance in the lives of Tudor men—the Plague that every now and then closed down the Globe Theatre, and the highly contagious graveyards spilling over, amalgamated the entire mankind in the propinquity of demise. The pace with which sickness knocked down living beings in previous centuries was beyond doubt homicidal, and Shakespeare would unquestionably have witnessed ache and anguish in London life on a daily basis. Therefore identifying with death is to comprehend hostilities, which is in essence about the extermination of human existence more willingly than trouncing or defeat. As a precedent, Hamlet's soliloquy over pitiable Yorick's skull continues to exist as a profoundly perturbing contemplation of death: “My gorge rises at / it. Here hung those lips that I have kissed I know / not how oft. Where be your gibes now? your / gambols? your songs? your flashes of merriment / that were wont to set the table on a roar? Not one / now, to mock your own grinning? Quite chapfall'n?” And as he got to his feet in the Elsinore churchyard: “I saw a bird alighted on the city walls of Tus / Grasping in its claws Kaika'us's head: / It was saying to that head, 'Shame! Shame! / Where now the sound of the bells and the boom of the drum?’” Are not we hear the jibe at our own devastative ways of politics while reading or reciting or performing such lines? Words like that do not need any specific geography to settle upon as politically perfect—they belong to every nook and corner of this planet irrespective of time and space.

As a consequence, while playing the crowd scenes of *Julius Caesar* in Africa, it becomes effortless and without rehearsal for the reason that the mass knew all about uncomplicated people tricked by 'tricky' politicians. People now turn out to be really interested in finding the postcolonial or late-late modernistic flavour while watching pieces like *The Tempest* or thinking about *Othello* as a testimony of the fear of the Arab—that 'Arabia' for the Bard. Prospero in *The Tempest* is full of both the self-satisfaction and brutality

of any modern-day terrorist and the clandestine bigotry of some 'white' house. He orders Ariel to demolish the arrogating Alonso's vessel resulting massive destruction; whilst shrewdly controlling Caliban—the 'terrorist'. Folks, especially those who were hit hard as a result of some stubborn occidental 'developmental steps', can easily make out the method used upon Caliban—at the outset naively nurtured by Prospero and then fated to slavery after misbehaving with Prospero's daughter, the colonial slave who turns not in favour of the fruits of civilisation that were tendered to him. On a graver note, *Othello* represents an obvious tragic narrative for the western world regarding the troublesome Middle East. He is a Muslim in the service of Venice—by neighbour to the Ottoman Empire—and is sent to Cyprus to battle the Turkish fleet. He is a mercenary whose self-hatred contaminates the play and eventually leads to his own death. Racially abused by both Iago and Roderigo, he lives in a world where there are men whose heads supposedly hang beneath their shoulders. Even till 1998 the widely read texts on this excellent 'coloured' tragedy contained connotations on Othello as the 'nigger'—while performing such a drama it is never hard to find arguments for adaptations, liberties or interpretations.

As a matter of historical fact, the changing face of playing Shakespeare, that people talk about widely today, were actually shifting from the days of James I and Charles I. At the time of Restoration two theatres—and between 1682 and 1695 only one—were ample to gratify the public demand. A generation earlier a smaller populace had required no less than six. Shakespeare, being less popular than Beamont and Fletcher, was recurrently altered to suit the taste of the times. Side by side, Actresses, now becoming visible for the first time, had to be provided for. At the end of *King Lear* Cordelia was made to live happily ever after as Edgar's wife, Miranda was given a sister, and Lady Macduff had her part enlarged. It is significant that the age which was most critical of his faults (1660-1800), was the one when most liberties were taken with the staging of his plays. Yet the period from 1660 to 1890 was an age of great acting when Betterton, Garrick, Kemble and many others appeared in adapted versions of the plays of the Bard. Shakespeare's plays were staged with elaborate scenery, and with savage cuts to make room for it. Those who really appreciated Shakespeare usually stayed away from the theatre, and we had the comic spectacle of Thomas Hardy in the front row of the gallery with his eyes glued not to the stage but to a text of the play.

Now a days, while performing in a Syrian refugee camp or in newly created South Sudan, liberties are taken not to critique the Bard or to suit the popular taste, but for contextualizing with the complex cultural space—with perhaps an opaque aim of sharing some fundamental philosophy with a number of distressed denizens. Shakespeare can still be used to remind ourselves of an earlier, "safer" (if nonexistent) world, a reassurance of our own ultimate survival. All those bones of contention present in Shakespeare's era, and which crowd in his theatrics—class discrimination, racial and bias, civil disobedience, eroticism, prejudice against women and their much debated role in society—are still pivotal and subjects in today's dysfunctional global society. Critics cry loud about the difficulties with reading him; it might prove really onerous if one goes over one of his plays for the first time, and trying to make sense of it. But that does not necessarily mean he will be what Geoffrey Chaucer is now—a brilliant author whose works can be read intelligently in the original by few individuals. After all, Shakespeare wrote his plays to be performed, not to be read in miserable isolation. The more plays that are enjoyed in this way—and enjoyment should be the keyword—the clearer a picture emerges of the universal and relevant situations which Shakespeare wrote about.

As our language changes, older forms of English become further knotty. This is why Shakespeare's place will be increasingly hard to defend. A taxing toil is to maintain that he remains at the very core of the Anglophone literature and culture, because his works have demurred in comparative esteem. Not that they are prostrated by the ravages of time, but all the time more subject to it. People know his reputation more than his words, and thus it embarks on to appear as though Shakespeare can never be beaten, even in this tech-savvy century—though he is the most un-digitalized of all writers. Conformist censors may extol him for the messages of nationalism, piety, harmony, unity and reconciliation which he proclaims to them. Middle-of-the-road critics may clap his 'infinite variety', density and ambiguity. Left-wing critics may speak well of him for the views about ideological obfuscation which he smuggles. And within many recent commentaries, whether they advertize themselves as semiotic or deconstructional or materialistic, we may detect not only the reductively skeptical tones of a **Thersites** of *Troilus and Cressida*, but also the considerate tones of a Launce (*The Two Gentlemen of Verona*), voicing concern for the small fry. On his 450th year of arrival, when the world is crying foul to Humanities, the Bard still breathes within us and none can take his share of reverence at any rate.

References

- Bloomekatz, Ari. "South Sudan troupe sees new country's struggle in Shakespeare." *Los Angeles Times*. Los Angeles Times, 16 May 2012. Web. 7 May 2014. <<http://articles.latimes.com/2012/may/16/entertainment/la-et-globe-to-globe-shakespeare-20120512>>.
- "Dartmouth Now." *Dartmouth Now*. N.p., 1 Aug. 2011. Web. 7 May 2014. <<http://now.dartmouth.edu/2011/08/americans-bring-shakespeare-to-war-torn-bosnia-cbs-news/>>.
- Ford, Borris, ed. *New pelican Guide to English Literature*. 1983. 2. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1986. Print.
- Hubbard, Ben. "Behind Barbed Wire, Shakespeare Inspires a Cast of Young Syrians." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 31 Mar. 2014. Web. 10 May 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/01/world/middleeast/behind-barbed-wire-shakespeare-inspires-a-cast-of-young-syrians.html?_r=0>.
- Reisz, Matthew. "Is there anything new to say about Shakespeare?." *Times Higher Education*. N.p., 26 Sept. 2013. Web. 10 May 2014. <<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/is-there-anything-new-to-say-about-shakespeare/2007545.article>>.
- "Shakespeare's past as food hoarder." *BBC News*. N.p., 1 Apr. 2013. Web. 6 May 2014. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-wales-mid-wales-21993857>>.
- Taha, Kamal. "Young Syrian refugees bring Lear to life at Zaatari camp." *The Daily Star Newspaper*. N.p., 27 Mar. 2014. Web. 10 May 2014. <<http://www.dailystar.com.lb/Culture/Performance/2014/Mar-27/251363-young-syrian-refugees-bring-lear-to-life-at-zaatari-camp.ashx#axzz31mTVUPKE>>.

Gossips and Songs: Emergence of 'Subculture' in *Othello*

Othello one of the four greatest tragedies of Shakespeare, in A. C Bradley's phrase, the 'most exciting and the most terrible' (qtd. in Orlin 2) is a play that has been at the centre of debates surrounding race, gender, power, and sexuality. This play has generated zillions of interpretations concerning the battle between the 'Other' (racist) and the Self of the European order, battle between good versus evil, violence towards women and blacks. Its overt lack of any 'suggestions of huge universal powers working in the world of individual fate and passion' (qtd. in Orlin 2) which has troubled critics like Bradley on how to place *Othello* within the canonical Shakespearean framework has, in fact led to newer engagements by the critics with which to understand this drama.

This paper is not about the warring of wills between *Othello* and Iago but about the relationship between Emilia and Desdemona, which I have attempted to show as one of the very first expressions of 'subculture'. Taking a cue from Dick Hebdige's "Subculture: The Meaning of Style" (1979), I would read their conversations, gossips as a way of style, one which exposes the 'fault lines' of the Renaissance patriarchy" and also, Julia Kristeva's ideas about the 'Chora' inform these debates surrounding the emergence of resistance against the power that seeps through the Western male hegemonic discourse.

Marriage and Male Desire in the Renaissance Era

Women in Elizabethan and Jacobean England were mainly thought of as expressions of 'objects of male desire, and dependent on that desire for their status, their livelihood and even their lives' (Newman 7). The various conduct books and manuals in proliferation during these times all engage in an enterprise of teaching women to remain steadfast to her duties of observing the marriage vows to pay 'close attention to the *office* and *dutie of a Wife* (emphasis added; qtd. in Newman 9). *Othello* is a play about marriage, and one which bespeaks of a larger dynamics involved in the heterosexual relationship within marriage. One can say using Gayle Rubin's argument that the patriarchal heterosexuality that informs *Othello* marriage is more about 'traffic in women', it is 'the use of women as exchangeable, perhaps symbolic property' to cement the order of men (qtd. in Sedgwick 25-26). Marriage in prefigures what Claude Levi-Strauss, discussed as not a 'relationship between a man and a woman', but 'between two groups of men', seemingly as 'objects' (ibid).

Luce Irigaray's article- "When the Goods Get together" first published in her collection of essays titled *This Sex Which Is Not One* (1985), articulates that women figures within marriage as an illustration of the 'male economy of desire' governed by the logic of exchange or traffic of women between men. Desdemona's first entry in this tragedy speaks of the 'divided duty' (1. 3. 179) between her father Brabantio and her husband *Othello*, one of whom she would have to espouse her allegiance in terms of unquestioning obedience, faithfulness and subservience. When Desdemona expresses her desire in passionate terms to be 'subdued/ Even to the very quality of my lord' (1.3. 248-48), we can visualise a culture wherein to use Irigaray's words, '[Male] homosexuality is the law that regulates the socio-cultural order. Heterosexuality amounts to the assignment of roles in the economy' (Irigaray

107). This homosexuality represents not actual sex between men but is an order that 'deprecates the feminine and invests the masculine with sexual desire accompanied by fear, guilt and loathing of female sexuality' (Boose 28). This inscription of being an 'object' materialized as asexual trope to be 'occupied' by men and further devalued by 'sexual congress with "pioneers"' (Boose 29), is not the narrative only to be read in the context of Desdemona, but that all the 'women are the fair papers on which the men of the play write 'whore'(Boose 38).

Robert B.Heilman discusses a 'world of economics' in which Desdemona manifests more as a 'female currency', associated mainly in terms of their roles as 'sexual commodities', the voyeuristic object that the play invites the audience to consume as well as to violate (555) . Even Rodrigo who idealizes Desdemona believes that she is available for sexual purchase if he had gold and jewels enough (*Othello* 1.3.329-359). Though the first few scenes during the famous trial of Othello, one can see the spirit of independence in Desdemona, but she is always described and rather circumscribed in language that speaks of her as a commodity. The loss of Desdemona is reported to Brabantio in terms of a material loss, he is 'robbed' by Othello. The injunction of the senators to Othello to 'use Desdemona well', is premised on a language that reifies Desdemona as an object/ prize to be won and possessed (*Othello* 1.3. 289). That Othello's declaration of love is couched in a language of gainful acquisitions is illustrative in Othello's own words, 'I won his daughter' as if she is some prize or property to accumulate (*Othello* 1.3. 93).It is not only the male characters who are aware and in fact manifest this language of economic weakness amongst the female characters, but even Emilia- the most exploited in this chain of exchange, commodity and consumption is aware of women being an item of usage and property as can be seen in these lines: '[T]hey are all but stomachs, and we all but food; [T]hey eat us hungrily, and when they are full, [T]hey belch us' (*Othello* 3.4.101–3).Desdemona's earlier independent streak and her agency in terms of subjectivity thus need to be studied in the light of 'her unwanted usage in the bartering economy' (Mulpeter 7). So, women in Elizabethan and Jacobean England with its highly stratified and gendered society existed 'only as the possibility of mediation, transaction, transference - between man and his fellow creatures, indeed between man and himself' (Irigaray 108).

So if male desires circumscribe the women within certain ascribed roles, to be traded, and violated, the question emerges what happens if these same 'goods' does get together? What would happen if Desdemona and Emilia come together, will the 'goods' be able to speak to one another, without the regulations of the 'market'? In the words of Irigaray, 'female homosexuality does exist'(110) and this will be read in the paper as a style, a subculture that resists this economy of patriarchal order. I am not reading the relationship between Desdemona and Emilia as a lesbian one, or as an aberration to a heterosexual relationship, but one which interrogates their situatedness within the formulations of a Renaissance male order.

Dick Hebdige's 'subcultures' is recognition of the political significance of the youth subcultures. If in Hebdige's definition of subculture as representing 'noise', 'anarchy out there' and subcultural style testifies to the 'idea' of 'style as a form of refusal', as a political transgression, this refusal I find in Desdemona also, to be dominated or calcified according to the categorizations labelled against her (221-222). Subcultures in general are often premised on a subversive value system, one that challenges the accepted, given values of the dominant

culture. This 'culture within a culture' always has its own dynamics and the ramifications of it are inevitable and indispensable. The subculture as a form of style which I find in the dynamics of her relationship with another exchangeable 'goods', more vulnerable and more open to exploitation than the Venetian lady- Emilia, is one of the earliest instances of a new language of emancipation.

In Act 4, sc. 3, popularly called the 'Willow Song' scene, this style becomes evident that it helps to consolidate the articulatory powers of both these vulnerable ladies. This style is not of punk, or of reggae but of a language interspersed with gossips, narratives and songs, which destabilizes the male order from within and exposes their fragile world built on 'progressively violating the object of desire' (Boose 36). However, before we analyse Act 4, one can see instances of sexual transgression in Desdemona not only being aroused by the stories of Othello – 'She'd come up again, and with a greedy ear/devour up my discourse/... yet she wished that heaven had made her such a man' (*Othello* 1.3 148-162). And finally in marrying a man of her choice she at once seems to defy both the Venetian state as well as her father. But this transgression and raucous freedom is subsumed within a narrative of male economy, 'robbing', 'using', to reify the patriarchal set up. Emilia on the other hand, seems to have no voice : 'Alas! She has no speech!' (*Othello* 2.1. 103), neither any material presence, one who is bidden to follow Iago's malevolent injunctions, even filching the handkerchief at the behest of Iago, that becomes the catalyst for the tragedy. From their very first encounter we can see an alliance between Desdemona and Emilia. In Act 2 scene 1, Desdemona defends Emilia consistently against the malicious slander of Iago, but this rouses him and he accuses all women of being whores, "you rise to play, and go bed to work" (*Othello* 2.1. 115). The very presence of two women forming a sympathetic confederate is enough to infuriate the 'paradigm' of misogynist violence. It is in their coming together in Act 4, scene 3- that a new space seems to emerge, one which seriously threatens and exposes the fissures in the male dominant discourses.

Space, Gender and Fissures of Patriarchy

Act 4 in Shakespeare's oeuvre has been traditionally regarded as the 'pity act'. According to Kenneth Burke, this act exemplifies a 'quiet lull in the action, women's voices and vulnerabilities, songs and pathos' (qtd.in Pechter 367). But this is purely reductive analysis, as this scene is one of the few instances where the voices of women are heard, a space beyond the symbolic order of men, unrestricted, free-flowing not dictated and ratified by men. If one would look at the performance history of Othello, it would become apparent that this scene has been consistently eliminated or reduced in performance. To use Hebdige's idea of subculture, one could say that this scene has been 'dismissed, denounced'(223) regarded as a mere 'lamentable ditty'. During the 18th century this scene was broadly censured, as it was felt that this scene 'diminished the dignity of a tragedy with domestic female babble' disrupting the 'form and norms of both gender and genre' (Pechter 369). One could locate in these censorship, a way to contain the solidarity of women which might threaten the hegemonic patriarchal discourse.

Act 4, coming in between the eventful temptation scenes of Act 3 and the violent denouement of Act 5, is a space which defies closure or fixity, it is maternal, the 'chora' of Julia Kristeva, the intermediate space which is both 'metaphysical and bodily'. This scene can be read as a void, one which Rose Braidotti, suggests creates a 'crisis in the master's discourse' (qtd. in Berry&Wernick 252). Kristeva's elaborates *chora's* as a 'heterogeneous

and disruptive 'semiotic' dimension upon which language obscurely depends; yet the tendency of *chora* is always to undermine the stability of the subject within signification' (qtd. in Berry & Wernick 255). *Chora* is the 'maternal mediating principle' between the semiotic and the symbolic that 'motivates the most primordial differentiations of what will eventually become the separated, social subject of signification' (Keltner n.p). This interlude is a visible manifestation of not only female alliances being forged but a 'gesture of defiance' (Hebdige *Subcultures* 3), a space at once of 'private freedom within this protected enclosure' (Petcher 367), a space in which both these women seem to find a voice, and release themselves from the ossified 'cultural imperatives' of what Irigaray observed in *To Speak is never Neutral*, 'she is presumed to be and to become' (qtd. in Estrin 53). This scene is 'self-fashioning' in Stephen Greenblatt's terms the gender dynamics of the play (qtd. in Orlin 6), a dialogue between the symbolic male order and the maternal space of semiotic. Though critics like Kenneth Burke and Eamon Greenan read the willow song scene as an instance of foreboding, wherein Desdemona 'seems doubly frail', in this paper the scene is read as a style to question the patriarchal discourse.

In Act 4, Sc.3, Desdemona revisits her past and reclaims that 'downright violence' (*Othello* 1.3. 247) which negates the voice, agency of women, breaking the shackles of the fathers and the Othellos' to prefabricate an identity for her. The 'anastrophic coming' of Irigaray (qtd. in Estrin 52) is played out in this scene of female friendships transcending borders of class. The enactment of a distant past, located in memory of fellow sisterhood (the song is of her mother's maid which enacts a subculture that refuses to be indoctrinated), facilitates a 'consolidation of her speaking powers' (55). The willow song is an acknowledgement of the past into the fabric of the present, one which not only encapsulates her 'relational identity', but at the same, from a woman articulated as the 'other', a woman who is relegated to a position of 'duty', she constructs herself through a gestural style of a female subculture. In Elaine Showalter's 'The Female Tradition', subculture is a sort of 'group consciousness', forged through a 'shared and increasingly secretive, physical experience' (15). According to Showalter, the intimate and deep female friendship is what encompasses the notion of 'subculture'. In remembering this song from memory, a song which will 'not go from her mind' (*Othello* 4.3 29), Desdemona reflections on Othello's transformation is displaced from state matters of Venice and Cyprus that might have 'puddled his clear spirit' (4.3.140), from the division of male versus female sphere, 'into a stronger and more assertive tonality' (Pechter 382). This song is not by Shakespeare, but a traditional ballad, a reservoir of anonymous commonsensical cultural stories, through which Iago also derives his power. This song is a subcultural response to a dominant tradition, one which Desdemona takes complete possession. The song is, to use Hebdige's words defining subculture, a 'profane articulation' (221) which through "perturbation and deformation" disrupts and reorganizes meaning' (227) and hence, refashions a new identity for these women.

Passed from mothers to a generation of females, this song manifests transformational energies by calling attention to her mistake: "Let nobody blame him, his scorn I approve-- / [Speaks] Nay, that's not the next" (4.3. 52-53), a sub cultural gesture by which she revises a whole tradition. Through these female intimacies forged through by songs and an enclosed space, Desdemona adopts a self unlike the one sought by Brabantio when he desired for an 'adopted child' (*Othello* 1.3 202), and Othello's wish for an image of the woman he desires to see in the courtship scene, for the replication of 'such a man'

(1.3.164). Though the traditional song emphasizes passive suffering of unrequited love, in Desdemona's version, the stylistic gesture is 'a continuing affirmation of her own power to love (Pechter 383). Revision of the tradition is also marked in her insistence to Emilia of "unpinning" (*Othello* 4. 3. 19, 33), as if unadorned she would not only 'return to the female discursive matrix' (qtd. in Estrin 52) but refuse, as act of defiance the 'paralyzing hold of the male economy of desire', which in turn would help to refashion a new identity.

The song embodies a reversal of women being the cause of men's virtuous order being threatened, rather it portrays a narrative of a series of male unfaithfulness resulting in female looseness: 'But I do think it is their husbands' faults/ If wives do fall' (4.3.87-88). Moreover, this subcultural energy forged by 'shared conversation, mutual affection and extraordinary intimacy' (qtd. in Ozieblo & Narbora-Carrion 96), remains as a refrain in the memory of Emilia, who at the throes of her death, enacts a particular scene of women's gossip, "what did thy song bode, lady?" (*Othello* 5.3. 247). This transformation of group consciousness of women across time and across cultures turns the room into an 'echo chamber' (Estrin 55). This cyclical repetition enables this subculture to access a 'reservoir of meaning' (56).

Moreover, the female babble in this scene destroys the potency of 'reputation' that secures the male order. Cassio's lament of having lost his reputation (*Othello* 2. 3. 252) marks the rhetoric of almost all the males within the play of a manifestation of dialectic of individualism. Female tongue was not only the bearer of 'villainous secrets' (4. 2. 22) but open tongues were often aligned with gossip and promiscuity (Ozieblo & Narbora-Carrion 96), which signalled a defiance, a protest against the brutal logic of the patriarchal order.

Act 4, scene 3 is remarkable in the way it interrogates the male order and its unequivocal assumption of order, privilege, and authority by these two women's chatter. The dialogue that ensued between Desdemona and Emilia is nothing short of a political action and an action to understand their own desires and their relationships which inevitably fractures the potency and the power of the male order. If Desdemona asks Emilia about women who commit adultery (59-61), Emilia provides a cogent and sympathetic account of women who have been denied rights, liberties and mutual love within marriage and thus to re-tell a narrative of gendered violence illuminating the constructions which have rendered the patriarchal order as given and natural (87-104). This subcultural gesture evident in these two women's idle gossip, obfuscating class, and riches is one of the most brilliant expositions of sisterhood forged through memory, pain and narratives, to enable the world of suffering and violence as less traumatic.

This stylistic gesture of a quotidian order recognizes and exposes the fictionality of this male paradigm. When Desdemona 'acknowledges the abetment of love from the bridal', she not only forms a female subculture of dissidence with Emilia who expresses that 'like husbands, wives have sense like them' (*Othello* 4.3 95-96), a gesture that imagines a mutual fulfilment in marriage.

Conclusion

This idle chatter reveals the misogynist discourse implicit within the whole Venetian society, and foregrounds a perspective that connects the past, present and future to find an enclosed space of coherence, world of peace, and 'signalling the recognition of gossip as a cultural and narrative force to be reckoned with'. A community of women is formed in

Desdemona and Emilia, with the women of the past, that enables Desdemona to recognize the faultlines of the society, mirrored in Othello and Iago's rhetoric. But dissidence imagined in their relationships is not mere tattle, as in the final scene, Emilia finds the voice to speak the truth and to resolutely defeat the brutal logic of the patriarchal set-up by exposing her husband's malevolence and Othello's complicity in this objectification of women. The subculture emerges triumphant, an economy of female desires that refuses to be subsumed within the male order.

References

- Berry, Philipa, and Andrew Wernick, eds. *Shadow of Spirit: Postmodernism and Religion*. London: Routledge, 1992. *en.bookfi.org*. Web. 1 Dec 2013.
- Boose, Lynda E. "Let it be Hid: The Pornographic Aesthetic of Shakespeare's Othello." Lena Cowen Orlin 22- 49.
- Estrin, Barbara L. "Coming into the Word: Desdemona's Story." *Luce Irigaray and the Premodern Culture: Thresholds of History*. Ed. Theresa Krier and Elizabeth D. Harvey. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004. 53-65. *en.bookfi.org*. Web. 5 Dec 2013.
- Hebdige, Dick. *Subculture: The Meaning of a Style*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- . "Subculture: the Meaning of Style." *Culture: Critical Concepts in Sociology*. Ed. Chris Jencks. Vol. III. London: Routledge, 2003. 221-234. Print.
- Heilman, Robert B. "The Economics of Iago and Others." *Modern Language Association* 68.3 (1953): 555-571. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 May 2014.
- Irigaray, Luce. "When the goods get together." Trans. Claudia Reeder. *New French Feminisms: An Anthology*. Ed. Elaine Marks and Isabelle Courtivron. Hemel
- Hempstead: Harvester- Wheatsheaf, 1981. 107-110. Print. Trans. of "Des marchandise entre elles." *La quinzaine litteraire* 215 (1975): n.pag. Print.
- Keltner, S K. *Kristeva: Thresholds*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011. *Google Book Search*. Web. 16 May 2014.
- Mulpeter, Kathleen. "Parallelism and Confused Gender Roles in the 'Female Economy': *Othello*, *Moor of Venice* and *Much Ado about Nothing*." *Valley Humanities Review*, (Spring 2010): 1-10. Web. 15 May 2014.
- Newman, Karen. *Fashioning: Femininity and English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago: Univ of Chicago Press, 1991. *Google Book Search*. Web. 5 Dec 2013.
- Orlin, Lena Cowen. Introduction. *Othello: New Casebook*. By Orlin. Hampshire: Palgrave- Macmillan, 2004. Print.
- . Introduction. *Othello: New Casebook*. By Orlin. Hampshire: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2004. Print.
- Ozielblo, Barbara & Maria Dolores Narbora-Carrior, eds. *Codifying the National Self: Spectators, Actors and the American Text*. Brussels: Peter Lang, 2006. *Google Book Search*. Web. 5 Dec 2013.
- Pechter, Edward, ed. *William Shakespeare's: Othello*. Chennai: Norton Pub, 2005. Print.
- . "Too Much Violence: Murdering Wives in Othello." Edward Pechter 366- 387.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia Univ P, 1985. *Google Book Search*. Web. 5 Dec 2013.
- Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of their Own: British Women Novelists from Bronte to Lessing*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977. Print.

Indigenizing Shakespeare: A study of Maqbool and Omkara

Introduction

The cinema has been interested in Shakespeare since its earliest days. Screen adaptations of his plays have served various purposes including proving the relevance of Shakespeare to our times as well as manifesting the ability of the cinema to cope with works originally written for the Elizabethan theatre. Cinematic adaptations of Shakespeare's plays can be seen as a case of inter-semiotic and inter-temporal translation. While the medium of presentation was changed, so was the context of the plays. Shakespeare's plays have originated in a specific cultural system- 16th century English literature; the playwright deviated from them and introduced some additional complexity. So while writing in that context, Shakespeare tried to infuse something new and different in his plays. For example, he transformed the then common play of vengeance into what we now call a “Shakespearean tragedy”, something unique and different from other plays of similar genre (Weissbrod 2006). So even in their originality, the plays had certain unique characteristics.

Adaptation of literary works for theatre and cinema are different as these two media are quite different. Going back to the Elizabethan theatre's era, the use of settings and decorations were minimal, all performances took place during the day time and as women were not allowed to act on stage young boys played the role of women. The theatre at that point of time had technical limitations. Moreover the target audience was also very specific. But cinematic adaptations have certain advantages as they can successfully create the illusion of reality on stage. Technical advancement has also changed the nature of theatrical as well as cinematic presentations. It has also broadened the consumption of such production on a more universal level. Films were more easily accessible because of mass production and consumption.

1. Cinematic Adaptations

Cinema as a medium is much younger than theatre. In its initial days, cinema simulated theatre since it lacked its own repertoire. So it depended a lot on theatre for material. But as technology became more sophisticated, films moved from silent to talkies and from black and white to colour as well as from 2-D to 3-D and 4-D. However, most cinematic adaptations of Shakespeare usually tend to retain elements of theatrical models. This may be due to respect for the original works or to render something exotic to the production. While cinematic adaptations are nothing new, the delicacy required in transmutation from books to celluloid, has often led to much consternation amidst Hollywood elites. Many have raised concerns that callous adaptations often do tremendous injustice to original works of art. Translation across medium comes with its own limitations. It is often transliteration.

Adaptation of Shakespeare has not been limited to the West only. He has influenced literature, films in non western parts of the world including India as well. Many Indian writers find their source of inspiration in Shakespeare. His plays articulated human emotions

in a timeless way. His plays are often not essentially bound by temporal contexts which facilitates its translation in various contexts. Cinematic and theatrical adaptations of his plays in India are also very common.

Adaptation process looks at how meaning is created with words in literary text and how that meaning is translated into the visual image. Although cinematic adaptations have a lot of potential, there are certain limitations. The language of written text is satirical, classy and metaphorical which cannot easily be conveyed through cinematic languages. Adaptation of written text into films in itself can be of three types: a) Literal - in which case the reproduction of plot and attending details is as close as possible, b) Traditional - while the overall persona of the text is maintained, the director also tries to make certain adjustments in the visual representation and c) Radical – where the director reshapes the book in extreme ways, by re-interpreting the story after relocating it in terms of time, setting, place etc. Shakespeare's works have seen almost all kinds of adaptations.

Some of the very first experiments in film making involved plays by Shakespeare and his works proved to be very popular with film makers for over a century. Over 200 versions of films have been made based on his plays. While such cinematic adaptations are an interesting study in inter-semiotic translations, the angle of a globalised world and culture brings forth other issues. Such cinematic adaptations in a globalised world try to seek commonality as it simultaneously prioritizes diversity. Cinematic usages of Shakespeare implicitly espouse Shakespeare's continued relevance. Shakespearean plays can take place anywhere in modern day city as Shakespeare was not for an age, but for all time. However certain cinematic adaptations of Shakespeare have been highly localized. And such localizations have actually given rise to something hybrid in nature.

The first Shakespearean film in any country was made in 1899, a simple photographic record of a small part of Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree's stage production of King John. The next few decades would see varied cinematic adaptations of Shakespeare's plays. At first it was the silent movies and then with talkies, the experimentation of representing Shakespearean plays through the medium of films continued.

2. Shakespeare in India

Shakespeare was introduced in India as a part of the Empire's cultural and political investment. Of many things that came to India from the Empire, Shakespeare was one of the most important and most enduring. Sri Aurobindo even regarded Shakespeare as superior to Kalidasa and particularly valued the former's essential force, beauty and creativity. (Khan, 2002). Shakespeare became considerably popular since his very introduction in India. The British playhouses staged his plays and created an appetite for theatrical performances amongst educated Indians, making his plays a part of curriculum in the newly established Hindu College. It induced in the students a taste for such drama and taught them how to appreciate it. His plays were translated into almost every Indian language. And interestingly the Indian context was also taken into account. This is proven by the fact that few changes were made to the plays inspired by Shakespeare's original works. For example, in the Bengali adaptation of *The Merchant of Venice*, the central role was shifted from Antonio to Bhanumati. In another translation, the Duke is referred to as Rajyapal which is more specific to India.

His literature has transgressed the time and space limitations and has been ruling the

Indian literary circles for more than a century now. His influence cannot be separated from the history of stage performance as most versions were composed mainly for the stage. Apart from being a source of inspiration theatrical plays, it also forms a crucial part of the curriculum for teaching, training, research and extension in universities and colleges. It has also influenced Indian theatre as well as cinema. Popular Indian playwrights like Habib Tanveer have used Shakespearean plays in a local context in an interesting way. His plays have shown the universality of Shakespearean plays by contextualizing them to the rural and tribal belt in India. Be it an adaptation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as *Kam Dev ka Apna Basant Ritu ka Sapna* in which the courtesans spoke Urdu while the commoners spoke Chattisgarhi or other works of Tanveer. Such nuances showed a class gap between the people and the noble class. Tanveer's achievement with Shakespearean plays remains in the fact that he was able to recreate such plays with novices from Chattisgarh and could also induce folk tribal music in the plays. This in itself brings to light the immense potentialities that Shakespeare's plays hold.

Needless to say, Shakespeare came to constitute the predominant literary and poetic inspiration from the West in most Indian languages. Some translations have been more direct than the others. Works influenced by him form a broad spectrum extending from brief prose retellings to extremely free adaptations. An exact numerical account may not be possible as certain Indianized adaptations often hold out no clue to their Shakespearean origin. The Shakespearean model had certain other formative effects on the structure, themes and other 'literary' aspects of early modern Indian drama. A vital contribution was the concept of tragedy, virtually unknown in classical Sanskrit drama.

3. Bollywood and Shakespeare

Shakespeare's influence has not been limited to only Indian theatre or literature. It has influenced Indian cinema as well. Bollywood's relation with Shakespeare goes way back to 1941 when J J Madan adapted Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* for his film *Zalim Saudagar*. Later many other adaptations came up—Gulzar's *Angoor* from *Comedy of Errors*, for example. Recently the hit adaptations by Vishal Bhardwaj—*Maqbool* (*Macbeth*) and *Omkara* (*Othello*) have led to a renewed interest in the Bard's masterpieces. This is shown by movies like *10 ml Love* (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*), *Issaq* and *Ishaqzaade* (*Romeo and Juliet*). Adaptations of Shakespeare has been such that a colonizing master text became and remains to this day, the most translated and adapted, performed and published Western author. *Romeo and Juliet* has been very popular with Indian film makers. Habib Faisal, the director of *Ishaqzaade* added an interesting twist by taking the romance to hinterland of Uttar Pradesh and bringing into the burning issue of Khap Panchayats which oppose marriage between particular clans. Commenting on the Bard's influence, literary Pundits claim that Bollywood may have struggled had there been no Shakespeare to inspire and borrow from. However many also point out that the existential and philosophical elements of Shakespeare's works already existed in Indian epics like *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata*.

4. Indianising Shakespeare

Shakespeare's presence in popular Hindi films can be found in both direct adaptations, often influenced directly by Parsi theatre performance, and in the use of several themes and motifs whose sources can be traced back to Shakespeare (Gruss, 2009). Bollywood's rediscovering Shakespeare comes at a time when it is increasingly banking on

literature. This trend started in a big way when the film trade reaped rich dividends from Sarat Chandra's *Devdas*, the global acclaim for the adapted version of Rabindranath Tagore's *Chokher Bali* and the critical thumbs up to Sarat Chandra's *Parineeta- the Married Woman*. To understand his continued influence and the potentiality of his plays to be indigenized, this paper will look closely at two such acclaimed adaptations. They are *Maqbool* and *Omkara*, both directed by Vishal Bhardwaj.

a) *Macbeth* meets *Maqbool*:

In the rich history of Shakespearean translation and adaptation, *Macbeth* occupies an important place. *Macbeth* has found a long and productive life on celluloid. Like his other works, *Macbeth* also has the qualities of timelessness and volatility which enables its reproduction in different backgrounds. It is one of Shakespeare's shortest works. The play displays how over-psychological needs of a person drive him or her to act. The protagonist *Macbeth*'s relationship with his wife, the three witches and Banquo shows the psychological and physical changes he underwent in his hunger for power. How his wife's instigations pushed him over the edge and with what repercussions is crafted excellently in the play.

Although there have been many adaptations of *Macbeth*, the most popular ones are Akira Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood* (1957), Roman Polanski's *Macbeth* (1971), Orson Welles *Macbeth* (1948) etc. *Macbeth* have also been adapted by Bollywood film director Vishal Bhardwaj. Coming to Vishal Bhardwaj's 2004 film *Maqbool*, set in the dark underworld of Mumbai, the film retained its Bollywood features such as festivities, songs, dances.

Based in the underworld of Mumbai, the film is about the kind of power struggles that is a constant factor in the underbelly of the city. Abbaji played by Pankaj Kapoor in one of his finest works, heads a crime family. He has a young protégé *Maqbool* played by the talented Irrfan Khan. Bhardwaj's choice of actors points to his zeal of making *serious* cinema as opposed to popular commercial Bollywood flicks. Abbaji's mistress Nimmi is played by Tabu, an actor known for her excellent acting skills. Nimmi fell from the favour of Abbaji owing to a younger woman. She makes up for this loss by taking a love interest in the young *Maqbool* and instigating him to take Abbaji's place as the head by killing him. Borrowing from *Macbeth*'s core theme, Abbaji who is the head of a crime family is murdered by his mistress Nimmi's ambitious lover *Maqbool*. The film successfully blended the basic plot structure of Shakespeare's play with popular gangland films of Bollywood.

The adaptation has certain points of convergence as well as divergence with regard to the original piece of work. The film is much more than a mere cinematic representation. It is rather a new interpretation. Bhardwaj's *Maqbool* is shifted to the dark spaces of the Mumbai mafia popularly referred to as the underworld. The murder of rival gang lords is normalized in such a set up. The law of this land is similar to the era Shakespeare wrote about - the pre modern era. The era of *Macbeth* is marked by feudal laws which follows the strictures "Might is Right". The feudal order needs to be maintained and any subversion to that order leads to repercussions. While the underworld subverts the laws of modern state, it in turn is guided by a code

of conduct which infuses the justice delivery mechanism amongst gangsters. Even this code of conduct is strictly followed and any deviation is met by strict punishment. By locating the film in Mumbai's underworld, the director stretched the possibilities of power, ambition and evil and how such imperatives are omnipresent. What is also interesting is the transformation of a royal persona of Macbeth into a gangster Maqbool. Such transformation of nobility to outlaws may convey a tinge of comic irony. While such transformation may initially seem farfetched, the complex issues that the great Shakespearean tragedy raises was not lost in Maqbool.

Maqbool's elaboration of the supernatural is also remarkable. In the narrative of Shakespeare, the witches play a crucial role in giving the narrative a shape. Shakespeare's three weird sisters/witches appear in the form of two corrupt clairvoyant policemen Pandit and Purohit. Played by Om Puri and Nasiruddin Shah, these corrupt policemen actively helped Abbaji in his illegal work. But these two not only predict what will happen like the witches, rather they themselves influence the turn that the characters lives would take. So one can say they act as supernatural agents obsessed with maintaining some kind of balance of power in the underworld to serve their own interest. Their decision not to kill Boti(a gangster) is crucial as Boti later kills Maqbool.

Coming to the pair of Maqbool and Nimmi, unlike Lord and Lady Macbeth, they are not married, hence rendering their love forbidden in the Indian social set up. As opposed to murdering solely for ambition, Maqbool is incited in many fronts by Nimmi who fell from favour with Abbaji. Nimmi's role turned it into a passion crime. Nimmi manipulated Maqbool by making him dream of taking Abbaji's place. However the remorse of what they did engulfed them completely. While unable to understand what went wrong, But later Nimmi dies during childbirth and cause of guilt. Maqbool also internalizes all his violent past deeds and dies at the hands of Riyaz Boti, another gangster from the group.

b) Othello in the heartlands of U.P

A tale of tragic love, it is adapted from 17th century classic, Othello and stars actors like Ajay Devgan, Naseeruddin Shah and Kareena Kapoor. While contextualizing it to the ground level politics of Uttar Pradesh, the lead Omkara played by Ajay Devgan plays a Bahubali or a political fixer for a local politician. The narrative is quite securely rooted in the setting of Uttar Pradesh which not only accounts for the characters but also provides the messy setting of local corrupt politics.

The film dwells on the complexity of human relationships. Instead of putting things as black and white, the film brings out the grey area. While in the context of British empire, the Bard is also a token of Englishness, that could be used to justify British colonialism, Bhardwaj's project can be described as an attempt of post-colonial rewriting and therefore a possible revision of Shakespeare's position within a post colonial India. This he achieves by appropriating Shakespeare's masterpieces and situating them to Indian cultural contexts and hence points to the possibility of finding common grounds.

While race is a central theme in Othello, caste is given the same prerogative

in *Omkaara*. This has to do with the parallel that can be drawn between race and caste and also the centrality and peculiarity of caste system to India. However the director transgressed only to some extent. Instead of making the dark complexioned Omi Shukla a Dalit, he portrayed him as a half caste while the female lead Dolly Mishra played by Kareena Kapoor is a Brahmin. But as the film moves ahead, the jealousy of love becomes the main focus as opposed to caste.

Another factor that takes centre stage is power and ambition. The character of Iago played by Saif Ali Khan and called Langda has multiple shades. Langda Tyagi is married to Omkara's sister and hence he is family. Being a second lieutenant, he is also the rightful heir to Omkara. But when it comes choosing an heir, Omkara chose a young urban educated boy Kesu played by Vicky Oberoi. He hoped Langda would understand the tactical move of portraying an educated young guy as the successor. The film pushes to the furthest point a victim exposition of Langda when it seems he is going to receive the ceremonial plate but it is finally handed over to Kesu. The scene showing Langda crowning himself after the ceremony with his own blood as he looks at himself in the mirror, has a purpose of presenting a more sympathetic Iago. Billo, a free spirited dancer is also given good screen time. It is through these characters that Bhardwaj Indianised the Shakespearean play. The film then moves on to show how Langda capitalizes on the insecurities of the jealous lover Omi to pave his own way for power and dispose of Kesu, his rival. He played on the supposed treachery of Doli towards Omi by manipulating a certain series of event. Even Doli's father told Omkara that a daughter who can cheat her father can never be loyal to anyone. All this was used by Langda meticulously to serve his own purpose.

While the temporal and spatial context of *Omkaara* is pretty farfetched and is rooted in local politics, there are few converging points. Langda believes that Kesu is not even deserving of what he got in the same way as Iago thinks of Michael Cassio who has no real battle experience. Iago also makes up about a false affair between Desdemona and Cassio. All this leads to Cassio being killed but when Othello discovers the misunderstanding he does not kill Iago, rather leaves him to a life of pain and despair. Similarly Omkara on discovering his mistake instead of punishing Langda, plunges a knife in his own chest and kills himself.

While both *Othello* and *Omkaara* is about ambition manipulating jealousy and distrust, there are few points of divergence in the two stories. While Iago suspected Othello of having cheated with his wife, Langda's wife is a sister of Omkara. So Omkara is not a lascivious manipulative person. Rather his only mistake has been choosing Kesu over Langda overlooking Langda's own political ambitions.

5. Conclusion

Although *Maqbool* and *Omkaara* have a clearly Indian flavor and appeal, their place within the so-called Bollywood cinema is ambiguous because of their unique adaptation of Bollywood's characteristic features. Bhardwaj uses song sequences to the minimal and only when it responds to the need of the storyline and not merely as fillers. The songs are well integrated in the film's narrative. *Maqbool* has just three songs shown as festive interludes.

Omkaara's song sequences do not include a change of spatial context- rather it is more realistic and provides continuity to the narrative. What such masterly adaptations has done is created a newer genre of films within Bollywood. While it popularized the age old tradition of making films based on best sellers, it also carved a different space for such hybrid films in Bollywood. Bhardwaj's movies are not mere adaptation of Shakespeare's plays, rather he brings the changed temporal and spatial context in a very strong way, giving a new kind of twist to popular movies. But how far has Bhardwaj transgressed with regard to the limitations of a Bollywood film? His transgressions has been measured, never something that will not be acceptable to the Bollywood audience. Bhardwaj's adaptations are not mere mirror representation of Shakespearean plays, rather they add something to the plays and produce something new. This has been rendered possible because of the timelessness of Shakespearean plays which frees it from the limits of time and space. However one cannot deny the fact that such adaptations have carved a newer space for such films which despite being written for a different time and space still finds fertile ground for playing out in Indian context.

References

- Brooke, Michael. "Shakespeare on Screen" available at Screen online.N. pag.Web. 2nd May, 2014.
- Chaudhury, Sukanta, "Shakespeare in India". *Internet Shakespeare Editions*.University of Victoria. N.d. Web. 3rd May, 2014.
- Gruss, Susanne. "Shakespeare in Bollywood? Vishal Bhardwaj's *Omkaara*". *Semiotic Encounters: Text, Image and Trans-Nation*. Sarah Sackel, Walter Gobel and Noha Hamdy. The Netherlands: Editions Rodopi, 2009. 223-238. Web. 1st May, 2014.
- Khan, Shabiba. "Literary Communication of Shakespeare and Its Influence on the Ordinary Man in India—Habib Tanveer". *Indian Response to Shakespeare*. Basavaraj Naikar. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2002. 12-17. Print.
- Mohan, Ritu and Arora, Mahesh Kumar, "Macbeth in World Cinema: Selected TV and Film Adaptations". *International Journal of English and Literature* 3.1 (2013):179-188. Web. 1st March, 2014.
- Shukla, Pragati, "Translating Literature into Visual Images". *The Criterion* 4.3 (2013).Web. 28th April, 2014.
- Singh, Prashant. "Shakespeare in Bollywood". *Hindustan Times*. Dec 4, 2013. Web. 2nd May, 2014.
- Srivastava, Priyanka. "Shakespeare in Love?No its Shakespeare in Bollywood!" *India Today*. Nov 13, 2013. Web. 4th May, 2014.
- Suroor, Hasan. "Shakespeare to blame for Bollywood's excesses?" *The Hindu*, Nov 3, 2012. Web. 4th May, 2014.
- Weissbrod, Rachel, "Inter-Semiotic Translation: Shakespeare on Screen". *Journal of Specialised Translation* 5 (2006): 42-56. Web. 25th April, 2014.

Renouncing the Bard: Problematizing Shakespearian Authorship in Roland Emmerich's *Anonymous* (2011)

The plot of the film is set in a rather exquisitely tailored London where everything pertaining to the authentic has been ingeniously substituted for the illusory. The film begins with Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, ordering a frantic hunt for a cache of manuscripts. Ben Jonson, who possesses the manuscripts, takes flight down the streets of London and into the theatre known as The Rose. The ruthless brigade of soldiers who have been sent to arrest Jonson, smash down the doors and intentionally set the theatre on fire. Consecutive flashbacks take the viewer back five and later forty years, as the film stirs up the alleged life of Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, from childhood through to his apparent entanglement in an uprising, and later on to his deathbed.

The focal action ensues towards the final stages of the Elizabethan epoch as political strategies flourish flanked by the Tudors and the Cecils (father William and son Robert), over the succession to Queen Elizabeth I. In a series of well anticipated but rather improbable flashbacks, de Vere is portrayed as a phenomenal genius, writing at eight or nine years of age *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, with de Vere himself delineating the role of Puck before the young queen Elizabeth. He is then required to live in the oppressive, puritanical abode of William Cecil where, years later, he murders a spying servant skulking behind the curtains, rather bizarrely like the death of Polonius in *Hamlet*. William Cecil uses this murder as a ploy and contrives to blackmail de Vere into a loveless marriage with his daughter, Anne Cecil, persuading him also to relinquish his literary pursuits. de Vere later becomes the Queen's lover, and sires – unknown to him – an illegitimate son; who is later adopted, and grows up to become Henry Wriothesley, third Earl of Southampton, but his true parentage is concealed from all but the Cecils.

De Vere then struggles against enormous odds; a pledge that barred him from writing, his wife's annoyance with his literary occupations which she viewed as a disgrace to her family and his conflicts with the Queen's counsellors. Principal amongst these is his father-in-law William Cecil, whose Puritanical views led him to consider theatres as abodes of the sinful. Cecil's preparation to have James VI of Scotland, the son of Mary, Queen of Scots, crowned king is also placed in jeopardy by the existence of de Vere's and the Queen's child, who was an influential aspirant for the throne as he was of untainted Tudor lineage.

Nearly four decades after his clandestine debut, de Vere visits a theatre and is profoundly overwhelmed by the approach through which the spectators are won over. The play, written by Ben Jonson, is however brought to a standstill mid-performance by the royal army because of its purportedly subversive plot. Jonson is detained and held captive. Highly impressed by the magnetic allure of art and bearing in mind that "all art is political ... otherwise it is mere decoration", De Vere takes the decision to utilize his surreptitiously written plays to uphold the Earl of Essex's cause, who incidentally

happens to be one of the Queen's illegitimate sons; over the contender chosen by the Cecils. After reaching a consensus and writing *Henry V* and, later, *Richard III* as propaganda designed to fuel an insurrection, he meets up with Jonson, who is restrained within the Tower of London. De Vere then exercises his authority to liberate him, in order to have his play *Henry V* staged under Jonson's name. Jonson is disillusioned and highly skeptical about the arrangement, deeming that the play would be a poor amateur's attempt and would besmirch his name for eternity. Jonson relinquishes the authorship, permitting an amoral young actor, William Shakespeare, to take the stage as the author. The allegedly "drunken oaf" takes on the role of De Vere's front, while Jonson turns out to be the only one who is cognizant about the true state of affairs. Shakespeare however, having fathomed the real author's identity, wrests funds from De Vere to build the Globe Theatre, and in return for his continued silence De Vere agrees to the deal. After Christopher Marlowe, another gifted playwright unearths the truth that Shakespeare's enigmatic talents hide the genius of another; he is discovered with his throat slit. Jonson later tackles Shakespeare and lays blame on him for the murder of Marlowe.

Towards the end, De Vere uses the play *Richard III* as a lightly implied attack on the hunchbacked Robert Cecil. His ulterior motive was to goad the pliable crowd into marching against Cecil, and thus weaken his command at the court. During which time, Essex would march with the Earl of Southampton to the Palace, and uphold his own claim to the succession. In the interim, de Vere writes *Venus and Adonis* to remind the Queen of their old relationship. He yearns to have a glimpse of her again in an ambiance of improved understanding, and to convince her to discharge Cecil. However the plan falls short, as a resentful Jonson, unwittingly betrays the scheme to Cecil, who guns down the multitude, impeding it from joining Essex. The Queen, won over by Cecil, believes that Essex is trying to unseat her using aggressive tactics. Cecil effortlessly detains both Essex and Southampton, who are then indicted for treason.

Robert Cecil then reveals to a disappointed de Vere the scandalous fact that the Queen had other illegitimate sons – one of whom was de Vere himself, thus adding the sin of incest to de Vere's inequities. He has a clandestine meeting with Elizabeth, and begs her to spare his son. The Queen agrees to spare Southampton, but wrests from him the promise that de Vere remain anonymous as the true author of "Shakespeare's" works to ensure that there remains an uneasy truce between the Cecils and de Vere. After the Queen's demise, King James VI ascends the throne as King James I of England. It is however not a triumph for Cecil as his hopes of a severe puritanical administration are devastated when the king expresses his yearning to see more of Shakespeare's work. Shakespeare takes his leave from the stage after having amassed a huge amount of wealth and relocates to Stratford to become an entrepreneur. De Vere dies in 1604, after having arranged for his manuscripts to be given to the care of a remorseful Ben Jonson. In his rage over his foiled ploys, Cecil however still wants the manuscripts destroyed. With the destruction of The Rose, he believes them burnt, but Jonson later realizes that they had endured the inferno. However, the "truth" behind them remains obscured: that Edward de Vere, and not the uncouth, barely literate Shakespeare, was their real author.

From the outset it is quite apparent that the film-makers might have realized at some point that the chronicle they sought to narrate about De Vere couldn't hold out against what is generally known about Elizabethan theatrical and political traditions. They had to choose

from two well defined options: set aside assertions in favour of De Vere and divulge that the film was a mere flight of fancy constructed in the fashion of *Shakespeare in Love*, or flout time-honored accounts and avow that the truth ; literary alongside political , has been concealed by means of a convoluted conspiracy. Emmerich and Orloff, are forthright believers in the de Vere story, and so chose the latter option, facetiously reworking English history. The apparent political ideology in the wake of their faith-based rather than fact-based choice has been the perfect formula for an intriguing and yet disconcerting film.

With the aid of cyber replicated imagery, *Anonymous* indeed does justice by capturing the architectural details of Tudor London, but regrettably the pretensions to historical realism conclude there. A Tudor England that to the best of several reputed historians' knowledge never had a standing defense force is recast as a militia monitored state with the iconic Tower of London being depicted as a rudimentary model of the more brutal kind of political prison where dramatists were detained and required to hand over each other to the powers that be and those dragged in are ruthlessly tortured. Soldiers hunting for rebellious writers don't vacillate over setting a popular theatre ablaze. The film makers have not made any allowances for social liberties or for political opposition in the film – there are no courts, no municipal authorities, no preachers, Privy Council or even a Parliament. Until the *deus ex machina* arrival of De Vere, Elizabethan public theatres were allegedly places where the lowlife masquerading as actors performed asinine plays written by dramatists so run of the mill they couldn't envisage how anyone could compile a complete play in blank verse. De Vere's genius was apparently so immense that it was unimaginable he could ever have been of a nature to join forces with lesser talents .Even Ben Jonson is delineated as merely inconsequential with De Vere glibly informing him, "You have no voice!" However it is the depiction of Shakespeare himself that is the '*unkindest cut*' of all. He is shown to be an uninformed, homicidal mercenary and social aspirant. The theatre audience is time and again christened the “mob” and is comprised of people who are discovered to be irrational and vacuous, both delighted and stirred effortlessly.

Then there also arises the question of Queen Elizabeth I who takes her position as an undeserving ruler in the political mound. The hitherto held perceptions of the acclaimed Virgin Queen of biographies and popular films are callously destroyed as Emmerich's Elizabeth is both flamboyant and licentious. The setting down of numerous illegitimate offspring to the character's account has been carried to extreme lengths as several well known figures of the Age are recast as her progeny. The film depicts each child being carted off to various distinguished houses for the noble families to look after; the explanation for this seemingly unnecessary and excessively vulgar portrayal is that even though the children are illegitimate they are also of royal blood. The eldest is shown to be de Vere. The next, according to the film makers is allegedly the Earl of Essex. The youngest child to be born out of wedlock is purportedly the Earl of Southampton, who apparently never learns that de Vere is both his brother and father just as the Queen herself is seemingly unaware of the imbroglio. The Queen is shown to be inept at maintaining a tight leash on her vacillating courtiers which in itself is far removed from the truth as Paul Hentzner in his seminal work *Travels in England*, translated by Richard Bentley, points out that the Queen was a strong ruler who could dominate her entire court with the sheer magnetism of her personality. In the film she is portrayed as a confused and disinterested woman who is easily maneuvered by one adviser after the next. There are no redeeming features in the film as the makers have depicted every

woman in the film as either shrewish or wanton. The sexual insinuations in the film are motivated not so much by an intractable misogyny as they are by a necessity to launch an obvious antagonism between the conflicting political coteries bent on convincing the queen, if not, her gullible subjects.

The film makers have also demarcated several historically unimportant Peers who are apparently steadfast to their patrician heredity and to the noble task of keeping England liberated from the alien rule of King James of Scotland. In conflict against them are the sinister, lowborn, Machiavellian politicians, the Cecils – William and his deformed son Robert. They are shown to be staid, unethical, puritanical, and calculating; forever on guard to advance their political ambitions. Even to the uninitiated it is quite obvious that the theory supporting de Vere as the author of Shakespeare's plays is patched together with cant and fanciful ideas. Even the political scenario has been at times presented incorrectly. While it is true that all the characters are based on real people, the unassailable fact that Shakespeare was indeed a renowned playwright can be analyzed from the various references in Francis Meres' *Palladis Tamia* (1598). He makes a reference to Shakespeare and speaks of "...his sugared sonnets among his private friends" and goes on to make clear cut references to *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *King John*. While the film presents the plays as being ostensibly written by de Vere, it cannot account for the fact that all the plays were duly registered under Shakespeare's name and for which evidence has been found in *The Abridgement of the English Chronicle* (1618) written by John Stow and Edmund Howes. The fact that de Vere died in 1604 further strengthens the argument in favour of Shakespeare as both *Pericles* and *Antony and Cleopatra* were registered on 20th May, 1608, while the Sonnets were registered on May 20th 1609. Thomas Greene, a rival and contemporary of Shakespeare, also makes an embittered reference to Shakespeare in the *Groatsworth of Wit* which was registered on the 20th of September 1592. As Greene was a companion of Christopher Marlowe he would have recognized at once had there been anything doubtful about the authorship of the plays. He would not have hesitated from revealing the truth but instead he spoke scathingly of Shakespeare's presumption and was almost certainly envious of his manifold talents.

There is no historical evidence that supports the theory of Queen Elizabeth having had numerous illegitimate offspring. And while the Cecils were in fact opposed to the Essex faction, the reason was quite different from that shown in the film. Essex was one of King James's most ardent followers in England during the closing years of Elizabeth's sovereignty, which is a fact that the film makers have expediently suppressed in the film. The reality was that William Cecil was filled with apprehension that King James might have borne a grudge against him for his role in the death of James's mother, Mary, Queen of Scots. Much of the mainframe action is directed towards the years from 1598 to 1603, when England's succession crisis was at its most passionate. It is during this time that de Vere truly finds his mission after finally visiting a public theatre for the first time in his life. He perceives how thousands of viewers are influenced rather effortlessly by an apparently hypnotic presentation. The representation of a great author who is ultimately reduced to a mere political propagandist and someone who uses his plays as vehicles to advance his group's cause is rather substandard. De Vere himself seems to be quite coherent about his literary persuasions: "All art is political ... otherwise it is just decoration." He exultantly congratulates his own interesting expertise and seemingly forceful impact at a performance

of *Henry V*. In the film the play so aggravates the partisan mob that the actors enacting the French are beaten up brutally. However there is no evidence in the chronicles of such an episode.

He then goes on to deride a political antagonist, William Cecil, as Polonius, in *Hamlet*. And attention must be drawn to the fact that by the time *Hamlet* was staged, William Cecil was already dead. At the film's culmination, on the eve of the desultory Essex uprising in 1601, de Vere stages *Richard III* in order to win the crowd's support for his group. The infuriated people throng out of the theatre mid-performance and head towards the court. En route they are viciously gunned down on Robert Cecil's orders in the film. History notes that the repercussions of the Essex uprising did not include large scale public riots and there was practically no violent altercation between the people and the royal army; if so it would undoubtedly have led to some reference in the various chronicles or anecdotes. While the Chamberlain's Men did stage a play before the futile uprising, it was *Richard II*, and it certainly did not have any impetus on ensuing events. In any case it can safely be concluded that the uprising was unanticipated at the time of the performance. The need for a propagandistic attack on the hunchback Robert Cecil led to the substitution being made with *Richard III* being used instead of *Richard II* in the film. That Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex marched into the city of London along with a few of his followers on the 8th of February in 1601 is a documented fact. However it can hardly be called an uprising as the members were mostly noblemen of varying degrees and were few in number while the citizens themselves raised arms against him instead of joining him as is depicted in the film. According to *The Abridgement of the English Chronicle* (1618) written by John Stow and Edmund Howes, on the 19th of February the Earl of Essex and the Earl of Southampton were taken to Westminster and found guilty of high treason. Essex was beheaded in the Tower on the 25th of February in 1601 in the presence of the Earls of Hertford and Cumberland and Lord Thomas Howard, Constable of the Tower. This incident has been delineated with a fair amount of truth though the reasons behind it are revealed to be quite baseless. Perhaps there are a few instances of historical accuracy as mentioned above but these however, are few and far between in the film.

The plot delineated in *Anonymous* speaks of defeat redeemed by a purely imaginative account of what might have happened. The film makes a futile attempt to raise questions such as what would have ensued if the truth of de Vere's authorship had never been concealed and his works had been interpreted correctly. What remains then is the reason behind this strangely unsatisfactory and disconcerting film. The need to portray an obviously peculiar and intransigent vision of the English past lies in the vestiges of an old plot to unseat a literary giant. The concept of the film has been developed from the work of a long dead writer named J. Thomas Looney (1870-1920), who was the first to put forward the hypothesis that de Vere wrote Shakespeare's plays. According to Looney's deductions Shakespeare was, among other things, a nobleman of Lancastrian origins, with a decided partiality for Italy and a mild propensity towards Catholicism. His book, "*Shakespeare Identified*" (1920) became the gospel for his followers and has fashioned the case for de Vere ever since. Looney was the leader of a fanatical Victorian religious group called the "Church of Humanity" in Newcastle. The group comprised of individuals who were positivists and worshipped Shakespeare. Looney acquired a number of followers and supporters, most remarkably Sigmund Freud, who read Looney's book in 1923. Even at the end of his life, in

1939, Freud repeats his view in the final revision of *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*.

In general the propaganda was not well received and the cult became nearly extinct, so Looney found a new channel for his opinionated views over the Shakespeare authorship controversy. He was then persuaded that no commoner who was concerned about wealth could have written the plays and reached the conclusion that only a scion of the royal family could have done so. It therefore had to be someone who was fairly in the limelight and well connected in the royal court, blessed with some talent and ultimately one who looked backward toward feudalism rather than ahead toward modernity. Looney's research yielded fruit in the form of de Vere who had a few poems and sonnets to his credit. Then Looney re-read the plays and came to the conclusion that he had discovered de Vere's life story in them. In all honesty it can be maintained that the reasoning came first and then the candidate was chosen after careful analysis. Looney was apprehensive of modernity, abhorred democracy, and craved for England's return to a feudal past and to a caste ridden society where everyone knew his and her place and the few ruled munificently over the many. "How differently might the whole course of European history have unfolded," he wrote, in lines that could well have been mentioned to justify the film *Anonymous*. Looney was also allegedly contemptuous of the fashionable playhouses and refused to believe that audiences there could fully comprehend de Vere's art. Looney's book begins by demarcating many of the well-known arguments about Shakespeare's purportedly poor education and personality which was according to him devoid of glamour and romance. He even disparages the means adopted by many preceding claims, in particular the Baconian inclination to search for ciphers. Looney considers it highly implausible that an author who hoped to conceal his uniqueness would leave any clues behind which might assist in his identification later. Curiously enough Looney disputed that *The Tempest* was not the work of Oxford alias Shakespeare, but apparently that of another author and that it had been erroneously added to the catalogue. He also maintained that its manner and the "dreary negativism" it endorsed were incompatible with Shakespeare's "essentially positivist" soul, and so might not have been written by Oxford. He also put forward the suggestion that the evidence of other playwrights' work in the late plays such as *Pericles*, implied that the author had died, leaving them incomplete. Such works were then finished and published by others, as were the sonnets, the dedication page of which, Looney argued, was enough to assume that the author has indeed passed away.

Looney's followers latched on to his theory that the true author was in all probability a renowned peer of the realm. Two of his supporters, Percy Allen and B. M. Ward, developed the Prince Tudor theory, which asserted that the Earl of Oxford and Queen Elizabeth I were lovers and had a son together. Looney however was strongly opposed to the theory, writing that it was "extravagant and improbable" and "likely to bring the whole cause into ridicule." Their suggestions on the other hand became the foundation for people like Emmerich and Orloff and endowed them with a stronger cause where they proposed that de Vere was indeed a Tudor prince and consequently heir to the English throne. Perhaps they wished to convey the contemplative dream of a continuing feudal reign which would have ensued if only de Vere had been recognized as the architect of the great plays and if the reasons which required him to articulate his political beliefs through the plays were revealed.

What is perhaps truly disappointing about the movie is that though Emmerich and Orloff, like every other enthusiast of De Vere, vehemently deny the fact that the hegemonic

and feudal roots of the De Vere faction have indeed prejudiced them to an enormous extent, it is quite obvious to everyone who is even mildly interested in English history. *Anonymous* despite its scenic beauty and descriptive vitality is a speaking example of far even the most devoted follower of the de Vere theory will fall into the abyss of futile myths and improbable justifications in the name of unearthing what that they assume is the truth but come up with yet another patched up version which can never really hold water.

References

- Anonymous*.Screenplay.John Orloff .Dir. Roland Emmerich.Perf.Rhys Ifans, Vanessa Redgrave, Sebastian Armesto, Rafe Spall, David Thewlis and Edward Hogg.Columbia, 2011.Film.
- Bate, Jonathan. *The genius of Shakespeare*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1998, p. 68.Print
- Cunningham, J.V, Ed. *In Shakespeare's Day*. New York: Fawcett, 1967.Print.
- McDonald, Russ. *Shakespeare: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory, 1945–2000*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2004, p. 4–8.Print.
- “De Vere, Edward.”*Encyclopaedia Britannica's Guide to William Shakespeare*.Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2014.Web.22 July2014.

Lunacy versus Love: An Analysis of Shakespeare's Sonnets

Though not acclaimed as a reputed publisher, Thomas Thorpe's 1609 edition, titled *Shakespeare's Sonnets: Never Before Imprinted* is referred to be a classic one and is termed as "Quarto," the basis for all other editions. It contains 154 sonnets, likely composed between 1592 and 1598. In Sonnets 1–126, the poet divulges his relationship with a young man, and in Sonnets 127–154, he discloses his relationship with a woman, often referred to as the Dark Lady. This paper explores sonnets 127–154 to bring out how the lover's (the speaker) obsession with the dark lady has taken away his balance of mind leaving him a lunatic lover. This paper scrutinizes the yearnings of the lover to relish his relationship with his mistress in spite of his inexplicable hatred towards her. Though he hates her for her infidelity and insincerity, he decides to be persistent in his self-made bondage that distances him to rational thoughts.

The lover's relationship with his mistress fluctuates between feelings of love, hate, jealousy, and contempt and the lack of consistency bewilders a careful reader making him doubt the lover's sanity itself. "The final sonnets (127-154) are addressed to a promiscuous and scheming woman known to modern readers as the *dark lady*. Both the poet and his young man have become obsessed with the raven-haired temptress in these sonnets, and the poet's whole being is at odds with his insatiable "sickly appetite" (147.4). The tone is distressing, with language of sensual feasting, uncontrollable urges, and sinful consumption" (Mabillard 2000). It is not clear why the lover entertains his dependency on the woman's affections although he is outraged by her acceptance of additional lovers. On the other hand, he admits that he is a slave to his passion for the woman and can do nothing to restrain his desires. The following paragraphs depict how the lover fluctuates between the feelings of love and hatred that is unjustified with respect to reason.

In Sonnet 127, the lover reveals his unfathomable love for his beloved and makes a reader visualize him as an epitome of love turning an iconoclast by terming the dark mistress as "beauty's successive heir" (l. 3). Traditionally, black colour has not been considered beautiful but the black eyes of the dark mistress beggar the modern application of cosmetics and make the lover prefer the natural colour of his dark mistress to artificial and painted beauty:

Therefore my mistress' eyes are raven black,
Her eyes so suited, and they mourners seem
At such who, not born fair, no beauty lack,
Sland'ring creation with a false esteem: (ll. 9-12)

The lover continues his saga of love in Sonnet 127 and makes everyone wonder by his comparison of love and lust. He believes that lust is something savage that leads to self destruction and its pleasures will turn out to be disgusting:

The expense of spirit in a waste of shame
 Is lust in action: and till action, lust
 Is perjur'd, murderous, bloody, full of blame,
 Savage, extreme, rude, cruel, not to trust;
 Enjoy'd no sooner but despised straight; (ll. 1-5)

Further, the man who commits the lustful action will despise himself and his actions, and others can also realize how the object of lust is madly pursued before its fulfillment and how it is discarded at once the act is performed. The lustful person assumes the diabolic wish in him as heaven without realizing it will lead to hell thus:

Mad in pursuit and in possession so;
 Had, having, and in quest, to have extreme;
 A bliss in proof,-- and prov'd, a very woe;
 Before, a joy propos'd; behind a dream.
 All this the world well knows; yet none knows well
 To shun the heaven that leads men to this hell. (ll. 9-14)

The lover's declaration of the quality of his love in Sonnet 130 is commendable. In fact, he makes fun of other lovers who falsely compare their mistresses to the beautiful objects of nature. He shows how his dark lady lacks the qualities hailed by other lovers but believes that she supersedes them all by her majesty. The lover ascertains that the eyes of his beloved are not bright like the sun and her lips are not red like the coral. Further, her breasts do not resemble snow and her breath gives out foul smell. In addition, black wires grow on her head and her voice does not have any music in it. In sum, she is an ordinary one without having any trait of a goddess. However, he considers her as a rare woman who excels all other women who have been falsely admired by other lovers:

I love to hear her speak, yet well I know
 That music hath a far more pleasing sound:
 I grant I never saw a goddess go,--
 My mistress, when she walks, treads on the ground:
 And yet by heaven, I think my love as rare,
 As any she belied with false compare. (ll. 9-14)

In all the sonnets mentioned above, the character of the lover is sublime and he deserves everyone's praise as he moves the readers by his lofty thoughts and loyalty to his mistress. However, the sonnets that are going to be discussed in the following paragraphs highlight his grudge against his mistress and question his love and sincerity of expression. Moreover, the outburst of his suppressed hatred links him to lunacy as there is no reason for him to cherish the meaningless bond. In Sonnet 131, the lover vents out his frustration thus: "The speaker declares that she is not at all black—except in her deeds! As if this weren't devastating enough, he adds that the "slander" of the "some," *hethinks*, arises from the judgment of her deeds. This is revenge for her tyranny, indeed, canceling all his praise"

(Bennett 220). He proclaims that the beauty of his beloved, which differs from conventional beauty, is not without its vices. He believes that his beloved is proud and cruel like other beautiful women and she lacks beauty of character as pointed out by other suitors. He accepts that there is truth in the accusation of the suitors who question her modesty and refrains himself from swearing it false thus:

Yet, in good faith, some say that thee behold,
Thy face hath not the power to make love groan;
To say they err I dare not be so bold,
Although I swear it to myself alone. (ll. 1-8)

In Sonnet 133, the lover curses his beloved for having enticed his friend away from him. He believes that she has cast a magical spell on his friend and made him her slave. "The undercurrents of Sonnet 132 scarcely prepare us for the groans, wounds, torture and slavery of Sonnet 133. The friend is brought back in line two as the third party in a triangle; he appears as someone already seriously hurt by the mistress who has stolen him from the speaker" (Bennett 223). Moreover, the dark mistress has wounded both the lover and his friend by her shameful act. The lover reveals the friend, who is enticed by the dark lady, as his soul mate and by taking him away the dark lady has done an irreparable damage to him. Further, he appeals that she has to release his friend and imprison the lover himself who is ever ready at her disposal. He would pledge himself as surety and will not feel any torment if his friend is freed:

Of him, myself, and thee I am forsaken;
A torment thrice three-fold thus to be cross'd:
Prison my heart in thy steel bosom's ward,
But then my friend's heart let my poor heart bail;
Whoe'er keeps me, let my heart be his guard;
Thou canst not then use rigour in my jail: (ll. 7-12)

Though the lover is ready to court bondage to release his friend, he is sure that the dark lady would not release his friend as she is so cruel and greedy to leave her possession and his friend is so kind and will not permit the lover to become a slave to the cruel lady. He also reveals how the friend was taken away as her forfeit when he stood surety for the lover and the lover is still unable to free his friend:

For thou art covetous, and he is kind;
He learn'd but surety-like to write for me,
Under that bond that him as fast doth bind.
The statute of thy beauty thou wilt take,
Thou usurer, that putt'st forth all to use,
And sue a friend came debtor for my sake; (ll. 6-11)

The lover's outburst of emotions in Sonnet 137 brings out the feelings of frustrations at the disloyalty of the dark mistress and it throws light on the lover's concept of love. He

considers Love as a blind fool who has blinded his eyes and made him ignore the foul nature of his mistress. It has also made him fail to realize that she is a bay that belongs to all passersby and is a property of none. Both his heart and eyes have beguiled him to perceive her foul nature in true light thus:

Which my heart knows the wide world's common place?
Or mine eyes, seeing this, say this is not,
To put fair truth upon so foul a face?
In things right true my heart and eyes have err'd,
And to this false plague are they now transferr'd. (ll. 10-14)

The lover declares how he and his dark mistress have a tendency to practice fraud on each other in Sonnet 138. “Sonnet 138 is one of the most famous of William Shakespeare's sonnets. Making use of frequent puns (“lie” and “lie” being the most obvious); it shows an understanding of the nature of truth and flattery in romantic relationships. The poem has also been argued to be biographical: many scholars have suggested Shakespeare used the poem to discuss his frustrating relationship with the Dark Lady, a frequent subject of many of the sonnets...” (Pishkar 73). He knows very well that his mistress lies to him by telling him that she loves him and he too deceives himself assuming she considers him a ‘green untutored youth.’ It makes the reader question why the lover allows himself to be deceived and why he blames her for her vile acts though he is aware of her despicable nature:

When my love swears that she is made of truth,
I do believe her though I know she lies,
That she might think me some untutor'd youth,
Unlearned in the world's false subtleties (ll. 1-4).

The lover continues his accusation in Sonnet 139, which focuses on her unfaithfulness. The poet announces that his dark mistress has done much wrong to him by being unfaithful to him and he pleads her not to wound him with her eyes though she can do with her tongue. He considers her eyes more powerful as they reveal her untrue affection towards him and hence he urges her to kill him by her looks rather than prolonging his pain by keeping them away from him:

Let me excuse thee: ah! my love well knows
Her pretty looks have been mine enemies;
And therefore from my face she turns my foes,
That they elsewhere might dart their injuries:
Yet do not so; but since I am near slain,
Kill me outright with looks, and rid my pain. (ll. 9-14)

The problem in the lover's behavior is his imbalance of mind that blurs his genuine thoughts and feelings. The confusion of the reader multiplies when the lover urges his beloved to assure him that she loves him alone though she can love others secretly in Sonnet 140. He implores her not to test his ‘tongue-tied patience’ beyond the limits and he would

damage her image by speaking ill of her. He is prepared to digest her liking for other men but wants her to proclaim it only to him:

And in my madness might speak ill of thee;
Now this ill-wresting world is grown so bad,
Mad slanderers by mad ears believed be.
That I may not be so, nor thou belied,
Bear thine eyes straight, though thy proud heart go wide. (ll. 9-14)

The poet hails his platonic love in Sonnet 141 and asks her to understand his love which could not be comprehended by the five senses. He loves her with all his heart and his mind has no control over it. The lover himself reveals how he is influenced by the free play of emotions rather than the sagacious guidance of his intellect:

But my five wits nor my five senses can
Dissuade one foolish heart from serving thee,
Who leaves unsway'd the likeness of a man,
Thy proud heart's slave and vassal wretch to be: (ll. 9-12)

Though the poet declares that his greatest sin is loving the mistress and her virtue is her hatred for him in Sonnet 142, he does not initiate any steps to change the conditions that imprison him and on the other hand, he asks her to realize that she would also be cheated by others in the way she has been cheating him by her unkind behavior. Further, he wants her to show pity on him if she wants to be loved by others:

Love is my sin, and thy dear virtue hate,
Hate of my sin, grounded on sinful loving:
O! but with mine compare thou thine own state,
And thou shalt find it merits not reproving; (ll. 1-4)

The lover lets out his suppressed emotions and hatred in Sonnet 147. He terms his love as a 'fever' that makes him mad and pine for unfulfilled love. He knows very well that his love is like an insane person as there is no truth in it and which breeds only illusion. Further, he justifies it by telling how he believes her to be fair and bright whereas in reality she is black as hell and dark as night:

My thoughts and my discourse as madmen's are,
At random from the truth vainly express'd;
For I have sworn thee fair, and thought thee bright,
Who art as black as hell, as dark as night. (ll. 9-14)

However, he assumes reasons for his irrational behavior in Sonnet in 148. He believes that either his eyes have lied to him or his heart has falsely perceived the eyes. Whatever may be the reason, the cause of such misapprehension is his mad love for her that fills his eyes always with tears and which blurs his understanding of his beloved. It is she who is cunning and who blinds his eyes to hide her falsehood from him:

That is so vexed with watching and with tears?
 No marvel then, though I mistake my view;
 The sun itself sees not, till heaven clears.
 O cunning Love! with tears thou keep'st me blind,
 Lest eyes well-seeing thy foul faults should find. (ll. 10-14)

In Sonnet 149, the lover declares that his mistress cannot say that he does not love her sincerely as he has taken the pains to justify her hatred and continue his love for her. He has lost himself thinking only about her, by treating her enemies as his own, and by frowning upon those she frowns upon. He wonders whether it is his blind love for her that makes her neglect him:

Canst thou, O cruel! say I love thee not,
 When I against myself with thee partake?
 Do I not think on thee, when I forgot
 Am of my self, all tyrant, for thy sake?
 Who hateth thee that I do call my friend, (ll. 1-5)

The poet culminates his hatred in Sonnet 152 by charging his dark mistress for being false both to him and her husband. Though she promised she would be faithful, she did not remain so and cheated them both. However, he consoles himself by telling that he has falsely sworn on many times that she is honest and fair against the truth:

And, to enlighten thee, gave eyes to blindness,
 Or made them swear against the thing they see;
 For I have sworn thee fair; more perjur'd I,
 To swear against the truth so foul a lie! (ll. 11-14)

Thus, the analysis has brought out how the lover is not constant in his feelings, whether hatred or love, and how he is unable to perceive his own actions. Further, he is unable to explain the reason to continue his love for the dark lady but at the same time he is persistent in reviving the forced bond without any justification. Hence, such an absence of reason to justify one's action warrants a study on the imbalance of mind and the theme of lunacy versus love is open for further analysis.

References

- Bennett, K. *Threading Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Illinois: Lake Forest College, 2007. Print Mabillard, Amanda. "Introduction to Shakespeare's Sonnets." *Shakespeare Online*. 30 Aug. 2000. Web. 20 July 2014. <[http://www.shakespeare-online.com/sonnets/sonnet introduction.html](http://www.shakespeare-online.com/sonnets/sonnet%20introduction.html)>.
- Pishkar, Kiyana and Nooshin Nasery. "Comparative Study of Theme of Love in Sonnets of Shakespeare and Hafiz." *International Researcher*, Vol.2, Issue 4. Web. December 2013 <<http://iresearcher.org/P7-64-75.pdf>>.
- Shakespeare, W. *Sonnets*. Djvu Edition: Global Language Resources Inc., 2001. E-book.

The Comparison of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and The Unheard Saga of Indian Diaspora

Introduction

Indians were sent by the Britishers to work in plantation estates in Caribbean island nations. The journey that began in 1830s in a ship that took about two months to reach made Indians to be more united among themselves and brave the hardships that they encountered in their journey as well as while working in far off nations. These people were in Indian Diaspora. In recent years Indians are found across the globe. They are educated and many of them are professionals. However, it was not the same story that we saw in the early part of the 19th century. Indians were indenture labourers in Caribbean, Mauritius and Fiji. Today Indian diaspora is strong and has a better network than 200 years ago.

Migration is not a new phenomenon. Countries cannot stop migrating people. Migrated people face a lot of hardships in their country of adoption. These people join the network of diaspora which is a larger entity. While referring to diaspora, Durham says: "Diaspora suggests a dislocation from the nation-state or geographical location of origin and a relocation in one or more nation-states, territories or countries" (Peters 1999: 23).

When we speak about indenture labour system, we come to know that many Indians did not want to cross the sea. Thus, they were forced to go with few enticements from the recruiters under the British regime in India. Kaplan is of the opinion that diaspora, in most cases is not voluntary: "These early historical references reveal that diaspora is not always voluntary" (1996).

Robin Cohen was of the opinion that the dreams of indentured labourers could not match with their lifestyle. To the ancient Greeks, diaspora was associated with "migration and colonisation" (Cohen 1997: ix). However, for Jews, Africans, Palestinians and Armenians the term had a more ominous connotation: "Diaspora signified a collective trauma, banishment, where one dreamed of home but lived in exile" (Cohen 1997: ix).

The Tempest was regarded as one of Shakespeare's comedies; but, the presence of tragedy, comedy, and a good deal of romance means that the play does not easily fit into any of these three genres exclusively. It all began in the classrooms while teaching and on the stage while acting the essence of the play was brought out according to the mood of directors of the play and the teacher who teaches this play to students. There are few important actors in this play.

Prospero is the rightful Duke of Milan, though his kingdom and title were usurped by his brother Antonio. Prospero was able to survive a plot on his life. If we compare this to Indian diaspora in the Caribbean, we have similarities in Prospero's losing his kingdom to Antonia while plantation owners who were hard taskmasters usurping the rights of

indentured labourers who had gone from India to work.

Let us look at the role of Caliban as depicted in the play. Caliban is a native of the island on which Prospero lands, and the one from whom Prospero steals control of the island. He becomes Prospero's only subject, doing all of his dirty work. Christopher Columbus (1451-1506) did similar deeds when he landed in the Caribbean islands. Columbus massacred the local island people and established his control over the Caribbean islands. The native island people were made servants by Europeans led by Columbus in his quest for expedition.

The local people of any region desist the newcomers who come to their islands. Indentured labourers from India had work in the agriculture fields that were managed by the Europeans. C.M. Haar feels that:

"Indentured servitude was called into existence by two different though complementary forces: there was both a positive attraction from the New World and a negative repulsion from the old" (Haar 1940: 371).

Caliban tries to rape Miranda, and is shunned by both Miranda and Prospero because of this. All who encounter Caliban regard him as sub-human, or reprehensible, because of his different looks and strange ways. This can be compared to the problems Indians faced in the residential quarters in the Caribbean islands. The most beautiful woman became the prey for the supervisor or to the plantation owner. Indian men had no option but listen to the taskmasters to move to another plantation leaving behind his family.

In *The Tempest* it is shown that Caliban has a capacity for poetry and understanding beauty, as shown by a speech in Act III, which is one of the most poetic, beautiful description of the play. Indians in the plantations used to spend their evenings by singing the songs and bhajans that they were doing while in India. Caliban's use of poetry can be compared to the people in the Caribbean islands who were indenture labourers who had their memories back in Indian culture and tradition which was displayed during their free time in order to forget the pain of dislocation from India to Caribbean island nations.

Amitav Ghosh in his *Sea of Poppies* mentions the nostalgic atmosphere of indentured labourers:

"Among the women, the talk was of the past, and the little things they would never see, nor hear, nor smell again: the colour of poppies, spilling across the fields like ábír on a rain-drenched Holi; the haunting smell of cooking-fires drifting across the river, bearing news of a wedding in a distant village; the sunset sounds of temple bells and the evening azan; late nights in the courtyard, listening to the tales of the elderly. No matter how hard the times at home may have been, in the ashes of every past there were a few cinders of memory that glowed with warmth—and now, those embers of recollection took on a new life, in the light of which their presence here, in the belly of a ship that was about to be cast in the abyss..." (Ghosh 365).

Caliban had a supporter too. Gonzalo is the only one within the play who even tries to evaluate Caliban and his kind fairly; the others, blinded by prejudice, mistreat him to various extents. Among Indian indentured labourers in the Caribbean, few taskmasters had identified few able bodied Indians who were doing well in their plantation work, thus

promoted them as supervisors.

Do we see the seeds of colonial mentality in the play *Tempest*? The role played by Caliban in Shakespeare's *Tempest* is related to colonialism. This was practiced by the westerners. The colonial discourse has given enough ideas to all academicians and theatre personalities that Prospero and Caliban become representatives of colonial rule that all the continents had seen in the past years. The indenture labourers from India in the Caribbean, Mauritius and Fiji too had the experience of colonial rule. The Europeans, particularly the British, had ill-treated Indian indentured labourers on the plantations, though these were managed by the hard taskmasters. Ill-treatment was rife on the plantations, and complaints by the workers only resulted in even harsher penalties for the complaints.

Were the Britishers blamed for the indentured labour system? The Europeans firmly believed that the coolies deserved harsh treatment because, they argued, the coolies were used to that kind of handling and responded only to harsh treatment. Caliban too was not understood by anyone except Gonzalo. Indian workers survived through the period of indenture through their own determination and resilience. Caliban used to forget his pain by writing poetry and reciting them. Indenture labourers were bonded to a master, who had virtually a free hand in extracting the kind of work he wanted from the servant. Caliban too was bonded to Prospero. The worker was confined to the estate and was let out only with special permission under stringent rules. In the play, Prospero could take the help of Ariel to tame the people whom he did not like.

In the plantation estates, the administration took a serious view of organised defiance as a bad precedent, and their original complaint of deception was quietly ignored. The pleadings from Caliban is turned down by Prospero in many occasions. Colonial administrations did not allow any Indian to acquire a reputation or a following as a leader. Ringleaders in any protest were swiftly isolated and sent off to a different island or region. Prospero, in the play *Tempest*, makes Ariel as his 'bidding man' to do for him anything he asks and Caliban is just a mere slave.

The play *Tempest* has a main female character. Miranda is Prospero's only daughter, and so young that she cannot remember anyone she knew before she came to the island. There were many children travelling in the ship to reach the destination of plantation estates, who in the later stage could not remember their childhood in India.

Miranda is intelligent and headstrong, having learned a lot from her father; but, when under Ariel's enchantment, she follows her father's plan, and falls in love with Ferdinand willingly. She and Ferdinand end up together, bound by their mutual infatuation. Many grown up children of indentured labourers in the Caribbean were intelligent. After completion of their elementary studies in their islands, they went to USA and European countries for further studies, jobs, marriage and to settle down.

Prospero arranges, through his magic, for Ferdinand to fall in love with Prospero's daughter, Miranda; Prospero's plot to have Miranda and Ferdinand married is his key to reclaiming his power in Italy. The colonial powers used these kind of machinations wherever they went in order to usurp territories.

Caliban is like a slave for Prospero, though he had aesthetic sense. Caliban

represents the slaves that Europeans exploited for many centuries. While speaking on the slave trade in the Caribbean, Lowenthal opines:

Almost four million Africans were sold into the British, French, and Dutch Caribbean; yet when slavery ended in these territories, the West Indian population of African descent was no more than a million and a half. When the slaves were emancipated, the Caribbean contained scarcely one-third the number imported; the United States had eleven times the number brought in." (1972: 43).

The language that was spoken by the early indenture labours among Indian diaspora was different. Gamble was of the opinion that the use of language of indenture labourers was an issue:

The Bengalis speak Hindustani and Bengali, while the inhabitants of the Madras Presidency speak Tamil, a totally different language. When these people meet in Trinidad, it strikes me as somewhat strange that they have to point to water and, and ask each other what they call it in their language. So totally different are the languages, the Hindustani and the Tamil that English has to become the medium of communication." (Gamble 1866: 33).

The play has the character in Ariel, a spirit of the island, over whom Prospero becomes master after ousting Sycorax. He is the source of Prospero's magical powers, causing the tempest and many of the conspiracies in the play, and works for Prospero somewhat against his will. He is an intelligent, capable servant, and is finally freed by Prospero for his devoted service. The indenture labour system was such an arrangement that initially it was for five years. After the completion of one term people in the Indian diaspora could come to India by spending travel fee. But if they extend the indenture period for another five years and thus work for ten years, they had a chance of getting a subsidized travel allowance. These all depended on the loyalty shown by the indentured labourers towards their masters.

The romance between Ferdinand and Miranda speak with a poetic, romantic, unrealistic tone that is very similar to the tone used by Romeo and Juliet when they spoke to each other; the same devices, of overstatement, paradox, contrast, and comparison are used to make elegant compliments to each other, and high-flown declarations of love. Members in the Indian indentured labourers displayed their romance, culture and traditions of India during their free time. This was done under the trees to forget their pain of dislocation from the motherland and also to bring back the sweet memories of the childhood that they had spent in India. We analyse the role of Ferdinand in the play, he slips into conventional, polished phrases when speaking to this woman whom he hardly knows, an example being when he tells her: "'tis fresh morning with me when you are by at night," though they have not been through a night together at all (III.i.33-34).

In Paul Gilroy's narrative of *The Black Atlantic* (1993) time has to be located in key spaces one of which is the Middle Passage itself. The ship, the medium of mercantile capitalism and of the middle passage of both slavery and indenture, is the first of the cultural units in which social relations were resited and renegotiated.

Most of the early indentured labourers came from the northern part of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The journey that Indians had while on the sea for an unknown place, the crew

members of the ship tried in vain to look after nearly five hundred odd Indians, still could manage by the personnel in the ship. In *Tempest*, Master of the ship tries to hearten the sailors, and gets them to sail the boat through the storm; but, one of Ariel's spells makes them lose heart and abandon ship. They are whisked safely away, and will take the party back to Italy at the play's end. (Act , Scene 1). Likewise, Indian indentured labourers who were travelling for the first time, had undertaken a long voyage to which they were not accustomed. They too had braved the tempest of the sea, diarrhoea and sea sickness. The condition of the workers was bad. L.F. Stock while commenting on the voyage condition writes:

A petition to parliament in 1659 describes how seventy two servants had been locked up below deck during the whole voyage of five and a half weeks, "amongst horses, that their souls, through heat and steam under the tropic, fainted in them" (249).

Concluding Remarks

Shakespeare's play the *Tempest* brings out the human nature of Prospero similar to that of a few good taskmasters of the plantation estate in the Caribbean, Mauritius and Fiji. Prospero's teachings, for whatever reason, have failed upon Caliban, and Caliban retains his more primitive nature, for which Prospero and Miranda despise him. Nevertheless, Shakespeare sketches his characters in such a way, that the coming generation would interpret these actors in different ways.

The play gradually builds up. In the end, the play's concern with political legitimacy is resolved by the disinheritance of the usurper, though it is unresolved in the case of Caliban. Indentured labourers were supported by many western social activists. Some of them put pressure on British Parliament to remove the system of indentured labourer which they considered was another form of slavery. Prospero has again secured his dukedom, and also his daughter's power and marriage; and so, with Prospero's main goals achieved, the play ends. Over a period of time, we find that indentured labourers in Indian diaspora getting recognition from the local population and thereby paving the way for their settlement in the adopted lands.

References

- B. V. Lal. 2004. *Girmityas: The Origins of the Fiji Indians*, Fiji Institute of Applied Studies, Lautoka, Fiji.
- Cohen, Robin, 1997. *Global Diaspora: An Introduction*, London: UCL (University College London) Press.
- Durham Peters, John. 1999. "Exile, Nomadism and Diaspora: The Stakes of Mobility in the Western Canon", in Hamid S. Naficy (ed.) *Home, Exile, Homeland: Film, Media and the Politics of Place*, London: Routledge.
- Gamble, W.H. 1866. *Trinidad, Historical and Descriptive: Being a Narrative of Nine Years' Residence in the Island*, London: Yates and Alexander.
- Ghosh, Amitav. 2008. *Sea of Poppies*. London: John Murray.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- H. Tinker. 1974. *A New System of Slavery: The Export of Indian Labour Overseas 1820-1920*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Haar, C.M. July, 1940. "White Indentured Servants III Colonial New York", *Americana*.

- Kaplan, Caren. 1996. *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*, Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Khal Torabully (with Marina Carter). 2002. *Coolitude : An Anthology of the Indian Labour Diaspora*, Anthem Press. ISBN 1-84331-003-1
- Lowenthal, David. 1972. *West Indian Societies*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Stock, L.F. (ed.) (1924-1941), *Proceedings and Debates in the British Parliament Respecting North America*. Quoted in Eric Williams (1964), *Capitalism and Slavery*, London: Andre Deutsch.

Shakespeare's Villains Are Stereotypes: Progressing Towards Humanness

What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculties!
in form and moving, how express and admirable! in action, how like an angel!
in apprehension, how like a god! The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals!
And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust?

(Hamlet II ii 303-306)

The greatest power and the intrinsic genius of Shakespeare is his ability to peer at the essence of life. For such immense timelessness of his philosophy, the brilliance of his language, the vastness of the “gamut of human experience” and the genuine humanness of his characters, Shakespeare and his plays live today after four centuries and will live forever. The enormity of the extent of human experience we find in his works seems even more baffling because of the realistic humanness of all of them, from watchmen to kings.

From this view point, this paper will focus on the humanness of Shakespeare's villains though they were modeled on Elizabethan stereotypes. Shakespeare followed the European literary traditions of the Renaissance stage and was able to tower above his contemporaries by the sheer fact that he was able to rise above those traditions and infuse breath into his characters. By portraying the stereotypical Virtue and Vice, he incorporated a psychological probing into what is good and what is evil. Cruelty is never good, but, Shakespeare seems to state that an insight into the psyche of these evil-doers will help us understand humanity better.

Dramatic Stereotypes of the Renaissance Villain

Oxford Dictionary of Literary terms defines villain as “the principal evil character in a play or story”. The villain happens to be one of the integral elements in drama and it is he who usually sets the action of the play into motion. Stereotypes are the clichéd predictable attributes that people think characterize a group. The villains of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama sprung from the stereotypical characters of Devil and the Vice in earlier Morality plays. The characters in the Moralities were an externalized analysis of internal struggle of humankind. The Morality plays and their descendants, the Interludes provided almost the only dramatic language and tools the Renaissance theatre had at its disposal. Shakespeare belonged to the transitional period of Renaissance and adopted from the Vice and comic villain of the Morality plays and the Machiavellian villain of his contemporaries.

O'Connell observes that Shakespeare was more affected by medieval drama and Mystery plays than other Elizabethan playwrights. This is because of his “generational and geographical positioning” in the history of literature (702). He goes on to explain how none of his contemporaries like Marlowe, Peele or Greene saw such plays in person. However, Shakespeare witnessed the Coventry Corpus Christi theatre probably many times till his

adolescence, says O'Connell. There are many references to such mystery plays in his works (for example in Hamlet III I 12-14). The Vice character of Morality plays provide framework for such vicious characters like Iago, Aaron the Moor or Don John but their portrayal rather than a stock archetypal evil is a more humanistic conflict of psyche. As a matter of fact, Shakespeare's villain represents a progression toward humanness without deserting the conventions of Morality and Miracle plays. He even maintained the Vice tradition of soliloquy, in which the allegorical Vice talks about its wile intentions. Shakespeare used the tradition of soliloquy for such characters as Macbeth and Claudius to disclose not just their evil intentions but also a part of their soul which is driven by the passions of all normal human beings.

Along with the character of Vice, Shakespeare used another figure of evil of his contemporaries, the Machiavellian villain. The playwrights before Shakespeare were greatly influenced by the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli. Machiavellian villains offer sharp contrast to the Christian values and views of social ethics, morality and hierarchy. They pose serious threat to the question of hierarchy and the 'divine' rule of monarchy as we see in characters like Richard III and Macbeth. Adoption of Machiavellian principles was against the Christian world view, and the Elizabethans, including Shakespeare, maintained that it would result in chaos and disorder in the society. The conceptualization of the Machiavelli as the arch-betrayer with scheming mind and the villain full of deceptions is the viewpoint from which we can understand the characters of Richard III, Edmund and Claudius. Yet, Shakespeare pushed the limits of static Machiavellian and Vice figures. He humanized them by showing their heart with its passions and weaknesses through soliloquies or course of action.

In addition, Shakespeare used other vicious stereotypical characters modeled on the notions and prejudices of Shakespearean era: the people who did not belong to the European society, "the other", like Jews (Shylock) and people of African descent or Moors (Aaron, Othello). Shakespeare took these stereotypical figures and made them human like, and hence, complex. Through irony and their emotional outbursts these characters become unique and move away from being typical. More of this is dealt with later.

Adapting the Traditions: Shakespeare's Villains

In following him I follow but myself—
Heaven is my judge, not I for love and duty,
But seeming so for my peculiar end.

I am not what I am. (Othello I i 59-65)

A closer view at some of the prominent villainous characters, their motives and stratagem would be beneficial for elaborating on the topic. All critics unanimously agree that Iago stands outstanding among Shakespeare's evil characters. As quoted above, in the very outset, Shakespeare represents Iago as someone who is totally self-centered and with no feelings of love or duty. His character happens to be the embodiment of the Vice figure of the morality plays and miracle plays. He neither accepts responsibility for his actions nor cares for a conscience. Iago is depicted as a rational and pragmatic person with exceptional power

of will and intellect. As a schemer and a manipulator he is stupendous, that no one suspects his vile intentions and in this he is the typical Machiavelli. Othello places total trust in Iago, and thinks of him as one “who knows all qualities with a learned spirit of human dealings”. Iago takes advantage of this trust and eventually betrays Othello. He is greatly skilled in his deceptive double life. Indeed he is the centre of the whole play with eight soliloquies more so than Othello himself.

Harold Bloom held that the character of Iago is not unnatural like that of Elizabethan stock evil characters but that his love of mischief was something “natural to man” (Annotated Shakespeare: Othello 205). There are some hints as to his motives. In the opening scene, within the first ten lines, Iago clearly expresses his hate for Othello because Othello did not appoint him as his lieutenant even though some high ranking ministers supported him. When Iago was the flag officer, he had vowed to die rather than let Othello's flags be captured in battle which shows his former devotion. However, Othello makes Cassio as his lieutenant without giving a reason. Hence Iago decides to ruin Othello. Bloom calls his motives to be similar to what Milton's Satan calls “a sense of Injured Merit”. Iago is also jealous of Othello's ability to woo the young and alluring Desdemona so much so that he himself starts harboring dark passion for her (II.i.276-77). He also suspects his wife with Othello (I.iii.378-82). A “superb psychologist” who manipulated Othello, Desdemona, Cassio, Roderigo and all others, fails to understand his wife Emilia and therein he gets vanquished. Emilia's honest indignation out of her affection for Desdemona shocks, defeats and leaves him at a loss of words at the end: “From this time forth, I will never speak word” (V.ii.300-3). Shakespeare infused all these human passions into the stock Vice character and enables us to imagine Iago as one of us. After all, Hamlet tells us, “There is nothing either good or bad but thinking makes it so”.

Shakespeare's Richard III is very much the inheritance of Moralities and especially, Machiavelli. Richard is never what he seems. He is a role- playing and scheming villain who goes to all heights of evil to overcome monarchical hierarchy and become King. In that he becomes the stereotypical Machiavel. Moseley observes “without the concept of the Machiavelli we could not begin to explain him (Richard)” (Humanities Insights: William Shakespeare: Richard III 54). Richard is shown as amoral, unscrupulous, witty deceiver, a mischievous trickster and a manipulator with the ambiguity of language and discourse typical of Vice figures like Haphazard, Ambidexter and Iniquity. Richard's aside: “thus like the formal Vice Iniquity, / I moralise two meanings in one word”, emphasizes how we should take him. However, all human beings need love and Richard is no exception. He has no one and can believe no one. His downfall begins when his only accomplice Buckingham also leaves him. Before his end, he breaks down and repents his actions (V.iii.206-28). Thus, his character shows a slight transition from stereotypical evil to a more realistic and humanistic conflict of psyche.

Alongside Richard III, it will be helpful to study another Machiavellian villain, Claudius. He again goes to all extent of evil to keep hold of monarchy – be it murdering a brother or plotting Hamlet's murder- under the guise of a benevolent King. Yet, he exudes true love for Queen Gertrude and expresses his guilt over his deeds in his asides (III.i.50-5) and soliloquy (III.iii.36-42). In this fashion, Shakespeare goes on to color Claudius's character with true human passions and lays bare the struggle in his mind.

Another outstanding villain exuding all the Machiavellian traits of deceit, intellect and acts of crime as a means to his ends, is Edmund. With vivid intellect, mastery over language and insightful manipulation, he stands along with Richard and Iago. At the outset when we meet him, his father Gloucester introduces him to the Gentry suggesting that he is his illegitimate son with most degrading levity and coarse humour (I.i.12-17). He has been an outcast and sent to foreign lands since childhood. Such treatment from his father for no fault of his would obviously wound his pride, stimulate his ambition and awaken his enmity towards the society: “Why brand they us with base? With baseness? Bastardy?” Hence, he decides that the only way to outgrow this disgrace is by worldly power. He is ready to wield his fast deceiving tongue and manipulates everyone in the play like a true Machiavel. Later he aims for the crown itself by marrying Goneril or Regan. Yet, like in all Shakespeare's plays, 'karma' plays out and as Edmund himself says “the wheel has come full circle”. Before he dies, Edmund repents his sins (V.iii.199-201), again an effort in Shakespeare to underline the basic humanity even in villains.

Don John of 'Much Ado About Nothing' another illegitimate son character must be viewed along with Edmund for rightful understanding of their predicament. Don John does not have the dexterous tongue of Edmund but is mostly in sinister silence. In the opening scene, we see that Leonato gives a warm welcome to Don Pedro, Don John's brother, but no one talks much with Don John. Only in the third scene we find that the silent and cool Don John is actually a “plain-dealing villain” and plots to defame Don Pedro and Hero. In the characters of Edmund and Don John, Shakespeare uses the stereotype of not just Vice and Machiavel but also the Elizabethan stereotype of illegitimate sons as evil. Though these characters originate from these stereotypes, Shakespeare shows us why they choose evil, the inner workings of their mind and we see our very same human feelings in them, only in an unrestrained condition.

The stereotype of people not belonging to the European society, 'the other', is ironically followed by Shakespeare. The Elizabethan stereotype of Jews as greedy, avaricious, inhuman people becomes the base from which Shakespeare builds the baffling character of Jewish usurer, Shylock. Boika writes, “the treatment of Shylock is a major source of irony which complicates the Venetians confident sense of their superior humanity and way of life” (Humanities insights: The Merchant of Venice 202). Shylock is shown as someone who puts money above human relationships (“My daughter! My ducats!”) and stand as the inhuman face of Capitalism. However, Shakespeare also nullifies this stereotype by other happenings like when he breaks down at the loss of his wife's non precious ring. Venetians are no better than Shylock as they are very harsh to their “purchased slaves”. Their blindness to their own evilness extends to how horribly Antonio treats Shylock (I.iii.114-27).

Under the same vein, if we look at the character of Aaron the Moor, and the stereotype of Black people, he is shown as pure evil. He categorically induces the brutal rape of Lavinia, viciously cuts Titus' hand and continues to do many atrocities. Yet, even he is humanized by his blind and human love of his new born babe. He does his utmost to safeguard his child (IV.ii.71-72), unlike the Titus or Tamora, and even confesses all his crimes to save his child. Anyhow, Aaron is resolute in his evil nature, refuses to conform to socio-political norms of being 'good' and is utterly unapologetic till the end (V.iii.185-90). Shakespeare shows all these villains as driven by the natural human passions like love, hatred, power, care and greed. Thus, though aligned to figures of medieval drama, they are

human-like.

“There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men observingly distil it out;”

These words of Henry the fifth convey Shakespeare's philosophy behind his portrayal of villains. By giving human emotions to these archetypal evil characters, the philosopher in Shakespeare seems to suggest the goodness in evil and vice versa. These ego-centric maniacs originated from and stayed true to the conventions of Renaissance villainy but in the hands of Shakespeare were humanized and brought to life. Evil actions leading to disaster cannot be accepted as good, but Shakespeare seems to extol that an insight into the psyche of evil-doers will help us understand humanity better and forgive, where necessary, as "the rarer action is /In virtue than in vengeance" .

References

Primary Source

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. The English Language Book Society and Collins, 1965.

Secondary Source

Boika, Sokolova, *Humanities Insights : William Shakespeare: The Merchant of Venice*, Humanities- E books, LLP,2009.

Bristol, Michael D, *Shakespeare and Moral Agency*. Continuum International Publishing, 2009.

Curtis, Perry and Watkins, John, *Shakespeare and Middle Ages*, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Hudson, Henry Norman, Ed. *King Lear*, Ginn and Co.,1911.

Moseley, C.W.R.D, *Humanities Insights: William Shakespeare: Richard III*, Humanities- Ebooks, LLP, 2007.

Mousley, Andy, *Re-humanising Shakespeare: Literary Humanism, Wisdom and Modernity*, Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Shakespeare, William, Rafflel, Burton, Bloom, Harold, *Annotated Shakespeare: Othello*, Yale University Press, 2005.

Mabillard, Amanda <<http://www.shakespeare-online.com/plays/shakespearevillains.html>>

As You Like It?: Shakespeare in the Kerala Secondary School Classroom

The recent debate on the study and the impact of Shakespeare in the academic curriculum gains relevance in an age that focuses primarily on industrial and technical education. As a producer of creativity and positive change in social and economic developments, progressive societies have emphasized the function of structured formal systems of education. With the rise in emphasis on scientific education and the mushrooming of technical and medical colleges in India, is it considered prudent to edify the students on Shakespeare and his works in schools?

A 2010 survey has revealed that as many as half of the world's children, across different nations, have encountered Shakespeare in the classroom. The significance of the study of Shakespeare in the Kerala context is debated. At a time when the world speculates on the overwhelming task of teaching Shakespeare in schools, it would be ideal to retrospect on the effects caused by the inclusion or exclusion of the Bard in the textbooks of Kerala, since the major areas of the school curriculum are the instruments by which the individual grows into a more secure, more contributory and a more total member of the society. It is proposed to review, in this study, the position occupied by Shakespeare in the four existing secondary streams of Kerala, the different methods of pedagogy used in the teaching of Shakespeare, and unearth the major problems encountered by students in the learning and comprehension of the timeless writer.

Much like the socio-economic diversity in India, school education also presents a multipronged model. Gone are the days when the State boards were the only choice of education. The 1950's saw the rise of the national level boards such as the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) and the Indian Certificate of Secondary Education (ICSE). And today the scenario has changed with the advent of the international curriculum in the country. The International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) and the International Baccalaureate (IB) systems have become an increasingly popular alternative to the existing syllabi in the state of Kerala.

With regard to the state syllabus, a negligible mention of Shakespearean studies is discernible in the English textbooks at the secondary level. The play *Macbeth* has been rewritten as a short story in the eighth standard textbook while a total absence of the writer may be perceived in the ninth and tenth standard-English curriculum. In the former, though it is suggested as a part of the extended reading section, it finds little or no place in the question papers. It is to be remembered that the previous syllabus of the Kerala State included a four play tragedy compilation in the abridged form. One has to understand that even though *Macbeth* was written around 400 years ago, it still holds relevance in today's contemporary society through the themes of revenge and appearance versus reality. An inherent animalistic quality, revenge is an emotion that all humans experience. The success of various television shows such as "Revenge" connects us with Shakespeare in contemporary times. Similarly

the lines “Look like the innocent flower but be the serpent under't,” reflect of objects, events and situations not being what they seem in today's social order.

Poetry, according to Wordsworth, was the “spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings,” something that cannot be composed under duress. The function of poetry is to ennoble and edify. To learn poetry is not merely to learn a new set of words or sounds; it is to learn that it is possible to think in a slightly different way from that to which one has become used, to realize that there is more than one way of organizing our experience. With this purpose in mind, the syllabus of the ICSE system presents a colourful presentation of the various facets of life through an extract from Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, prescribed in the poetry section, titled “The Seven Ages of Man.” A glossary is provided at the end of the lesson for the comprehension of students. In this monologue, prescribed to the students at the eighth standard, Jacques begins an extensive metaphor where life is likened to a play, and humans, the various actors in the play. In this work, man basically plays seven parts in his lifetime – the helpless infant, the whining schoolboy, the emotional lover, the devoted soldier, the wise judge, the clueless old man and the corpse. Shakespeare understood that all of us are “merely players,” working through the diverse roles that escort the various ages and stages of life. He also understood that we often assume disguises, with or without the assistance of costumes, to help us negotiate the relationships and obstacles that we encounter along the way. Perhaps it is this understanding of our aptitude to play parts in our lives that make Shakespeare's plays reverberate even in contemporary Kerala. But Shakespeare fails to occupy a place in the poetry section of the eighth or ninth syllabi. Shakespeare is more of a dramatist than the poet and this fact is acknowledged by the syllabus. Besides, Shakespeare's drama contains great poetry. However the syllabus makers felt that there is no need to include any of the sonnets in the syllabus. By making *The Merchant of Venice*, the syllabus makers have included Shakespearean poetry because his drama is poetry in the general sense.

This is in sharp contrast to the pedagogical methods used in the CBSE stream. Shakespeare is introduced to the High school students of the CBSE system only from the ninth standard onwards. As in the ICSE stream, “The Seven Ages of Man” is taught. But unlike the former system, the CBSE presents the lesson with pictorial diagrams and introduces the students to various devices such as metaphor, simile etc. On the basis of their understanding of the poem, the students are made to answer several questions. It is noteworthy that the technique of play acting is used, as originally intended by Shakespeare, at the start of the reading where all seven “mimers” are at the front of the class and the readers at their desks. For each age, the reader stands up and reads, while the corresponding “mimer” mimes what is being read. Choral reading is also carried out to help the students explore this passage.

Shakespeare's timeless themes often talk about the lessons and experiences of people which will always be of significance because even though times change, the people do not. People still desire for power and wish to empower themselves in the social strata, as revealed through the character of Mark Anthony. This is the underlying theme of one of the greatest tragedies of Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, which the CBSE syllabus introduces to the students of the tenth standard. The extract on the assassination of Caesar is prefaced with an introduction to the plot and characters of the play. Footnotes are provided on boldened words or phrases in the text for the further comprehension of the

student. At the end of the lesson, the understanding of the students is tested through a number of multiple choice questions, annotated paragraphs, identification of the characteristics of the various characters. The lesson also invites the students to group discussions concerning assassinations in the contemporary times. The syllabus encourages the students on play acting as well. Suggestions and sites are also provided for further instructions regarding set-design, costumes and direction.

Drama edification may not be looked upon as an imperative part of the curriculum in India, or for that matter Kerala, but the scenario is gradually altering, predominantly in schools with a national or international syllabus. The play *As You Like It* was used as stand-alone lesson to discuss this facet of Shakespeare's art and craft at the ninth and tenth standards in the previous syllabus of the ICSE stream. The text provided a comprehensive treatment of the play under various headings like the English Drama, the Elizabethan Stage, Shakespeare's Life and Career, Shakespeare's Times, Shakespeare's Works, Date of Composition and Publication, the Sources of the Play, the Nature of Shakespearean Tragedy, the Dramatic Construction and the Characters. The plays were made easy for the students by providing a paraphrase along with the original lines and footnotes as well as extensive notes to elucidate the meaning. Numerous specimen questions and answers are also provided from the examination point of view. As of the current syllabus, a Verity edition of *The Merchant of Venice* is prescribed. A workbook, as a companion volume for the text, is published exclusively for the ICSE students in the ninth and tenth standards. The workbook introduces the students to the storyline, the different themes in the play, characterisation, critical comments, explanations and references to classical allusions. Moreover, this volume also provides a number of structured questions on each scene, which is in accordance with the examination pattern. But the lesson does not address the impact of Shakespeare at the theoretical and textual levels as in the previous syllabus. All that is expected of the student is close familiarity with the text. The students are not expected to arrive at general conclusions, work out theoretical frameworks, compare and contrast aspects of the play but they are expected to have a close familiarity with the text. That is what an annotation does. By testing the students through annotations in the question papers, they are expected to bring out the semantic significance of the passage.

When Shakespeare can be found integrated in the state and the national streams as part of the literature and language papers, which is compulsory for the students, the IGCSE syllabus, for the students at the eight and nine standards, offers a choice between the literature and language components prescribed in the curriculum. An advanced and extensive study awaits the student who chooses the former. But there is a marked absence of Shakespearean studies in the eight standards, which primarily focuses on the revision of the language elements taught in the previous classes. Each act is the basis for engaging lessons and discussions. All lessons hold inspiration in a myriad ways in which teachers and students can construct inventive classroom collaborations. The universal ideas recommended at the end of each lesson are an invitation to connect the episodes with other pieces of resonant literature.

A cold, rational approach, particularly of subjects that do not interest the students, is unproductive and dreary. No one, young or old, likes learning subjects they find monotonous. Why do we expect children to? If one needs to teach students, one must engage them. The IGCSE system does just that by encouraging role playing, and is in stark contrast to the other

streams. The play acting activity is a great tool that is used to introduce the idea of roles and role playing in life and is extensively used in this system unlike its counterparts. A performance-based reading of Shakespeare is encouraged by the teachers as well as the texts prescribed under this system. The learning objectives of the lesson focus on the utilization of visual, audio, oral and role-playing techniques to promote critical scrutiny. After completion, the students should be able to recognize the application of a range of devices and distinguish the diverse ways in which to analyze the different interpretations of the given text.

Seminar topics and assignments have been incorporated into the various syllabi as an essential part of it. They are intended not merely for purposes of internal assessment, but envisaged as a chief pedagogical component of the curriculum for the secondary course in the Kerala State, CBSE, ICSE and IGCSE streams. In the stipulated time period, the student is expected to introduce the topic and provide as much detail within the time limit provided. The teacher in charge of the particular module has to act as the facilitator for the seminar presenter. After the presentation, the teacher provides the students with supplementary information or tips for further studies on the topic. But none of these seminars or assignments involves a theme related to Shakespeare in any of the streams. Since English is seen as a communication tool than as a device to access the glories of English literature. English is taught not because it is the language of Shakespeare and Milton but because it is a marvelous international communication tool. And it is this perspective that has influenced the syllabus makers to ensure that everything that is not connected to the language component is kept out of the seminar and assignment list. The pupils are not taught Shakespeare because he is one of the glories of the Anglo Saxon tradition, but because by teaching and learning Shakespeare, the student can imbibe a subconscious and an unconscious grasp over the language which they would not otherwise receive.

Most educators refuse a place for Shakespeare in the classroom and he is thus forced to sit outside as witnessed in the Kerala State syllabus. One common lament of students is that they cannot understand the gibberish of the Elizabethan language. But it is to be recognized that even though the language is archaic, most of his phrases are well known. Similarly most teachers in Kerala find preparing for the lesson a tedious chore. But with the arrival of the internet which consists of a near-infinite compendium of information on the writer, teaching ideas and video clips, this, to a large extent, is resolved. Another common complaint from teachers is the excessive use of violence and obscene language in the works of Shakespeare. Systems such as the ICSE have taken steps to present bowdlerized versions of the plays through the Verity edition.

When most teachers admit to the irrelevance of Shakespeare in modern academic circles, others are appalled by the notion of the Bard's exclusion. The significance of Shakespeare can be found in the recognition of the commonalities between Shakespeare's time and our own. For instance the newspapers serve us with a daily dose of the deaths of grief stricken lovers belonging to different communities as in *Romeo and Juliet*, the harassment inflicted on society by the modern day "kuberaas" reflected through the character of Shylock, prejudice and inequality experienced by the various backward communities of Kerala as witnessed in the character of Othello and so on. Similarly flattery and assurance are the persuasive tools of Lady Macbeth and the art of persuasion is something we would all like to master. It equips the students with the skills they will need to handle an array of everyday situation and emotions with better insight into human knowledge

and interaction.

Given Shakespeare's omnipresence in our modern world, he is clearly a source authority. In teaching, students are encouraged to become interpretative authorities and to interject their own powers of observation into the investigation of Shakespeare's motives. In this way, one follows Shakespeare in asking the students to take the abstract text of a play, written some hundred years old, and challenge it with their own acuity, thereby coming to their own, individual understanding and knowledge of Shakespeare and modern society.

Another reason to teach Shakespeare to high school students of Kerala is to help them develop the ability to analyze English writing that uses so much figurative language, and vocabulary. It makes students use a higher level of thinking. They have to think out of the box in order to understand his plays. It also builds up their vocabulary and teaches them how to recognize things such as metaphors, similes, allusions personification, and alliteration thus making them efficient communicators.

Even though written hundreds of years ago, Shakespearean studies have social relevance even today in a different socio-political context. Shakespeare had entered our world centuries ago and has not exited to this day as his works continue to live on even in the twentieth first century. His characters reflect human society everywhere. It can be said that one is able to recognize and relate to these archetypes of characters and settings through one's "collective unconscious" in which all of the history of human experience is contained and all of us have access to it through our subconscious minds.

References

- Arnold, Matthew. *Essays in Criticism*. New Delhi: Rama Brothers India Pvt. Ltd, 2003. Print.
Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth*. New Delhi: Rama Brothers India Pvt. Ltd, 2003. Print

Echoing the Bard: Shakespearean Allusions in Animated Narratives

Literature and entertainment meant for children have always held the interest of critics and scholars alike. Entertainment meant for children when infused with a vein of morality acquires greater significance in the eye of the serious beholder. Walt Disney's musical animation movie, *The Lion King*, released in 1994 was an instant favorite among the children of the time. In spite of the eye-catching façade of the animal fable complete with the “king of the jungle” lion, the lioness queen and the lion prince, the consistent moral pedestal of the plot cannot be overlooked. The film deals with the responsibilities of monarchy and the peril of abandoning the inevitability of maturity, a theme which is one of the oldest in history, and it is not the least apparent in one of the oldest works of literature by The Bard himself, William Shakespeare. The work that Disney's *The Lion King* parallels is none other than *Hamlet: Prince of Denmark*.

The high seriousness of the tale of the Prince of Denmark does not fortunately lose its grandeur on being transformed on such a large scale into cinemascope. Nor does the infusion of a streak of gravity into an animal fable meant for children seem absurd or out of place. *The Lion King* offers clear analogues for characters and incidents from the Bard's tragedy, expect of course, for the dismal calamity crowning the end of the original work. *The Lion King* is set in the jungle where the kind and benevolent king Mufasa rules over a peaceful kingdom of Pride Rock. The title song, “Circle of Life” enlightens the audience as to the reason behind the popularity held by Mufasa. As the king, Mufasa recognises the significance of respecting the balance of the environment, confining hunting and killing for the purposes of survival only. In *Hamlet*, allusions are often made to the capable rule of Hamlet the Senior and Mufasa, never for once fails his “original” in keeping this reputation. Both the kings are murdered by their respective brothers through vile means for usurping the throne.

In *The Lion King*, the role of the young prince whose father is murdered is played by a cub named Simba, whose naiveté procures him more than his fair share of hardships and troubles. The close parallel between Simba and Hamlet Junior cannot escape detection. Both of them can be accused of procrastinating for, both Simba and Hamlet “delay” their action of retribution for their respective father's deaths. The loss of their paternal companion leaves Hamlet incredibly melancholy and Simba without a royal teacher and father during his tender years. Each of them runs from their responsibility, although inside themselves they know what must be done: Hamlet attempts to validate his suspicions while Simba hides from his past and finds refuge in the escapist philosophy of “Hakuna Matata” which means “no worries.” He spends years away from Pride Rock frolicking away in happy forgetfulness with his slow but compassionate friends Timon and Pumbaa. However at one point these friends inadvertently touch upon a sensitive subject which immediately immerses Simba in a torrent of memories. He is reminded of his father who died before his eyes. Though Simba, as a cub might not have recognised his father's death as a well formulated murder, the young Simba, at this moment of sudden vision, seems to know.

Even though *The Lion King* does not portray Simba in a dilemma as “to be or not to be”, his vehement denial to return to Pride Land vouches for the angst that he has been suffering from since his day of revelation. Simba resounds Hamlet's monologues when he vents his feelings in doleful retaliation against his responsibility towards his father and his kingdom when his childhood friend Nala pleads with him to return. Once again, it takes the apparition of the murdered father to present himself and shove the doubtful son into action. When Mufasa's ghost says “Remember who you are....you are my son and the one true king!! Remember...Remember...”, he clearly resonates the King Hamlet's final words to his son “Hamlet, remember me.”

However like Hamlet, Simba does not prolong his retribution lost in self doubt and philosophy. The moment he receives his father's command, he charges to Pride Rock to rescue his land from his undeserving uncle Scar, who has by this time almost devastated the place with his pack of hyenas. There he enters into a fierce battle wherein, Simba is saved the trouble of killing Scar as the villain is attacked by his own pack of hyenas. The high tragedy at of Hamlet is fortunately avoided here. When the Bard denies Hamlet his mother, Ophelia and a future, *The Lion King* ends on a positive note with Simba ascending the throne with his mother, his wife Nala and his new born daughter by his side.

Scar, the vile usurper, is one character to reckon upon. Although he parallels Claudius on the material level his villainy surpasses that of Claudius. Whereas Claudius is a second rate schemer who after the act is consumed by anxiety and guilt, Scar is a magnificent villain who revels in his monstrosity. He is more akin to Richard III or Iago, people who find delight in playing with and manipulating the troubled minds of their prey. It is Scar who after murdering his own brother infuses a sense of guilt into the disoriented mind of the innocent Simba. He makes the cub believe that he is responsible for the death of his father. His Machiavellian villainy knows where to place the dice. “What will your mother think?” he asks Simba making the cub cringe at the thought of facing his mother as his father's murderer.

Scar, just like Iago is a master manipulator. He creates an illusion in Simba that he is responsible for Mufasa's death and that he should flee rather than facing the wrath of his mother. To make his scheme foolproof he sends his sidekicks to make sure that Simba is dead. Just like Iago and Richard III, language is the weapon for Scar. He uses very few words but, they find their mark. He convinces Mufasa that he is not a threat, he convinces a pack of vicious hyenas to become his strong men and finally his words consign Simba to a lifetime of compunction. Thus, in Scar, one can find echoes of a number of Shakespearean villains especially the Machiavellian villain Iago.

Another very significant aspect to be taken into consideration is the way in which the oft discussed mother fixation of Hamlet has been portrayed in *The Lion King*. Simba is the darling son of Mufasa and Sarabi. However Simba's love for and his haste to please Sarabi is evident from the very beginning. When tragedy strikes, the primary trial that Simba has to undergo is to face Sarabi, and this is the confrontation from which he tries to flee. Confronting Sarabi with the guilt of her widowhood hanging upon him is unimaginable for Simba. Moreover, on his return, he is provoked into attacking Scar when he finds his mother mistreated. Hamlet's Gertrude and Simba's Sarabi are not the same but the affection of both sons for the mothers cannot escape notice.

When an animated narrative, which is “prescribed” for children's entertainment

alludes to and draws from the works of a mighty author from centuries ago, we have an illustration of inter textuality tethering eras, genres and cultures. *The Lion King*, of course, is not the only work that is based on a Shakespearean text. There have been adaptations, translations and re –presentations of Shakespeare across nations, cultures, languages and mediums. Even among the musical animations many carry undertones of Shakespearean themes.

Disney's *Pocahontas* arguably draws its basic thread from Shakespeare's swan song *Tempest* yet deviates from the major theme in the anti racist philosophy it proclaims. The second part of *The Lion King* which is entitled *The Lion King II* resembles *Romoeo and Juliet* with its warring families, youngsters falling in love and the consequent troubles. However, here too Disney steers clear of the tragic vein and unites the lovers in matrimony. By identifying the Shakespearean element in animated narratives, this paper has assayed to reassert the enduring character of Shakespearean themes and the universal nature of his philosophy. The gravity with which the master dramatist has analysed human nature and psyche is so sturdy that it endures all mediums and all audience. When the maturity and intellectual capacity of the grown up spectator could perceive the agony of Prince Hamlet, the innocence of the child could perceive the pain of Simba. Yet both pangs are the same, hence the magnitude of The Bard.

References

Shakespeare, William,Ed. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor. *Hamlet (Arden Shakespeare, Third Series)*. New York: Arden, 2006. Print.

Bradley, A.C. *Shakespearean Tragedy: Lecures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, and Macbeth*. New York and London: Penguin, 1991. Print.\

McElveen, Trey. *Hamlet and The Lion King: Shakespearean Influences on Modern Entertainment*. April 1998. Web. 10 July 2014.

Butler, Issac. *The Shakespearean grandeur of The Lion King's Villian*. May 2000. Web. 10 July 2014.

The Lion King.Dir. Rob Minkoff, Roger Allers. Disney. Walt Disney Pictures.1994. You Tube.

Rekindling the Old Flame: A New Pedagogy of the Universal Master

1. Introduction

Harold Bloom has commented that there is no rival to set against William Shakespeare for his originality. Bloom has quoted Emerson who liked to remark, “The originals are not originals”, but himself withdrew this observation in respect to Shakespeare alone (*Viva Modern Critical Interpretations*, 3). However, re-makings and re-creations from this 'original' has been taking place. But why? Time has proved again and again that centuries of artists have been motivated to borrow from this well of creativity, the Swan of Avon. A detailed analysis of what makes Shakespeare's works enjoy this legendary status reveal that it is due to the universal nature and quality of his works. His eternal fame rests on the subjects he wrote about- the intense and most innate emotions living beings, irrespective of time and space experience, the emotions and feelings of love, hatred, betrayal, lust, greed, ambition, failure, jealousy.... He is the greatest psychoanalyst literature has ever seen. His plays examine with great psychological subtlety how the idiosyncratic flaws in the protagonists lead almost to their tragic destruction and also of those surrounding them. He explored such human conditions that centuries of creative artists have shadowed his works creating trendy and contemporary reincarnations of his plays for the faults that he imparted on his characters which served as vehicles for profound explorations of the human character and morality.

2. Adaptations: Relevance

It is often said about Shakespeare that his spirit was never extinguished at his death, arising from the innumerable works in which his influence can be traced. However, despite the universal quality and charm of his works, the Shakespearean language has become difficult to decipher over the time and their inclusion in the school and university curriculums tend to lose the passion and intensity with which they were studied and analysed in the earlier decades. It is here that the significance of the filmmakers rises. They have bent the Bard's works to give rise to new interpretations by adapting the classic into something modern and unique.

3. The Bard and the New Millennia

The modern generation has known William Shakespeare's artistic renderings even before they have been confronted with the challenges of reading his plays. With popular movies ranging from *10 Things I Hate about You* (*The Taming of the Shrew*), *She's the Man* (*Twelfth Night*), *King of Texas* (*King Lear*) to *The Lion King* (*Hamlet*), the Gen-Next have internalised and have loved these movies without consciously realizing their associations with their true master. These movies include both teenagers and children as their target audience; can serve as the most felicitous tool for bringing them to terms with literature which they may otherwise find difficult to comprehend. Using technology for teaching enables the perfect transition of a teacher and a student to a facilitator and learner, as per the modern standards recommended by academia world over today. Moreover, it has been scientifically proven that more than 83% of learning takes place through visuals.

This paper seeks to illustrate how a film adaptation of a Shakespearean play can be used to create a new pedagogy that will help the learners to better appreciate and venerate the inimitable Bard, simultaneously tracing his influence on contemporary works, for the universal and eternal themes they deal with and why they have been adapted so. For the purpose explained above, an oft-quoted tragedy, *Hamlet* and its modern rendering by Disney, *The Lion King*, have been taken.

The 1994 Walt Disney production, *The Lion King*, directed by Roger Allers and Rob Minkoff, begins with the birth of Simba, the son King Mufasa and Queen Sarabi, the Royal couple who rule over the Pride Lands of Africa. Simba's birth creates resentment and envy in Scar (Mufasa's brother), who plots the death and elimination of both Mufasa and Simba to establish himself as the heir to the throne. Mufasa is killed by Scar and poor Simba is forced to flee, claiming never to return, being coerced to believe that he was responsible for his father's death, while Scar basked in his stolen authority. Far away from his homeland, he befriends Timon, a meerkat and Pumbaa, a warthog, and grows up with them, living under their motto, "hakuna matata", a Swahili phrase which finds an English equivalent in the phrase, 'don't worry, be happy'. Now, a young adult, he happens to meet Nala, his childhood love and companion, who urges him to get back to the Pride Lands and fulfil his duty as the true king, for their homeland has been turned into a wasteland, an abode of the malicious Scar and his loyal army of hyenas. Stricken by the guilt of his father's death, he refuses to return. However, when he learns of Scar's transgressions and is moved into action through his father's spirit, he plans to avenge his father's murder. The song, "I just can't wait to be king!" sung by him early on in the movie, takes on a new meaning now and Simba returns, Scar and his pack of hyenas are destroyed and Simba takes his place as the rightful king and the "circle of life" is completed with a newborn cub being born to Simba and Nala. Other prominent characters include Zazu, the hornbill and Rafiki, the mandrill.

The protagonist of *Hamlet* is Prince Hamlet of Denmark, son of the deceased King Hamlet, murdered by his brother Claudius, who in haste then married the Queen Gertrude. The play opens on a cold winter midnight in the castle of Elsinore. A ghost which resembles the late king appears and is seen by Bernardo, Marcellus and Horatio who endeavours to start a conversation with it, but in vain. They decide to tell Hamlet about it. The scene shifts to a room in the castle where Claudius and Gertrude talk with Laertes about his upcoming trip to France and then to Hamlet who is in deep mourning for his father. The couple tries to persuade him to lighten up. He is then updated by the trio at the watch station about the ghost they saw. Claudius and Gertrude send Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, friends of Hamlet, to discover the cause of Hamlet's mood and behaviour. Hamlet greets his friends warmly, but quickly discerns that they are spies. That night, the ghost appears to Hamlet and tells him that Claudius murdered him by pouring "juice of cursed hebenon" in his ear, which caused his blood to "curd" and his skin to be covered with a "vile and loathsome crust". It then demands that Hamlet avenge him. "Well said, old mole!" replies the son, and he tells Horatio and the rest of his allies that he is going to "put on an antic disposition". Quite soon, Ophelia meets Hamlet secretly but is so alarmed by his strange antics that she tells her father of Hamlet's state. At their next tryst, Hamlet rants at Ophelia. He decides to stage a play (the mouse-trap), re-enacting his father's murder, and thus determines whether Claudius is guilty of the crime as the ghost accused, by studying his reaction. After seeing the 'King' murdered with poison in the ears, Claudius abruptly rises and leaves the room. This served as proof for Hamlet of

his uncle's guilt. Gertrude summons Hamlet to her chamber to demand an explanation. On his way, Hamlet passes Claudius who was praying. Claudius has just been talking to himself about the impossibility of repenting since he still had possession of the ill-gotten goods. Hamlet then sneaks up behind them, but hesitates to kill him, because killing Claudius would send him straight to heaven, while his father is still in hell or purgatory. Hamlet mistakenly kills Polonius. Claudius, fearing for his life, banishes Hamlet to England on a pretext, to be closely watched by Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. In the meantime Ophelia commits suicide. Claudius convinces Laertes that Hamlet is solely responsible for all this and then Claudius is informed that Hamlet is very much alive. Claudius swiftly concocts a plot. He proposes a fencing match between Laertes and Hamlet with poison-tipped rapiers, but tacitly plans to offer Hamlet poisoned wine if that fails. With Fortinbras' army (enemy troop from Norway) closing on Elsinore, the match begins. Laertes pierces Hamlet with a poisoned blade but is fatally wounded by it himself. Gertrude accidentally drinks the poisoned wine intended for Hamlet and dies. In his dying moments, Laertes is reconciled with Hamlet and reveals Claudius's murderous plot. In his own last moments, Hamlet manages to kill Claudius and names Fortinbras as his heir.

Without having any background to *Hamlet*, one will never be able to decipher the association between *The Lion King* and the Shakespearean tragedy. However, once the connection is made, we can see the jigsaw puzzle creating a perfect comparison. A comparative study of these two exemplary works also brings to light the differences arising from the intended audience. Wagner in his *Adaptations* perfectly justifies this 'gap' in his description of 'analogy adaptation' i.e. an adaptation “which must represent a fairly considerable departure for the sake of making another work of art”, of which the two works considered here serve as examples. Similarly, Imelda Whelehan states that the characters and plots go through a simplification process when they are being transferred to the scene. This too can be noted here and perfectly justifies the modifications rendered in the character portrayal from the play to the movie under consideration.

4. How *The Lion King* can be used as a study guide for *Hamlet*

Although, *The Lion King* is an animated musical and may seem more appealing to the elementary school children, it is viewed and enjoyed with the same vigour and appeal by teenagers and adults alike. Being born into an era of computers and technology, any tech-oriented learning is enthusiastically welcomed by the contemporary audience. Tapping this advantage, the learners can be made to watch this movie, imbibe its message, analyse the characters. For example, the film under consideration stresses on the importance of responsibility and the potency of relationships. A study of *The Lion King* is to be followed by an essay of *Hamlet*. These processes are in fact an act of translation i.e. one text is decoded for the other. Once *Hamlet* has been studied, a comparative analysis (critical appraisal) of both the works is to be made.

In both, we see a young prince, naïve and enjoying the royal privileges, lose his father resulting in an unfortunate turn of circumstances. His own uncle is responsible for the severe blow he faces. He is expected to seek vengeance for the quagmire into which his family has been pushed by his uncle, the usurper. He is accompanied by two friends who provide comic relief in the text. He also has a wise counsellor/ friend to remind him of who he really is and what his real responsibility is. In his effort to shirk off his duties, he forsakes the one to whom he has pledged his heart. Eventually, he avenges his father's death by bringing

an end to his uncle. As always in the plays of the Bard, emotions and feelings of love, guilt, greed, jealousy and above all responsibility and sense of duty, are well depicted in *Hamlet* and equalling it is *The Lion King*. Therefore, it is Simba and Prince Hamlet, Mufasa and the deceased King Hamlet, Scar and Claudius, Nala and Ophelia, Sarabi and Gertrude, Rafiki and Horatio, Timon and Pumbaa as Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. Beyond this basic story line, everything else is different between the two works.

'Why are such deviations from the original play made?' will be a likely question from the learners. The answers and discussions centred on this leads to an understanding of how adaptations work. Although there is a clear parallel between *Hamlet* and *The Lion King*, the adaptation was made as an animated musical providing a wholesome family entertainment with special focus on the children. This alone serves as the primary reason for the comparatively milder plot and the 'happily ever after' ending. The darker themes of *Hamlet* such as vengeance, murder, lust and selfish motives are subjugated. Every single action in *The Lion King* is justified for the ultimatum - completion of "the circle of life". The movie though derived from *Hamlet*, a play which is an epitome of Revenge tragedy in English literature, with its thickening plots and innumerable murders and death, stands on its own as a classic children's movie which represents imperative morals, such as evil never goes unpunished and is overcome by good and, importance of dignity as Simba tells Scar, "Step down... or fight!". All through the movie, the essence of the Shakespearean characters and events have been kept in check. The innateness of the play are strengthened and reinforced not only through the dialogues or expressions, but also the background effects and musical scores which is quintessential in creating the predetermined impact. The bright and luminous areas (during the reign of Mufasa and in the jungles where the motto "hakuna matata" reigned) contrasted by the doom of Scar's reign illustrates the difference between good and bad. To add fragrance to the characters 'borrowed' from Shakespeare who were greatly adapted to suit the targeted audience, the characters have been named appropriately. In Swahili, Simba means 'lion', Pumbaa 'simpleton', Rafiki 'my friend', Shenzi (the female hyena) 'savage', Banzai 'skulk' and Nala 'gift'. These implications which are brought into the movie with reference to character portrayal alone, reveals how deeply etched are the characters designed by the Bard. Dr. Johnson's comment on Shakespeare's character portrayal in the *Preface to Shakespeare* stands true here. Yes, indeed, Shakespeare is "the poet of nature; the poet that holds up to his readers a faithful mirror of manners and of life ... In the writings of other poets a character is too often an individual: in those of Shakespeare it is commonly a species". *Hamlet* depicts the mental turmoil, confusion, chaos, pain, doubt, fear, love, hatred, vengeance, suffering, malignity, the most complex of human emotions, waging war within each character when struck by the realities they are forced to face. No other soul can paint with words that which Shakespeare has painted.

5. Conclusion

Thus, to conclude with, the commendable fact here is that in spite of the innumerable renderings of the Shakespearean plays into films, the underlying relevance of human condition is focused, captured and presented, resulting from the need to show justice to the powerful characters sketched by Shakespeare. This analysis proves that character portrayal is of prime importance when it comes to adapting a Shakespearean play. The net effect of these adaptations of the great Bard is that they remain as modern as ever because of the timelessness of their themes and characterisations. The glorious plays of Shakespeare can be

thus studied using their contemporary adaptations all the while relishing the beauty and power of his creations. In this manner, the modern generation will continue to venerate him as their predecessors have done, for their likes and perspectives and cognizance are channeled to the Bard and his contributions through works which are familiar to them and are adored by them.

We can therefore see four main areas being covered through this pedagogy, tracing the influence of the Bard, introduction of a new teaching – learning methodology, a critical appraisal of two classical works and an elementary understanding of adaptation techniques.

6. References

Primary Sources

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Ed. Alan Durband. United Kingdom: Hutchinson Education, 1986. Print.

The Lion King. Dir. Roger Allers and Rob Minkoff. Perf. Matthew Broderick, James Earl Jones, Moira Kelly and Jeremy Irons. Walt Disney Pictures, 1994. DVD.

Secondary Sources

Giddings, Seth. "The Circle of Life: Nature and Representation in Disney's *The Lion King*." University of the West of England 49 (1998): 1-18. PDF file.

Johnson, Dr. Samuel. *A Preface to Shakespeare*. Ed. R. W. Desai. New Delhi: Sangam Books Ltd., 1997. Print.

Wagner, Geoffrey Atheling. *The Novel and the Cinema*. New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson U.P. 1975. Print.

Viva Modern Critical Interpretations: Shakespeare's Hamlet. Ed. Harold Bloom. New Delhi: Infobase Publishing, 2008. Print.

Translation as Negotiation: N. P. Dave's *Denmark no Rajkumar, Hamlet* (1917).

Introduction

Narbheshankar Pranjivan Dave (1871-1952) translated Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Gujarati in 1917. It was the last translation to appear in *Shakespeare Mala*¹ (A Garland of Shakespeare Plays), a series of five translated plays of Shakespeare in Gujarati. Dedicated to Maharaja Bhavsinhji Bahadur of Bhavnagar, Dave's *Shakespeare Mala* was the first rigorous and systematic attempt to bring out Shakespeare plays in Gujarati through translation. The manuscripts of translations were submitted to the minister of the king and discussion on the translated text was held subsequently (N. Dave, *Mezar* 3-4). His views were also considered while finalizing translations (3-4). Along with Gujarati translation of the title of the play, the first page also bears the name of the present translator and his educational qualifications. The word "*bhashantarkarta*" (translator), which the translator uses for himself, shows his self-confidence and awareness as a translator². *Hamlet* (1917) translation has thirty one pages long introduction, divided into three different sections. The introduction provides critical examination of the translated play and evaluation of major characters at length³. Three divisions are:

1. *Prastavana* (preface), where Dave gives his ideas on the translation technique of the present play.
2. *Hamlet*, where he provides background to the play, renders the entire story as a narrative and deals with the plot-construction and theme of the play.
3. *Patra-bhed* (character differences), where he gives a critical analysis of the play and evaluates major characters at length.

Receptive of and Responding to the Change: Dave's Discourse of Translation:

In his translation of *Hamlet* (1917), Dave follows the original text very closely and largely remains "faithful" to it. Dave translates nearly the entire text in Gujarati. He selects prose as a medium and word as a unit of his translation. He retains the original setting, names of characters and formal structure of acts and scenes. It has to be kept in mind that for a proper understanding of the play, as the preface to the play informs, Dave emphasizes upon its performance along with its reading. For that purpose, he also attempts to mould his translation for the stage by following some of the conventions of the contemporary Gujarati professional stage⁴.

Dave's translation of *Hamlet* and other translations of Shakespeare plays, which were brought out under *Shakespeare Mala* series, differ in the method and purpose from previously made Gujarati translations of Shakespeare plays. In the early decades of the second half of the nineteenth century, Shakespeare translations were primarily made by English educated elites to introduce Shakespeare to the *bhasha* speaking masses⁵. Primarily meant for reading, some of these Gujarati translations of plays were transformed into

narratives and were serialized in contemporary literary magazines⁶. Some of these early translations and adaptations were made out of reverence for the Bard, where the translators also protested against the “indianization” of Shakespeare plays by the Parsi playwrights and accepted that it was impossible to bring into Gujarati the real poetic genius of the Bard⁷. With the establishment of professional Gujarati drama companies in the late 1870s, adaptations of Shakespeare plays for the stage performance started to appear in Gujarati. Playwrights of these drama companies found excellent plot-construction and spectacular events in Shakespeare plays and were largely attracted to his techniques such as soliloquies and 'a play within the play' (Dalal 95; Kaji 32-33).

Dave's *Shakespeare Mala* marks a change in the present discourse of translation of Shakespeare plays as it renders full-length Shakespeare plays into Gujarati through translation. Dave's discourse of translation seems receptive to the changes discernible in contemporary views on translation and literature. Navalram Pandya⁹ (1836-1888), an important Gujarati commentator on the translation practice in the 19th century, emphasizes the nature and *rasa* of the original text as far as its translation is concerned (Parikh 29-30). He distinguishes between texts belonging to *mohansahitya* (literature in light vein) and texts belonging to *kavyasahitya* (serious and elegant literature) (29; 74). He suggests that if the text to be translated belongs to *mohansahitya*, it should be adapted following the time and place of the readers of the target language (29). On the other hand, if the text belongs to the *kavyasahitya*, he argues that it should be translated (74-77). So far as the *rasa* of the original text is concerned, he believes that it should be brought into both types of translation (30; 76). He considers Shakespeare plays belonging to *mohansahitya* and argues that they should be adapted following the time and place of the readers of the target language. Navalram Pandya argues:

From our consideration, there are three types of translation: following words or literal (*shabdanusari*), following the meaning or semantic (*arthanusari*) and adaptation (*rasanusari*). It is essential to follow the time and place (*deshkal*) of readers (*shrotao*) in *rasanusari* translation or the *rasain* translation will become bad *rasa* (*viras* or *kurasa*). (If you) do not want to call it *rasanusari*, call it *deshkalanusari* (as per time and place). Without doing thus, the poem (*kavya*) of one country or time will not be able to provide the intended *rasa* to the people of another time and place (*deshkal*). *Shakespeare wrote his plays following his own time and place (Shakespeare e potana natako deshkalanusari karya che). Therefore, they have become most famous in the English language, and if they are to be translated into the languages of India (hind), they will not be popular (lokpriy) without following the same principle* (29-30, emphasis mine).

Dave's method of translation differs from these views as he does not follow Pandya's idea of *rasanusari* translation while translating Shakespeare plays. For Dave, Shakespeare plays do not belong to the literature of entertainment. In fact, Dave's approach to translation confirms that he was aware of the enhanced merit of translation and plays of Shakespeare in the contemporary Gujarati literary field. Two contemporary Gujarati articles dealing with the subject of translation, namely *Bhashantaro ane Anukarano* (Translations and Adaptations) and *Bhashantar athava Anuvad na Grantho* (Texts for Translations), approve of the heightened value of translation and Shakespeare in the contemporary literary field. These

articles discussed the relevance of translation in enriching the Gujarati literature and put emphasis on translation in order to produce important works of other languages in Gujarati (Dave, M. 193-204; Thakkar 129-204). Published in the contemporary Gujarati journals *Buddhiprakaksh* (1902) and *Sahitya* (1913) respectively, both these articles also made a strict distinction between *bhashantar* (*translation*) and *anukaran* (*adaptation*), and gave more importance to translation than adaptation (198;134). Moreover, one of the two articles also pointed to the shift of Shakespeare plays from *mohansahitya* (the domain of literature of entertainment) (Parikh 29-30) to *suddh sahitya na grantho* (books with literary qualities) (M. Dave 197). The author of the same article also accorded more value to translation than criticism and argued that a translator requires more skill, scholarship and ability than a critic (194-195).

In his adaptation of Shakespeare's *All's Well that Ends Well* (as *Chandra-Raman*, 1906) for the stage, Dave does not provide any introduction to the play. In his preface to the adaptation, Dave argues that the task of evaluating the play is entrusted to readers and critics. The preface also informs that the adaptation is not included in the *Shakespeare Mala* series and is not dedicated to Maharaja Bhavsinhji Bahadur of Bhavnagar. As the preface further informs, the adaptation is dedicated to Prabhashankar Dalpatram Pattani –the minister of the same king. This instance shows that translation is not merely adaptation for Dave. He makes a clear distinction between translation and adaptation, and for him translation is on a higher plane than adaptation. His decision not to provide an introduction to his adaptation of *All's Well* suggests two things about Dave's awareness as a translator: 1) that a translation requires extra-literary materials for its proper understanding, and 2) that an adaptation does not require an explication in the form of an introduction as it would be reviewed by spectators. For Dave, translation plays a critical role. His decision to translate other Shakespeare plays “word by word” seems to come from his awareness regarding the increased understanding of the concept and value of translation in the present literary field itself.

***Madhyamata* (moderation) as the Mode of Translation**

Talking about the philosophical aspect of the play in his introduction, Dave emphasizes upon *madhyamata* (*moderation*) in life and thought:

The instruction (*updesh*) of Shakespeare is that people have to go on doing tasks assigned to them in this world with proper thinking and enthusiasm. And there should be moderation in thought (*vichar*) and enthusiasm (*utsah*). (If) we speak in the language of Aristotle, there should be golden moderation (*soneri madhyamta*) in an every task, moderation that the greatness of human ethics emphasizes. Where this moderation is not followed, the element of pain enters into the nature with the intensification of a single thought or defect. No doubt, the man who cannot keep control over his disease or disorder (*vikar*) is born to bear pain. Pain arises in the world in many ways and this is one of them, and so a person has to bear it (*Hamlet*, Intro. 14).

Madhyamata (*moderation*) is also an important attribute of Dave's discourse of translation. It also characterizes his mode of translation as he uses an idiom that is pitched neither too high nor too low. Dave uses neither highly “Sanskritised” nor completely colloquial Gujarati. In fact, he uses moderate Gujarati that suits the nature of the play. His

translation evidences his competent command over both languages. Dave uses moderate diction (use of words both from “Sanskritised Gujarati” and Persian²) as an important tool of his translation. It helps him in maintaining a flexible and expressive idiom that captures the mood of the text and also avoids the danger of obscurity resulting from following the original text very closely.

His decision to translate using moderate Gujarati also needs to be understood in the context of language debates of the time. In the late 19th century Gujarat, educated high-caste Hindu Brahmin elites took up the issue of language reform and standardization in order to construct their regional identity and to dominate the literary field of the time (Isaka 1-20). In their attempt to establish hegemonic cultural and political dominance over the literary field in Gujarat, they began “Sanskritisation” of the Gujarati language and attributed the present “impurity” of language to the Arabic and Persian words in Gujarati (13-15). They not only introduced Sanskrit words in Gujarati but also began to discard these “foreign” words by replacing them with words of Sanskrit origin (Isaka 13-15; Yagnik and Sheth 15-18). In fact, many Persian and Arabic words, especially related to trade and administration, had already entered and got naturalized in Gujarati during the Mughal period and were in use since then (Yagnik and Sheth 16-17).

If educated high-caste Nagar Brahmins attempted to dominate the literary and cultural domain through the process of standardization and “Sanskritisation” of Gujarati, voices of resistance against the process were also raised simultaneously. Resisting voices were of the view that “popular” words instead of words of Sanskrit origin should be used and literature should be written in a simple language so that all could understand. In an anonymous article, entitled “M.A. ma Deshi Bhashao” (Vernacular Languages in M.A.) and published in *Samalochak* magazine in 1901, the writer argued:

Hindu writers who try to make their writing (*lekh*) profound (*ghaado*), using Sanskrit words in spite of the availability of native words (*deshy shabdo*), are just attempting to differentiate themselves from other speakers of the Gujarati language. “*Sarvadeshik*” literature is necessary to be written (*sarvadeshik lekh lakavani jaruriyat chhe*) (M. A. 59).

In another important article, entitled as “Gujarati Bhashane Kevi Rite Sammrudhh Karvi, Ek Charcha” (The lines on which the Development of the Gujarati language should proceed³) and published in the same *Samalochak* magazine in 1908, a participant of the debate named Pranlal K. Desai argued:

Books (*grantho*) should be written in very simple language. Instead of that, “Sanskritised Gujarati” becomes so hard that one's mind starts aching while reading. Translations, which are being done presently, are also using the same style (*shaili*) so the main intention of translation is also not met. (Pandya 71)

Dave's translation seems to confirm to the demand of producing works in simple Gujarati as he uses moderate Gujarati for his translation. While educated high-caste elites of the time deliberately attempted to Sanskritise Gujarati with a view to define their “regional identity” and to establish their “social and cultural dominance” (Isaka 1), Dave rendered his

² The word 'Persian' here denotes use of those Persian words which have been naturalized in Gujarati.

³ English translation by the author himself.

translation following the opposite need and demand of producing literature in moderate and simple Gujarati.

3. Translator in Three Different Roles:

Dave does not merely translate Shakespeare plays. The entire *Shakespeare Mala* is a rigorous attempt to enable and facilitate Gujarati readers to have an informed understanding of Shakespeare. *As an interpreter of Shakespeare*, Dave also attempts to interpret Shakespeare and his techniques as a playwright. Along with the translation, he also unravels complexities of the play and its plot-construction. Especially, his introduction is a kind of answer to questions that may arise in readers' mind while going through the play. *As literary critic*, he attempts to make available critical comments and opinions of western critics on the text and its issues. The basic purpose is to provide enough explanation on the play and its important aspects to his readers. He provides more than ten western critics' views and critical commentary in his introduction and footnotes to the translation. Dave also repudiates some of the claims made by these western critics and provides his own assertions. In footnotes, his basic strategy is to reproduce each opinion in single inverted commas and the critic's name in brackets.

Dave repudiates almost all claims made by western critics such as Voltaire, Goethe, Schlegel and Johnson on the character of Hamlet and attempts to evaluate it on his own following the Indian philosophical point of view. About the character of Hamlet, Dave argues in his introduction to the translation of *Hamlet* (1917):

Thus, here is too much difference in opinions (*mat-bhinntva*) on the character of Hamlet. The substance is that Hamlet's nature is noble and he has noble intentions. Different elements of human nature are mixed in it. The viewpoint of life in the western thought is different (*vilakshan*), so the mystery of life is described accordingly; but I think it is not difficult to understand the character of Hamlet from our Aryan point of view (*aarya drashti*). Hamlet tries to achieve peace of the soul by acquiring the stability (*samyavastha*) of mind. But due to nature and complexity of circumstances, the element of pain enters in his life; and at the cost of his life, he achieves the peace of the soul (*Hamlet* Intro. 16).

As a comparative critic, Dave attempts to evaluate the play using Indian philosophy of life. Another important attribute that Dave shows as a comparative critic is that for him the tragedy acquires importance from a different point of view. For him, the question of pain – how it arises and enters in one's life – becomes important.

A Textual Analysis of *Hamlet* (1917) Translation:

A. Literal Translation

Dave's translation is "literal." He selects a word as a unit of his translation and translates following the original text closely. He does not take much liberty with the original text and remains close to the original syntactic pattern. Moreover, he also provides footnotes to explain his word to word translation.

King: How smart a lash that speech doth give my conscience!

The harlot's cheek, beautied with plastering art,

Is not more ugly to the thing that helps it
 Than is my deed to my most painted word:
 O heavy burthen (3.1. 55-54).

Raja: Te kathan mara antahkaran ne kevo sakhat fatako mare chhe! Mara atyant dambhik shabdo na praman ma jevu maru kruty chhe tena karta, gulabi rang thi shanagarela veshya na gal je vastuma te sahayak thay chhe, teni sathe sarkhavata vadhare kurup nathi. Arre bhare boja! (ND).

Here, Dave attempts to translate following the original very closely. He also ably translates words like 'my deed' and 'my most painted word' as *maru krutya* and *mara atyant dambhik shabdo* respectively. He uses the technique of “loan translation” while translating exclamatory words such as “o heavy burthen” as *are bhare boja* (oh! the heavy burden).

B. Propriety in the Choice of Equivalents

One of the most important features of Dave's translation is his use of appropriate and choice equivalents. Dave uses equivalents from both “Sanskritised Gujarati” and Persian. It is also an important part of his strategy of moderation. Dave's use of proper equivalents helps him in retaining the original pattern and brevity without obscurity in translation. It also allows him to be creative within limit. Dave's use of proper and able equivalents and moderation as a poetic strategy transform his close observance of the original syntactic pattern into a creative act of recovering the original tone and temper.

Queen. Did he receive you well?

Ros. Most like a gentleman.

Guil. But with much forcing of his disposition.

Ros. Niggard of question; but, of our demands, Most free in his reply. (3.1. 10-14)

Rani: Tamaro satkar ene saro karyo?

Roz. Taddan sajjan ni jem.

Guild. Pan parane parane thato hoy tevo.

Roz. Prashn puchhavama koshriya; pan ame puchhiye to javab Ghana mokala manana. (ND)

Dave's translation follows the original very closely. The use of word *koshriyo* is apt for 'niggard', which in Gujarati means 'miser' and 'skinflint'. He also maintains precision in diction and dialogues in his translation. Dave also brings alliterative effect in translation.

Ham. ...but, by'r lady, he must build churches, then; or else shall he suffer not thinking on, with the *hobby-horse*, whose epitaph is 'For, O, for, O, the *hobby-horse* is forgot.' (3.2. 37-40)

For 'hobby-horse', Dave's use of the word *duldul ghodo* (Duldul horse) is apt. *Duldul* was the name of the Prophet Muhammad's horse whose *Taziyas* are made and carried out in the month of Muharram. He also provides explanation in a footnote about the character of hobby horse and its use in the Morris dance.

King: Alas, how shall this bloody deed be answer'd? (4.2. 17)

Raja: Afasos, aa krur kruty no javab kem devase? (ND)

King: O wretched state! O bosom black as death!

O limed soul, that, struggling to be free,

Art more engaged! (3.4. 67-69)

Raja: Are kambakht dasha! Are mrutyu sam kala hraday! Are chontela jeev, je virakt thavana fanfa marta vadhare vadhare ragi thay chhe! (ND)

Dave's use of able equivalents, both from Persian and "Sanskritised Gujarati," (*afasos* for 'alas'; *kambakht* for 'wretched'; *chontelo jeev* for 'limed soul'; *virakt* for 'free' and *ragi* for 'engaged') heightens the tone of the translated sentence to match the original one, and also retains the original structure and syntax. It also helps him in rendering a sense close to the original in the target language. For example, his use of the phrase *chhontelo jeev* for 'limed soul' renders the original sense of a bird that has been ensnared with the use of bird lime (a sticky substance) rather than net. Dave's appropriate use of Persian words in such exclamatory sentences captures the tone effectively and successfully brings the original effect in translation. Moreover, Dave's use of the Persian diction also provides alliterative effect to these lines. These Persian words are again used as able equivalents.

C. Translation of the Grave-digging Scene

Dave translates speeches of the grave diggers in one of the dialects of Gujarati (probably in Charotari Gujarati) and transforms these grave diggers into "*gamadiya*⁴." Perhaps, Dave wanted to provide 'comic relief' to the audience and the readers. But, we can also see that in the dramas written during the time, these dialects are attributed to those characters that belong to lower caste and class.

Generally, in Gujarati dramas of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, speech varieties of different characters are based on their social background and status (J. Dave, Gujarati ane Marathi 118). In Himmatlal Kalidas Dactar's five-act drama Taralaxmi Natak (1891), Jagdish Dave observes that the servant Damu speaks in Marathi, judge with his clerk in English and the thief with his wife in the *gamadiya* language (118).

Many Gujarati dramas of the same time, which were written following the western style of drama writing, also adopted the technique of providing comic relief along with other factors. Heeralal Kaji observes that it was Morbi Arya Subodh Natak Mandali (est. 1879) that started to interweave romantic scenes in a comic vein as heroic scenes were considered not enough for the spectators (42). The usual method was to represent a person from the Baniya or the Ghanchi community or persons from lower classes and castes conversing in their own dialects (J. Dave 89; 122; 141). In these light scenes, language and social background of particular characters used to become major factors in creating laughter on the stage (89; 122; 141).

In his analysis of Shreemat Pativrata Gunsundari Natak (1891), Jagdish Dave notes that in the sixth scene of the last act there is a conversation between two *gamadiya* untouchables named Dhaniyo and Nathudi in one of the Gujarati dialects (Gujarati ane Marathi 122). He further says that this scene reminds us of the grave-digging scene of Hamlet (122). In this scene, they are shown happy conversing as they are to get clothes of Dariyakhan who is about to be hanged (122). In Manilal Nabhubhai Dwivedi's drama Nrushinhavatar (1896), the same language is attributed to two chandals⁵ who appear for a while to obey the order of beheading Prahalada by his father. (Nrushinhavatar 132-134).

⁴The word '*gamadiyo*' in Gujarati connotes a person who is illiterate, foolish, of lower status and one who is unaware of urban manners.

Thus, in translating gravediggers' dialogues in a dialect rather than the Gujarati used in the rest of the translated text, Dave seems to follow the established convention of providing comic relief to audience during the performance of the play. On the other hand, the same decision also points to the linguistically stratified and hierarchical society where a person with particular speech variety is ridiculed and mocked by those who speak standard Gujarati, and whose status and background are measured by his or her use of a particular speech variety.

D. Omission from the Text

All those references, which are obscene, abusive and morally offensive in nature, are either omitted or deflated by the translator. Dave omits the most of Hamlet's obscene retorts from his translation. Dave retains some of the same references which are essential to the text. It has to be kept in mind that Dave's translated manuscripts were sent to the minister of the King and the translated text was also discussed by him. Thus, the minister's supervisory kind of role also needs to be remembered. Dave omits the second stanza of the fourth song (4.5. 52-55) and the entire fifth song (4.5. 58-64) from his translation. Ophelia in these songs reveals the unfaithfulness and deceit of the male lover in a love-relationship, and the beloved's physical exploitation by the same male lover. The songs contain explicit sexual connotations and therefore seem to have been omitted.

Conclusion

In conclusion, one can say that Dave's translation is path-breaking in many ways. His literal translation modulates the syntax using appropriate diction – choosing from “Sanskritised Gujarati”, Persian words, dialects etc. – and brings out the deeper layers of meanings implicit in the original into the Gujarati rendering. He interprets the text with open mind and quotes from various critics to show the various interpretations available. The foot-notes where he gives all this information allow the reader to formulate his own views of the text. Dave's pre-independence translation shows greater confidence in its approach to a Shakespeare play. It is interesting to note that Dave's translation of *Hamlet* (1917), though made during the colonial period, resists and repudiates the imposition of western critical thought on the play, and evaluates the play from an Indian point of view.

Omission from the translated text is an important feature of the translated text. Most of the obscene, abusive and offensive references of *Hamlet* are omitted by Dave. This reflects the contemporary moral and social attitudes towards gender and sexuality. Omissions also point to the ideological perspectives inherent in translation process. The choice of poetic style and aesthetic mode is dictated by the ideological assumptions of the translator. In conclusion, we can say that Dave is more sensitive to the culture specific aspects of Gujarati literary tradition and uses translation as a mode of negotiation with alien literary tradition

End Notes:

1. Dave's *Shakespeare Mala* (A Garland of Shakespeare Plays) was a series of translated plays of Shakespeare in Gujarati. Five Shakespeare plays were translated under this series, beginning from *Julius Caesar* in 1898 to *Hamlet* in 1917. Moreover, it was a state sponsored enterprise, undertaken by Maharaja Bhavsinhji Bahadur of Bhavnagar. Because of his financial support, these translations of

⁵Chandalin Gujarati means a person born of a Brahman mother and Shoodra father. It also means an assassin. The word connotes despicable person who is inhumane, barbarous and loathsome.

Shakespeare plays were printed free of cost and their prices were also kept at low level. The series came to an abrupt end because of a disagreement between Dave and the manager of Bhavnagar Press. Dave was criticized for putting more emphasis on introductions than translated texts and for keeping the prices of published texts at high level. Anyhow, the series was also praised as it introduced a new *rasain* Gujarati literature. See Narbheshankar Pranjivan Dave, preface, *Mezar for Mezar athava Thai Eva Thaiye to Gaam Vachche Rahiye* (Measure for Measure or In Rome you must be a Roman) (Bhavnagar: n.p., 1906); Ranjitram Vavabhai Maheta, "Gujarat ni Rangbhoomi: Ek Charchapatra" (The Theatre of Gujarat: A letter for an Open Discussion), *Ranjitram Gadhyasanchay Vol -2* (Ahmedabad: Gujarati Sahitya Parishad, 1982), 464-472, (The letter by Ranjitram Maheta was first published in January, 1916.)

2. Dave uses the word *bhashantarkarta* for himself in almost all translations of Shakespeare plays, and that shows his confidence and awareness as a translator. Mohanlal Parvatishankar Dave in his article "Bhashantar athava Anuvad na Grantho" (Texts for Translation), published in the magazine named *Sahitya* (May, 1913), argued that translators, generally, write *lekhak* (author), *rachanar* (creator) or *taiyar karnar* (one who prepares) instead of directly writing *bhashantarkarta* (translator) on the first page of their translated texts. He further argued that they do so because the task of translation is considered of secondary importance. And so it is a strategy to keep oneself away from the indignity (*nanam*) which is there in the term *bhashantarkarta*. See Mohanlal Parvatishankar Dave, "Bhashantar athava anuvad na grantho" (Texts for Translation), *Sahitya* 1.5 (1913): 193-194.
3. Dave's critical and comprehensive introduction is a significant part of the translated text. His translation of *Othello* (1898) has ninety three pages long introduction. In his own time, Dave's translations were popular and read well because of these informed introductions. During the same time, these translations were also criticized for their greater emphasis on introductions rather than translated texts. The same introductions were again acknowledged as "*suvachhya*" (informing and clear) in 1960s and 70s. See Vavabhai Maheta, "Gujarat ni rangbhoomi," 471; Vijayray K. Vaidhya, "Granthalaye Latar" (A Visit to a Library), *Granth* 52.4 (1964): 45-46; Takhtsinh Parmar, "Shakespeare Gujaratima" (Shakespeare in Gujarati), *Granth* 54.6 (1964): 51-52.
4. Dave sets Ophelia's songs in the *ragasof* popular songs of contemporary Gujarati dramas and different musical genres such as *chabakha* (whiplashes) of Bhoja Bhagat, *Marathi Sakhi* and *Marashiyas* (funeral eulogia). In footnotes to these songs, he also provides information regarding these *ragasin* which these songs can be sung. He also translates songs of the Grave-diggers into four line stanzas of rhyming couplets. Moreover, Dave makes some of the passages of the play (3.2. 194-219) recitable by applying the same strategy of translating them into four line stanzas of rhyming couplets. Dave gets his friend Keshav Harshad Dhruv to translate the player's speech on the ransacking of Troy (2.2. 474-541) into *Harigeet chhanda* and he himself translates Hamlet's reflection on Julius Caesar (5.1. 229-233) using a newly invented *chhanda* by Manishankar Ratnajji Bhatt.

5. Ranchhodbhai Udayram Dave, Mansukhram Suryaram and Chhotalal Sevakram translated Lamb's *Tales from Shakespeare* and published it as a book under the title *Shakespeare Kathasamaj* in 1868. Another translation of the same *Tales* was published by Suvichardarshak Mandali (Bombay) under the title *Natyakatharas-1, 2*. See Vaidhya, "Granthalaye latar," 46.
6. *Othello* was serialized as a story in the *Buddhivardhak Granth* magazine in the years 1861-62. *Pericles*, *Cymbeline* and *King Lear* were also serialized as stories in the *Buddhiprakash* magazine in the years 1864, 1871, and 1872 respectively. See C. N. Patel, *Buddhiprakash Lekh Suchi* (Gandhinagar: Gujarati Sahitya Akademi, 1990).
7. In his preface to *Vaidhyakanya* (an adaptation of *All's Well That Ends Well* in the story form), Narayan Hemchandra argues that this effort is made merely to introduce the poetic genius of Shakespeare to Gujarati readers. He further observes that to bring into Gujarati the same poetical genius in a perfect way is out of one's capability. In his preface to *Verona Shaher na Be Gruhashtho* (a translation of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*), Ratilal Desai informs that he eschews the Parsi playwrights' practice of "changing the original names for eastern ones" as he desires to produce a "faithful" translation of a Shakespeare play. See Narayan Hemchandra, *Vaidhyakanya*, preface (Ahmedabad, 1895); Ratilal Chhotamlal Desai, *Verona Shaher na Be Gruhashtho*, preface (Bhavnagar, 1871), I.

References

- Dalal, Jayanti. *Kaya Lakadani, Maya Lugadani* (The body wrapped in costumes, the illusion built of wood). Ahmedabad: Ravani Prakashan Gruh, 1963. Print.
- Dave, Jagadish. *Gujarati ane Marathi Samajik Natak (1850-1900)*. Ahmedabad: Vasant Prakashan, 2000. Print.
- Dave, Mohanlal Parvatishankar. "Bhashantar athava Anuvadna Grantho" [Texts for Translation]. *Sahitya* 1.5 (1913): 193-204. Print.
- Dave, Narbhashankar Pranjivan. Preface. *Chandra-Raman athava Premni Aantighunti [All's Well that Ends Well]*. Palitana: n.p., 1906. N. pag. Print. (Chandra-Raman or The Complexity of Love).
- . Preface. *Denmark no Rajkumar, Hamlet [Hamlet: The Prince of Denmark]*. Bhavnagar: n.p., 1917. N. pag. Print.
- . Preface. *Mezar for Mezar athava Thai Eva Thaiye to Gaam Vachche Rahiye [Measure for Measure]*. Bhavnagar: n.p., 1906. N. pag. Print. (In Rome you must be a Roman).
- Desai, Ramanlal Chhotamlal. Preface. *Verona Shaherna be Gruhashtho [Two Gentlemen of Verona]*. Bhavnagar, 1871. i-ii. Print.
- Dwivedi, Manilal Nabhubhai. *Nrusinhavatara*. Ahmedabad: Gurjar Granthratn Karyalaya, 1955. Print.
- Hemchandra, Narayan. Preface. *Vaidhyakanya [All's Well That Ends Well]*. Ahmedabad, 1895. N. pag. Print. (Daughter of a Physician).
- Isaka, Riho. "Language and dominance: The debates over the Gujarati language in the late nineteenth century." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 25.1 (2002): 1-19. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 11 January 2012.
- Kaji, Heeralal Lallubhai. *Gujaratni Rangbhoomi*. Ahmedabad: Sastu Sahitya Vardhak Karyalaya, 1951. Print.
- "M. A. ma Deshi Bhashao" [Vernacular Languages in M.A.]. *Samalochak* 6.2 (1901): 57-60. Print.
- Maheta, Ranjitram Vavabhai. "Gujarat ni Rangbhoomi: Ek Charchapatra" [The Theatre of Gujarat: A letter for an Open Discussion]. *Ranjitram Gadhyasanchay Vol -2*. Ahmedabad: Gujarati Sahitya Parishad, 1982. 464 - 472. Print.
- Pandit, Chandramanishankar Jethalal. *Shree Madan Vijay Panchanki Natak*. Introduction. Ahmedabad: n.p., 1909. 1-28. Print.

- Pandya, Kantilal Chhaganlal. "Gujarati Bhashane Kevi Rite Samrudhh Karvi, Ek Charcha [The lines on which the Development of the Gujarati language should proceed]." *Samalochak* 13.2 (1908): 67-82. Print.
- Parikh, Narhari Dwarkadas, eds. *Navalgranthavali*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan Prakashan Mandir, 1937. Print.
- Parmar, Takhtsinh. "Shakespeare Gujaratima" [Shakespeare in Gujarati]. *Granth* 54.6 (1964): 51-52. Print.
- Patel, C. N. *Buddhiprakash Lekh Suchi*. Gandhinagar: Gujarati Sahitya Akademi, 1990. Print.
- Thaker, Dhirubhai. *Samalochak: Svadhyay ane Suchi*. Gandhinagar: Gujarat Sahitya Akademi, 1987. Print.
- Thakkar, Mathurbhai Durlabhdas. "Bhashantaro ane Anukarano" [Translations and Adaptations]. *Buddhiprakash* 49. 5-7 (1902): 129-134, 173-178, 197-204. Print.
- Vaidhya, Vijayray K. "Granthalaye Latar" [Visit to a Library]. *Granth* 52.4 (1964): 45-46. Print.
- Yagnik, Achyut and Suchitra Sheth. *The Shaping of Modern Gujarat: Plurality, Hindutva and Beyond*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2005. Print.

Indianizing the Bard: A Diachronic Study of Shakespeare Reception in India

This paper attempts to identify the socio-political conditions that went into the process of translating Shakespearean plays into Indian languages, especially Malayalam. It looks at translation more as a cultural activity rather than a literary act of bringing texts from one language to another. Translation as an act of faithful transfer of knowledge, information and ideas from one language to another is a colonial enterprise and implies certain power relationships among the languages and cultures involved (Bassnet 4). A historical perspective shows that translations are neither ideologically innocuous nor do they emerge from vacuum. A proper understanding of Shakespearean translations in India demands interrogation of its colonial relations, an analysis of the linguistic and literary history of languages involved and the political conditions of that time. This paper, through a chronological study of Shakespeare translations in India attempts to show how India subverted Shakespeare, a colonial tool imposed by the British, in questioning the iniquities in the social sphere and the colonial authority in the political sphere.

The canonization of Shakespeare and the institutionalisation of 'Bardolatry' were part of a larger socio political project of England's creation and promotion of its national identity (Loomba and Orkin 1). In the colonial period also, Shakespeare was used as a signifier of English cultural refinement and superiority. This paper looks at the various ways in which India subverted this colonial tool in order to undo the master discourse and to assert an identity of its own. The paper is divided into three sections. The first part looks at the politics behind the colonial performance of Shakespeare plays by British companies in India. The second section deals with the act of imitation and consequent "distortion of rigid categories propagated by colonial representations through simultaneous mimicry and resistance". The third section shows a transformation from the phase of mimicry to that of appropriation and indigenisation whereby Shakespeare's plays are conceived and reconstructed according to the local conditions and ethos.

Institutionalisation of English education and dissemination of Shakespeare in India through English education system and the travelling theatre groups from abroad were crucial discursive practices in the grand project of colonialism. The introduction of Shakespeare into schools and colleges in India began with the advocacy of English education by Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800-1859) in 1835 and continued by the establishment of the universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in 1857. Right from Matriculation to Master's degree and research, Shakespeare has found an inevitable place in this system of education. The inclusion of Shakespeare in the syllabus of the Civil Services examinations was another important step by the British. In the India Act of 1853, the British Parliament stipulated that the positions in the Indian Civil Service be awarded by competitive examination. In 1855, a commissioned report by the East India Company recommended the inclusion of English Language and Literature as a subject in Civil Service exams and it could earn candidate a thousand points – the same as Mathematics and more than any other subject.

Thus knowing Shakespeare became a necessity for those aspiring higher jobs. It should be noted that English literature as a subject of study appeared in the curriculum of the colonies long before it was institutionalized in the home country. Oxford introduced it in 1894 and Cambridge English was founded only in 1911 (Barry 14). More than indicating the extent of involvement of imperialism with the local literary culture, it points to the discursive practices of colonialism and its desire for ideological control.

Apart from including Shakespeare in the academic world, a huge number of drama troupes were appointed by the British to perform Shakespearean plays in its colonies. Organizations like **CEMA** (Council for encouragement of Music and Arts), **ENSA** (Entertainments National Service Association) were founded and drama companies were sent to perform Shakespearean plays in the colonies. British touring companies visited India frequently in Victorian times, and they were received warmly by the expatriate British as well as by the English educated Indians. Theatre-going was an integral part of British life in colonial Calcutta of the eighteenth century, as much as it was in London. Theatres were built in the major centres of trade and empire, and Shakespeare provided a prestigious part of the repertory. In Calcutta, then the capital of British India, the earliest recorded performance is of *Othello* at the Calcutta Theatre in 1780. Between 1872 and 1876, Lewis's theatrical troupe produced several Shakespearean plays in the *Calcutta Maidan*. In 1882, Herr Bandmann visited Calcutta with his troupe and staged *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard III* and *Othello*. In the meanwhile, several playhouses like Mrs. Bristow's Private Theatre (1789-90), Wheeler Palace Theatre (1797- 98), the Athenaeum theatre (1812- 14), The Chowringhee Theatre of (1813- 39), the Kidderpore Theatre (1815), The Dum Dum Theatre (1817- 24), Baitaconah Theatre (1824), and Sans Souci Theatre (1839- 49) were established. Besides the repertoire of their own local actors, the playhouses also invited actors from London. Mrs. Atkinson, for example, came from Drury Lane Theatre and Mrs. Chester from London's Royal Theatre. This tradition continued in the twentieth century with Shakespeareana, the travelling troupe run by the Kendal family, which performed Shakespearean plays across India (Thakur 195).

Through these imperial performances, Shakespeare acted as a prime location for the representation and legitimization of power. Apart from the dissemination of colonial culture, this also intended to 'naturalise' their superiority in the colony by representing "sectional interests as universal ones".

James Barry's 1848 theatrical production of *Othello* at the Sans Souci theatre in Calcutta, which cast Baishnava Charan Adhya, a native Bengali actor in the title role of *Othello* became a huge sensation, and marks a point of departure from the dramas constructed according to the colonial ethos. The racial difference was highlighted when *Calcutta Star* called Adhya "a real unpainted nigger". Such comments point to racist discourses creating and propagating difference. The British anxiety over the possible cultural and racial contamination is also seen in the review that appeared in *The Englishman*.

In the delivery, however, the effects of imperfect pronunciation were but too manifest. This was to be expected, but not to the extent it occurred. Scarcely a line was intelligible, and this did not arise from the low tone of voice; Othello spoke quite loud enough, but he 'mouthed' too much. Had he spoken in his natural tone, he would have succeeded far better. His action was remarkably good in

some parts, and once or twice when he delivered himself in a modulated tone, we were much pleased with the effect produced. Taking it as a whole, we consider the performance wonderful for a Native. (Thakur 197)

Adhya's entry into the exclusive British theatre, therefore, can be seen as an important moment of intervention in the cultural discourse of colonialism. It raised the possibility of undoing the master discourse by the displacing of colonial authority of Shakespearean text via his speech and colour. Adhya's entry marked such a resistance that Jyotsna Singh calls "an alternative choice of 'playfully' disrupting rigid categories of difference through simultaneous mimicry and resistance". It is an act of mimicking the cultural genres of the colonizer, and thereby succeeds most strongly in highlighting his own difference from his colonial master. Thus Adhya's Bengali performance thwarts European effort to erect gradations of race. Singh's "Different Shakespeares: The Bard in Colonial/ Postcolonial India" which follows Bhabha's concept of mimicry, sees Adhya's entry into colonial world as disrupting the simple colonizer- colonized binary whereby the Bengali actor by putting on the "white mask" also enacted his difference from the white world, both in fictional Venice and in colonial Calcutta.

Shakespeare plays which were widely performed in Indian schools and colleges during that time also belong to the stage of mimicry as the students went on to perform them in imitation of the English theatres in Calcutta. Elements of mimicry can also be seen even in the Parsi theatres of that time. Mimicing the colonial culture, they were named as the Victoria Natak Mandali (Victoria Theatre Troupe), the Alfred Theatrical Company, the New Alfred Company, the Shakespeare Theatrical company, the Jubilee Company, Alexandria Company, and the Imperial Company. Dramatic performance by these companies shows a kind of mimicry which is "not a mere re-presentation, but a repetition with difference".

Subversion of colonial authority through local versions of Shakespeare informs the next stage of study. From the 1870s onwards, Shakespeare plays began to be staged in Bengali translations and adaptations. It is worth considering the development of these trends against the backdrop of the Dramatic Censorship Act of 1876. The nationalist intelligentsia of that time used cultural productions like drama as tools for communicating political ideas. The colonial government perceived these native dramatic practices as potential threats to the colonial mission and enforced stringent measures like Censorship Act, making a number of Indian plays their target. Artists and playwrights turned to Shakespeare as an avenue for protest as they discovered Shakespeare to be not only familiar but also relatively safe from the Censorship. In the 1870s and 1880s, there appeared a number of translations and adaptations of Shakespeare plays in the vernacular languages. Thus the knowledge of colonial models was used as a tool for striking back at the coloniser.

Thus, after subverting the rhetoric of the oppressor and using him as a weapon to fight back, the native writers turned to Shakespeare for enriching their literary and generic competence. Here Shakespeare functioned as a site of resistance to revitalize native traditions and also to contest the preconceptions about their culture. Breaking the Elizabethan dramaturgy, Shakespeare made his appearance in such varied forms as prose narratives, dramatic dance forms like *Kathakali* and *Koodiyattam* from Kerala, *Yakshagana* from Karnataka, *Jatra* from Bengal, and *Nautanki* from Uttar Pradesh. His themes are also beautifully interwoven by Indian cinema which produced a number of films in different languages based on Shakespearean plays (Panja 103).

Shakespeare intervenes into the Literary Polysystem of Malayalam

This section looks at Malayalam literary corpus and the central role that Shakespeare translations played in redefining its cultural identity. According to the Polysystem theory of Itamar Even-Zohar, translated literature participates actively in shaping the polysystem of a language and thereby maintains a central position in the cultural, literary and historical system of the target language. They are rewritings that become new originals, and are powerful enough to shape the reader's perceptions. Zohar describes three major cases where translated literature occupies the primary position.

When a polysystem has not yet been crystallized, that is to say, when a literature is “young” in the process of being established; (b) when a literature is either “peripheral” (within a large group of correlated literatures) or “weak,” or both; and (c) when there are turning points, crises, or literary vacuums in a literature.

Malayalam literary condition seems to fulfill all Zohar's three criteria. Kerala depended on translations in a period when Malayalam literature was 'peripheral' or 'weak' and the established Sanskrit and Tamil models were no longer tenable for its cultural and political requirements. Through the works in translation, new ideas, characteristics and techniques were introduced into Malayalam literature which did not exist there before.

Thus Malayalam translations of Shakespeare also have a remarkable role in redefining Kerala's prevailing aesthetic sensibility, as distinct from the dominant classical drama in the Sanskrit tradition and musical drama in the Tamil tradition. These translations undertake a conscious critique of the prevailing literary traditions and social values. They critiqued Tamil musical drama (*sangeethanatakam*) that dominated Kerala stage during that time. These dramas were mere musical concerts and hardly bothered about the quality of acting or dialogue. They used colourful costumes and spectacular settings to create a world of fantasy. Contemporary reality never penetrated into it. In his translation of *The Taming of the Shrew* titled *Kalahinidamanakam*, Kandathil Varghese Mappilai satirises the pompous style of these musical plays. In the opening scene, he ridicules the Tamil musical plays of his times. The play presents a landlord who is a great admirer of musical play. He has brought a renowned Tamil musician for performance. The name of the theatre group is “*Kusala Kolahala Leela Vilasini Sabha*”. Here the word “*kolahala*” means 'chaos' and “*leela*” means 'play'. This ridicules the convention of providing high sounding names that signify nothing. The name also suggests the crude nature of dramatic performances that prevailed in the late nineteenth century Kerala .

These Shakespearean translations also critiqued the Malayalam translations of Sanskrit plays, which were widely staged during that time. These were presented in highly Sanskritised Malayalam. Their theme looked backward to old legends and the verse dialogues were remote from living speech. But the early nineteenth century translations of Shakespearean plays employed simple colloquial prose as their medium. This marked a shift from the dominant Sanskritised, poetry-centred literary tradition to simple colloquial prose. Through these translations, the everyday speech of the lower classes made its appearance into the literary realm. Thus “the conflict between Sanskritised Malayalam and varieties of everyday speech that we encounter in these Shakespeare translations reflect the prevailing social conflict between the feudal elite and the lower castes” (Ramakrishnan 79).

Translators undertook Shakespearean translations as a part of a larger socio-cultural

project of questioning the prevailing literary culture and social values which propagated the Sanskritization of language, literature and aesthetic sensibility. Brahminism had defined every form of knowledge in Sanskrit, which was thoroughly incomprehensible to the lower class. Dominant dramatic practices of that time like *Kathakali*, *Koothu* and *Kodiyattam* employed Sanskrit their medium. The feudal elite considered Sanskrit as the only vehicle suitable for creative works. 'Literature' for them, was synonymous with 'Sanskrit literature' and they considered it demeaning to translate Sanskrit works into the vernacular (K. Narayanan 23). Such subtly manipulated coercive acts are very much part of the upper class attempt to ensure that the manipulation is not apparent to the collective unconscious of the masses.

Translation of Shakespearean plays brought in another mode of theatre which was closer to social realism. These plays differ notably from existing kinds of theatre prevalent in the first decades of the 18th century. During that time performances used highly Sanskritised language and were part of temple rituals. But the Shakespearean translations with their realist themes and colloquial language prepared the community of readers for a shift in sensibility. Obviously, Malayalam had no prior models for this kind of writing when Umman Philipose attempted his translation of Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* under the title *Aalmarattam* (1866).

Nineteenth century translations of Shakespeare were mostly free adaptations that appropriated the originals to suit the regional requirements. The first translation of a Shakespearean play in Malayalam was *Aalmarattam* (1866), a free translation of *The Comedy of Errors*. Following this translation, many other translators also published their translations of Shakespeare. *Portia Swayamvaram* (1888) by Chempakaraman Velayudhan, is a rendering of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* into Attakatha. *Kalahinidamanakam* (1893) by Kandathil Varghese Mappila is free rendering of the *The Taming of the Shrew*. This translation Indianises the characters and incidents. The translator tried to achieve a phonetic similarity with the original names. "Petruccio" is Parthasarathy, "Tranio" is "Tranakan", "Biondello" is "Pandunki", "Grumio" is "Kumaran", and "Curtis" is "Kattari". The locations are thoroughly Indian but phonetically similar: "Padua" becomes "Patalipuram", and "Verona" becomes "Varanadeshm". Chunakkara Krishna Warriar's *Vasantikasvapnam* (1905) is an adaptation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Warriar retains the Sanskrit tradition in the prologue introduced by *Sutradharan*. The location is "Avantidesham" (Athens) ruled by "Indravarma Maharaja" (Theseus) married to "Kanakalekha" (Hippolyta). Kodugallur Kunjikuttan Thampuran's *Hamlet Natakam* (1897) is not a literal rendering of the original but shows equivalence of meaning. When compared to the recent prose translations of Shakespeare published in 2000 under the editorship of Ayyappa Panicker, the earlier translations are characterized by their conversational ease maintained throughout.

Kerala used Shakespeare translations in order to assert its identity. Even in those translations, which are considered "faithful" to the originals, some kind of adaptation has been attempted at the cultural or linguistic level. Thus they dismissed the oppositional content of the alien aesthetics by absorbing and transforming the foreign according to their needs.

These translations created an imaginative community by targeting a particular audience, generalizing and addressing their issues. This worked towards the creation of an

imaginative community. As Anderson in his work *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* said, this created in the minds of each man “the image of their communion” (6) that share the same aspirations. The imagined alliance among the people of this imagined community was so strong that regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail, they conceived themselves as one. This collective spirit might have played a remarkable role in the creation of a new provincial state, Kerala, in 1956.

Haroldo de Campos' notion of Cannibalistic mode of literary transfer regards “[T]ranslation as transfusion. Of blood. Ironically, we could talk of vampirization, thinking now of the translator's nourishment”. Here the “weaker” or “peripheral” Malayalam culture is devouring the stronger and bigger Shakespeare tradition and thereby acquires its strength. Their very project is not to deny foreign influences or nourishments, but to absorb and transform them by the addition of indigenous input. In a way, Malayalam could be seen as devouring Shakespeare and incorporating the native culture into the discourse of the translated text.

Works Cited

- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary And Cultural Theory*. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2008. Print.
- Bassnet, Susan. *Translation Studies*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Bhatia, Nandi. *Acts of Authority/ Acts of Resistance: Theatre and Politics in Colonial and Postcolonial India*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.
- Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield. *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. New York: Manchester UP, 1986. Print.
- Illiaiah, Kancha. *Why I am not a Hindu*. 2nd ed. Kolkata: Samaya, 2005. Print.
- Loomba, Ania and Martin Orkin, eds. *Post-Colonial Shakespeares*. New Delhi: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Narayanan, Kattumadam. *Malayala Natakagaliloote*. Cherplecheri: Udaya Press, 1960. Print.
- Paniker, Ayyappa. “Natakam.” *Adhunika Malayala Sahitya Charithram Prasthanangaliloote*. Ed. K. M. George. Kottayam: DC Books, 1998. 417-76. Print.
- Ramakrishnan, E. V. *Locating Indian literature: Texts, Traditions, Translations*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan, 2011. Print.
- Sankarapillai, G. *Malayala Nataka Sahitya Charitram*. Thrissur: Kerala Sahitya Akademi, 2005. Print.

'I Am A Man More Sinn'd Against Than Sinning': An Evaluation

The works of William Shakespeare (1564-1616) have always been the source of many discussions, debates and much analysis and evaluation. Be it students, scholars, professors, critics, Shakespeare enthusiasts or ordinary readers, Shakespeare has always had something special to offer to each one of them. The value of his works, the themes he has dealt with, his dramatic genius, the use of words, props, music and characters, the elements of his drama, the society they reflected, the kind of people he created, the reason for his popularity today – almost four centuries after his death – have all been voiced, marvelled at, discussed about and debated over for years. The fact that four hundred years of reading and consequent interpretation by readers and performers have only led to increased enthusiasm in unveiling the magic contained within the rich and complicated fabric of his works; and the fact that with time, the meanings discovered and significance penned on his writings have only grown, bear testimony to the brilliance of a writer who drew out realistic characters and gave them lives that any reader could relate to and crafted such stories that have been marvelled at for the perfect balance maintained between simplicity and complexity, between all the classes of society represented and for the commendable and awe-inspiring integration of diverse elements into one organic whole.

The tragedies of Shakespeare are exceptionally written stories of suffering, violence, pain, sin and redemption and have given the world such characters as Iago, Macbeth, Hamlet and King Lear who have held audiences and readers captivated through the ages. When a crazed Hamlet challenges Laertes during Ophelia's funeral, when an envy driven and deceived Othello decides to kill his wife, when a guilty and remorseful Lear tells Cordelia that he'd kneel down and ask for her forgiveness, the intensity of passion and the depth of emotion contained in their words and in each of their actions is not only clearly present onstage or within the pages of a book, but is felt in the depths of one's own being, is impressed upon each reader's soul. Among the tragedies of Shakespeare, *King Lear* has been regarded as an exceptional composition with its presentation of extreme human anguish, violent natural elements, catastrophic consequences of sins, grave follies and the uncalled for suffering of men who get punished for their honesty. It is this drama of which A. C. Bradley commented thus in his work, *Shakespearean Tragedy*:

King Lear has again and again been described as Shakespeare's greatest work, the best of his plays, the tragedy in which he exhibits most fully his multitudinous powers; and if we were doomed to lose all his dramas except one, probably the majority of those who know and appreciate his best would pronounce for keeping *King Lear*. (198)

“ I am a man/ More sinn'd against than sinning” (3.2. 59-60) is one of the most famous lines from *King Lear* that has been celebrated, discussed and has adorned an envious position of significance in all conversations about the drama. The sad and pitiful state, to which a king is reduced, and the cold ingratitude and mercilessness of two daughters have

startled generations. Yet, a deeper contemplation on the drama and the conduct of Lear along with an unbiased and impartial examination of the faults of a father who not only values verbal display of seemingly truthful emotions but also fails to see the honesty in the “low sound” that “reverbs no hollowness” (1.1.46-7) presents before the reader, the picture of a man not completely free from the guilt of several sins. Lear's reaction to situations and people, his proud, egotistical nature, his folly of falling for flattery, impulsive decisions, uncalled for wrath and fury, unthinking actions, even, the completely irrational division of his kingdom on the basis of a public test of love and filial bonding, all emerge as serious faults that can be held against him. When his fool tells him “I am better than thou art now; I am a fool, thou art nothing.” (1.4.186-87) it is truth that rings through the words and while one tends to sympathise with a man wronged in such a manner, a reader is left wondering whether Lear himself is not the reason for his downfall and failure.

One may be led on to believe that Lear is indeed terribly wronged. When a great king is reduced to a state, where he can only exclaim “I gave you all.” (2.4.249), to his two ungrateful daughters, as they stand determined to deprive him of all his luxuries; and turned out into a stormy night can do nothing else but offer himself to the violent forces of nature – “...here I stand, your slave/ A poor, infirm, weak and despised old man.” (3.2.19-20) – a reader is bound to sympathise with him and hold as culprits the perpetrators of such gross injustice. However from the beginning of the play Lear's faults surface one after the other. Dividing the kingdom on the basis of a public test of love is a sin that is aggravated by the fact that he wishes to keep his kingly pleasures and benefits even after giving away everything as inheritance to his daughters. Nothing could be more foolish that to think that he would be able to command the same authority that he had been enjoying, once he gives away his kingdom. The flaws of Lear the King come to the fore in the first scene itself for only a poor administrator and ruler would believe that he could give away his kingdom and yet remain the king.

It may also be argued that King Lear fails as a father for he does not recognise the sycophancy and selfish interests of his two older daughters and at the same time also thoughtlessly turns away his daughter who speaks the truth. The fact that two daughters have absolutely no love and respect for Lear – neither as a father nor as a king – and that they feel no remorse and no guilt in speaking deceivingly to gain his wealth and then turning him away, depriving him of basic rights like safe shelter, point to the utter failure that Lear is as a father. Again, he proves his impulsivity and thoughtlessness by banishing the honest and frank Cordelia, which shocks even his older daughters, who, inspite of being filled with bitterness and vile intentions is nevertheless startled to find Lear making such rash and foolish decisions:

GONERIL. You see how full of changes his age is; the
observation we have made of it hath not been little:
he always loved our sister most; and with what poor
judgment he hath now cast her off appears too
grossly.

REGAN. 'Tis the infirmity of his age: yet he hath ever
but slenderly known himself. (1.1.283-88)

Pride and arrogance too can be held against Lear as he fails to accept his aberrations of reason and instead of seeing his own mistake, fumes over the ingratitude shown and the foul breach of trust and love committed by his daughters. It is this pride that echoes in his words as he demands a public and ceremonial expression of love from Goneril and Regan:

Which of you shall we say doth love us most?
That we our largest bounty may extend
Where nature doth with merit challenge.(1.1.44-46)

He is responsible for the dishonesty that brews from two of his daughters for they have realised that their inheritance depends on their words. Consequently, they gain by flattering Lear's ego and pride. His vanity is clear in the scene where he warns Kent : “Come not between the dragon and his wrath” (1.1.115) when Kent speaks in favour of Cordelia and asks Lear to reconsider his callous decision of banishing Cordelia. Lear is so full of himself and so sure about the fact that he has every right to be indignant at a daughter whose 'crime' is speaking the truth that he fails to understand, that, the most loyal Kent is the voice of good reason and judgement that Lear himself does not possess.

With every curse that he voices, every threat and warning that he gives, with every harsh utterance, he only moves closer and closer to his ruin. The bitterness that fills him when things happen unexpectedly and when he finds himself the victim of his own wrong judgement makes him cover up his fault by holding others guilty. Thus when Lear says, 'I am man,/More sinn'd against than sinning.' (3.2.59-60) he succeeds in attracting the sympathy of readers and spectators; however, a reader – as a fair and unprejudiced judge – should stop to consider the responsibility Lear has in his bringing about his fate. It is true, as Linda Woodbridge writes, that, “...King Lear grows from a petulant egomaniacal old tyrant into a humane man who worries about the poor and whose gaze has turned outward...” (227). However, this penance and remorse comes only after Lear has been turned away by both his daughters and finds himself in the most hostile of conditions and is wrecked emotionally. It is only then that he notices how difficult life is for ordinary people, only then that he realises the injustice in his kingdom. Concepts of humanity, compassion, righteousness, impartiality and equality is contemplated upon by Lear when he wanders around the heath and begins to regret his actions.

King Lear, in the words of William Hazlitt, is Shakespeare's “great masterpiece in the logic of passion” (259). It is this passion of anger, pride, vanity, and the foolish dotage of a father who lacks insight and wishes his daughters to flatter his ego that leads to the downfall of a king. His daughters may have shown him ingratitude, his courtiers may have been hypocrites, his sons-in-law may have been passive and he may have been a victim of merciless malice but fact remains that Lear himself is the architect of his ruin. The dramatic intensity with which Lear's suffering is presented along with his passionate outbursts contributes towards the creation of a character who is viewed and commiserated as a tragic hero subjected to inhuman cruelty and injustice. However, it is difficult to agree that he is a man more sinned against than sinning, for, his insensitivity to true and loving service and impartial advice and his determined refusal to come to terms with his own errors, especially in the former part of the play, makes him responsible for the fate that he is condemned to, makes him the reason for all his misery.

References

- Bradley, A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd, 1958. Print.
- Hazlitt, William. "Characters of Shakespearean Plays." *The Collected Works of William Hazlitt*. Ed. P. P. Howe. Vol. 4. London: Dent, 1930. Print.
- Marsh, Nicholas. *Shakespeare: The Tragedies*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1998. Print.
- Ribner, Irving. "The Gods are Just: A Reading of *King Lear*." *The Tulane Drama Review* 2.3 (1958): 34-54. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 July 2014.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. New Delhi: UBS Publishers' Distributors Pvt. Ltd, 2007. Print.
- Woodbridge, Linda. "Tragedies." *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*. Ed. Stanley Wells and Lena Cowen Orlin. New Delhi: OUP, 2007. Print.

Shakespeare's Tragedies Rejuvenated: Manifestations in Different Theatre Movements

“There Shakespeare, on whose forehead climb
The crowns o' the world; oh, eyes sublime
With tears and laughter for all time!”

Elizabeth Barrett Browning (1806–1861), *A Vision of Poets*¹

Shakespeare was an exceptional genius. His mastery at building scenes of anguish, pathos, laughter and violence is remarkable and incomparable. His tragedies mirror real life and that is the reason why his readers group his four main tragedies- *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Macbeth* and *King Lear*- as his magnum opus. The tragic element persistent throughout the plays has their own motifs, but the main one being – Catharsis. There occurs purgation or cleansing when one views his tragedy and this experience is absent as far as the works of his contemporaries are concerned. As Samuel Johnson stated, “Imitations produce pain or pleasure, not because they are mistaken for realities, but because they bring realities to mind.” (*Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare*²)

To imitate Shakespeare is rather an implausible task. But many dramatists have taken steps towards it just to know the position they occupy with respect to the “myriad minded Shakespeare” (Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, chap xv). Shakespeare occupied the stars while his imitators the clouds.

Many notable writers tried to adapt his tragic elements with rather a different treatment, giving due respect to the great soul. One such writer was Toni Morrison, the 1993 Nobel laureate. Unlike other female writers she believed in the “female phase”³ as put forward by Elaine Showalter. She opined that the only way to fight against the patriarchy prevalent in the literary canon is by speaking from a female point of view rather than imitating or protesting against what male authors have celebrated as feminine sexuality. To prove her point she took Desdemona, the wife of Othello, as her protagonist in her famous play *Desdemona*. *Othello* was one of Shakespeare's masterpieces, but when looked upon from a feminist viewpoint, the play considers female characters as mere baits to fate.

Desdemona by Toni Morrison (2011)

Desdemona, as directed by Peter Sellars, came under the feminist theatre and was a huge theatrical success. Feminist theatre concerned themselves with the sad plight of women in the society and tried to change the norms, renouncing patriarchy as a tool invented by coward men. Toni, thus, tried to portray the transformation of the docile character of Desdemona to a strong willed women.

In Othello, Desdemona is a faithful wife, brave and thoughtful daughter and a loyal subject to the Moor. Her character is very well depicted in act 1, scene 3, lines 179-188⁴

Abja G Rasheed is M.A. Student, All Saints' College, Chakkai, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala.

“My noble father,
I do perceive here a divided duty.
To you I am bound for life and education.
My life and education both do learn me
How to respect you. You are the lord of my duty,
I am hitherto your daughter. But here's my husband,
And so much duty as my mother showed
To you, preferring you before her father,
So much I challenge that I may profess
Due to the Moor my lord.” (Desdemona to her father Brabancio)

But she is submissive to her husband. She is a good listener before him. Thus, her voice is suppressed by her own husband. The courage with which she addresses her father before the senate and the power with which she passes orders to her servants gets nullified while standing face to face with her “better-half”. Thus, Shakespeare knowingly or unknowingly biased male characters over those of females.

Toni questions this bias and decentres the protagonist from Othello to Desdemona giving vent to her emotions. The play opens with a powerful note:

“My name is Desdemona. The word, Desdemona means misery.. I am not the meaning of a name I did not choose”. (*Desdemona, Scene 1, line 13*)⁵

This marks the keynote of the play. She is no longer a prey in history, but a legend in the classics. Strangling her to death was symbolic of silencing her freedom of expression in *Othello*. But in *Desdemona* she regains the same and takes maximum advantage of her voice to speak to the world, the loose ends of Othello-Desdemona plot.

Another important technique that distinguishes Toni's play from Shakespeare's was the presence of female characters that outnumber the males. In *Othello*, there is a mention of a character called Othello's mother in a dialogue that takes place between Othello and Desdemona:

“That handkerchief
Did an Egyptian to my mother give,
She was a charmer and could almost read
The thoughts of people. She told her, while she kept it
'Twould make her amiable and subdue my father
Entirely to her love, but if she lost it
Or made gift of it, my father's eye
Should hold her loathèd and his spirits should hunt
After new fancies. She, dying, gave it me
And bid me, when my fate would have me wived,

To give it her”. (act3,scene4)⁶

In the same way, Desdemona's mother never makes her appearance in the scene. But Toni foregrounds them and makes them talk about the sad fate of their wards. Another name that is mentioned in the original play is Barbary, Desdemona's mother's maid, the author of “willow song”.

It is in *Desdemona* that Barbary unfolds the secret behind Desdemona's falling in love with a black-skinned moor. The maid was the one who took ample care of Desdemona from rather a very young age. The influence this African lady had on her was immense. Her love and care, according to Desdemona, was a result of her lack of the so-called norms of beauty prevalent in their society. Thus, she expected the same loyalty and love from Othello. It is this identification of Barbary in Othello that makes her prone to love.

To make Barbary's influence on Desdemona more strong, Toni introduces a new song in lieu of the “willow song”. The song “someone leans near”, written by the author herself shows several resemblances to willow song but from a different perspective. The line stands for Othello himself leaning forward to kill Desdemona. Thus, Toni Morrison succeeds in composing a poem that sounds far more relevant in this specific context.

But Barbary later in the play says that her real name is Sa'ran which in West Africa meant 'joy'. So her name comes as an irony to the name Desdemona which means misery.

Another shocking revelation of the modern plot is the kind of sensuous life, that both Othello and Iago, the villain critiqued for his “motiveless malignity” (Coleridge) led. Othello reveals the truth to Desdemona that he had attempted rape twice before his marriage along with Iago. But this never shocks Desdemona. She only feels sick of her husband indulging in numberless wars that destroy peace of mind.

“I am sick of killing as a solution. It solves,
nothing, Questions nothing, produce
Nothing, nothing, but more of itself.
My mistake was believing that you hated
War as much as I did.you believed, I loved
Othello the warrior, I did not” (scene 10,line54)⁷

Here one can also find Desdemona being placed as a stark contrast to Othello. She loves peace and is thus against Othello's will of conquering and capturing others.

Another stark contrast in *Desdemona* is the appearance of Emilia, the maid who unwittingly stole the handkerchief from Desdemona. Emilia appears on the stage feeling guilty of the crime that she once committed . She mourns the death of her Queen. But there is a sudden shift in her thought when she is reminded of the social status that separated her from Desdemona. She always felt jealous for Desdemona and badly craved for a friendship with her which was denied by the so called “norms of the society”. So it was a shrewd tactic that Emilia implemented by stealing the handkerchief. She acted like a sadist who wanted her master to suffer even at the loss of her own life. Emilia feels that women find it difficult to flourish so at least there should be survival of the fittest.

Thus, Toni Morrison was victorious in retelling the old tale of *Othello*. She

criticized the modern society in the best possible way. Her words contained a sting that could poison the minds of millions of men who devalue women. Desdemona is also aware of this fact:

“.. men made the rules and women followed them. A step away was doom and misery without relief..”(scene 1, line 19)⁸

Unlike the old 'fragile' Desdemona, the new woman, Toni's Desdemona, who speaks of her past from the grave is outrageous and audacious. The play attracted a wide audience, including the Black and Latin American Feminists.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are dead- Tom Stoppard (1966)

Hamlet is one of Shakespeare's complex plays. Many critics have tried their luck at pointing out the motif of Hamlet. From A.C Bradley to Ernest Jones, critics have attempted a deconstruction of *Hamlet* only to find that the plot still remains tangled and the key is only with Shakespeare. While one would focus on the main characters in the play, it is the natural tendency of the readers to leave out the minor characters who often indulges in some significant acts. Taking this point in mind, Tom Stoppard, the famous proponent of the absurd theatre, took up two minor characters from the original play and viewed the plot of *Hamlet* from their viewpoint.

Absurd theatre say life as essentially existential. Following the path paved by Samuel Beckett and his famous *Waiting For Godot*, Tom Stoppard focused on showing the transience of life and death. The protagonist(s) of the play has been Rosencrantz and Guildenstern often grouped together as two friends who share the same wit and luck.

The play opens with a game- tossing of a coin. It symbolically represents the turn and fall of fortune as well as the mirroring of good and evil deeds they committed. The tone changes with the entry of a group of players who offer them a show for meagre amount. Ros and Guil (as given in the original text) try to fool around and make them perform in the middle of the forest. Soon they are reminded of the call for them from Denmark, Hamlet's native land. They are still confused as to why they are summoned, but decides to try their luck by going to the kingdom to meet the new King Claudius and Queen Gertrude.

Stoppard was clever enough to devise a new technique- mixing of Shakespeare's language and Modern English. To remove any sort of doubt, he quotes from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* the dialogues between Hamlet and Ophelia, Claudius and Gertrude, Hamlet and Polonius etc. But the difference lies in the way Ros and Guil perceives all this encounter. They are sure of the fact that it is the lack of advancement that Hamlet is frustrated about. They also make a wild guess that it can also happen out of unrequited love from Ophelia.

Yet another significant happening in the play is “play within the play” or the “mouse trap”. The players that are summoned are the same with whom Ros and Guil had a word fight with. They enact the play as modified by Hamlet just the same as in the original text. But the difference is that the players also act out the death of 'two spies' who conspire against the young Prince and the irony occurs when Rosencrantz finds out that the players have a stark resemblance to themselves. Thus they get a chance to anticipate their future and fate. When Claudius hands them the letter addressed to the King of England, they “smell something

rotten in the city of Denmark” (*Hamlet*, act 1, scene 4)⁹. While travelling in the boat they read the letter and comprehend the fact that they are acting as spies asking for the murder of their childhood friend, Hamlet. Though filled with guilt and remorse in the beginning, Ros and Guil portray the absurdity of real life through their selfishness.

“..they're going to kill him. Well, he is a man, he is mortal, death comes to us all, etcetera, and consequently he would have died anyway, sooner or later. Or to look at it from the social point of view-he's just one man among many, the loss would be well within reason and convenience. And then again, what is so terrible about death? As Socrates so philosophically put it, since we don't know what death is, it is illogical to fear it. It might be... very nice. Certainly it is a release from the burden of life, and, for the godly, a haven and a reward. Or to look at it another way - we are little men, we don't know the ins and outs of the matter, there are wheels within wheels, etcetera - it would be presumptuous of us to interfere with the designs of fate or even of kings. All in all, I think we'd be well advised to leave well alone. Tie up the letter - there - neatly - like that - They won't notice the broken seal, assuming you were in character.” (*Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*, Act 3, Guil to Ros)¹⁰.

They try to pacify their sense of guilt by pointing out futile reasons like death awaits all alike. They are more concerned about gaining a better living than saving a human soul from damnation. The twist comes soon when Hamlet switches the letter that Claudius gave with the one he wrote asking for the stabbing of his friends to death which will bring peace to the nation. In the original play, they are unaware of all this 'behind the screen' shots. But here they again get a chance to read their own death warrant. While they take time to contemplate the tactics played on them by Hamlet, death confronts them and the lights fade out. Thus, it is moreover a welcomed death by Ros and Guil even after knowing their fate penned in the letter.

The play closes off with the same scene as that of the original play. Almost every character is found dead on stage, except Horatio, who is bound to the duty vested in him by his friend Hamlet to :

“..absent thee from felicity awhile,
And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain
To tell my story.” (Act5, scene 2, Hamlet to Horatio).¹¹

The death of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, thus symbolizes the fall of vices in the society. Their fate reminds the future of all those who value their life to be superior in the present world of cooperation and understanding.

Tom Stoppard was crystal clear in the theme that he brought to limelight. He connects the tragic death of a King and His son to the modern era of commotion and absurdity. Though the audience in the beginning found the play ambiguous, the ending suggested them a lesson for life-

Datta, Dayadhvum and Damyata (give, sympathize and control) [The Waste Land, T.S.Eliot, line 432]¹²- to help and give your goodness to your fellow beings, sympathize with others and to control the inward savageness in every human being.

***Macbett* by Eugene Ionesco (1972)**

Ionesco, the famous French playwright was also interested in the theatre of absurd.

He composed a lot of absurd plays like the *The Chairs*, *Rhinoceros* and *Macbett*. Like the name suggests, *Macbett* is an adaptation of Shakespeare's famous tragedy *Macbeth*. Ionesco's literary guide, Jan Kott, wrote a work called *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, and it is said that Ionesco was deeply influenced by this book. While Shakespeare's *Macbeth* talked of the repercussions of over-ambition and greed, Ionesco's *Macbett* is a farce on the present day society which is deeply concerned with making wealth and occupying a better position rather than being human.

Apart from being an absurd play, Ionesco has also made use of several other techniques like the alienation effect as put forward by Bertolt Brecht in his play. The opening scene itself comes as a stark contrast to the opening scene of *Macbeth*. Whereas in *Macbeth* the announcement made by the soldiers that both Macbeth and Banquo fought victorious in the battle makes King Duncan feel proud of his generals; in *Macbett* we have King Duncan who acts indifferent to the situation. The wounded soldier who brings the good news is not even sure of the names of his generals. He speaks out a stupid speech, but King is not concerned about the relevance of the news. He spends his time in getting dressed up as a king. King Duncan who acts a clever, good and generous King is portrayed as a idiotic and irresponsible king in *Macbett*. This creates a distancing effect wherein the audience perceives the whole play just as a work of art and does not try to step into the shoes of the characters.

Another difference in treatment is characterization. Ionesco ignores characters like Lady Macduff and his son, but introduces two new characters- Lady Duncan and Thane of Glamis. Lady Duncan replaces the cruel character of Lady Macbeth. 'Thane of Glamis' is a title occupied by Macbeth in the original play. But Ionesco gave flesh and blood to this title and brought out a new character. This can also symbolize the dual personality that Macbeth possessed- a loyal subject to the King as Thane of Glamis and a cruel and manipulative murderer as the Thane of Cowdar.

Lady Duncan is the villainous character in the play. She plans to murder her husband with the help of Macbett by promising her own hand in marriage after her husband's death. This incites Macbett's innate savageness and he murders the King. All this happens with the help of Banco who was a good character in the original play. But later when Macbett usurps the throne, he murders Banco.

Supernatural elements are also inculcated in Ionesco's *Macbett* but with a difference. Instead of the three witches, there are only two of them. Number two symbolizes sexuality as in two biological sexes- male and female. Thus, here Ionesco's use of number two can mean the union of a male and female villain- Macbett and Lady Duncan respectively. There is also the appearance of the ghost of Banco during the wedding feast. This scene commemorates the wedding feast scene in *Hamlet* where King Hamlet reveals the whole truth to Prince Hamlet. Just like that the ghost of Banco reveals the secret plans of the couple to Macol, King Duncan's son. It is Macol who kills Macbett and not Macduff.

There is also a continuous turn of plot. In the beginning, Thane of Cowdar and Thane of Glamis calls the King a traitor and a usurper; but later it is Macbett and Banco, who defended the King against Cowdar and Glamis, call him a traitor. This can symbolize the turning loose of villainy. Two cruel men paving way for two other murderers is relevant in the present day politics or rather commonly known as power politics. Money matters a lot in

the play and ambition is difficult to be erased from the modern world of corruption. So Ionesco's mind set in writing this play could be one of a prophet who talks to the world to burn the fire of cruelty and lust or can be thought of a soothsayer who predicts the depth of evils and vices the world is going to witness from the future generation who grow up from the manures put by their corrupt forefathers.

***Lear* by Edward Bond (1971)**

Edward Bond, is a famous post-modern British dramatist who made his mark in the canon of English literature by his Theatre of Cruelty. He tried to present shocking and terrifying scenes of violence and murder on stage. His dialogues are often ambiguous and his imagery complex. To quote Bond:

“I wrote about violence as naturally as Jane Austen wrote about manners. Violence shapes and obsesses our society, and if we do not stop being violent we have no future”. (Preface to *Lear*)¹³

Bond's most famous work in this genre was *Lear*, a rewriting of Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Bond took some of the major characters from the original play, but tried to change the familial relationship between them. In the original play, Cordelia is the loyal daughter of King Lear. But in *Lear*, Cordelia is the wife of a Gravedigger's boy and her occupation is keeping pigs. Bond thus tried to increase the level of violence by placing a helpless victim of power with whom the audience feels empathetic.

Lear's prized possession is his daughters, Bodice and Fontanelle. Though they are as cruel as Goneril and Regan, the daughters of King Lear, Bond tried to make his drama quite different from Shakespeare's by changing their names. Coleridge once commented:

“Goneril and Regan do not appear often, so that the peculiar effect of horror which they produce is not mitigated, as it might be, by familiarity ; and when they are present, not a sentiment, not an image, which can give pleasure on its own account is admitted”.¹⁴

This is the same with Bodice and Fontanelle. Whenever they appear together the level of violence is at its peak; the best example being the torture of Warrington. His tongue is pulled out and to invoke more pain, pokes Bodice's knitting needles into his ears thus making him deaf and dumb. Just as Goneril and Regan threw out their father into the street after gaining the throne, Bodice and Fontanelle not only threw into the hands of fate, but is also cruel enough to lock their own husbands in prison for their inaction.

Shakespeare's Cordelia is considered to be the noblest heroines. Bond's Cordelia is just the opposite. She is innocent in the beginning as the pregnant wife of the Gravedigger's boy. After the murder of her husband and the cruel rape she had to suffer, she has altogether changed into a different individual. From then on the sweetness of her words change into poisoned swords. After waging a war against Lear's daughters, the unlawful successors to the throne, Cordelia gains power and also her vengeance towards also those who destroyed her peaceful living also reach its fullest. Her rebellious war is symbolic of all those citizens of a country who try to question the corruption of the government. She says : “Your law always does more harm than crime, and your morality is a form of violence.” (*Lear*, act 3, scene 3)¹⁵. Therefore, Bond's treatment of Cordelia was successful as far his aim to answer the vices of the society was concerned.

Cordelia also orders for the blinding of Lear. This is one of the cruelest scenes to be depicted on stage just like the stoning of a baby to death in *Saved*. A scientist uses his newly invented machine to pluck out Lear's eyeballs and thus his light of introspection and anticipation is lost. He can no more foresee his future. But his blindness is symbolic. Though he loses his eyesight, he is able to feel the consequences of his cruel past. His losing of eyesight is symbolic of putting off of his ignorance and violence.

Lear's madness is also symbolic. In *King Lear*, the King is forced to insanity by the filial ingratitude exhibited by his daughters Goneril and Regan. But in *Lear*, the king feigns madness to escape from the cruelty of his daughters, Bodice and Fontanelle. From this it is doubtful as to whether Bond tried to adapt elements of tragedy from others plays of Shakespeare or not. The feigning of madness is one of the famous techniques used by the Bard in *Hamlet* to untie the mysteries of a murder. In the same way, Lear's madness is also an attempt to fight against the ingratitude of his daughters and to cause their downfall.

The main difference lies in the resolution of the work. *King Lear* has got a very tragic ending that marks the death of King Lear and Cordelia. But in *Lear*, Justice is not denied. Cordelia gains justice as she enjoys power and is heir to the throne while Lear meets up with a tragic death. He is shot down by a Farmer's son, the caretaker of Lear during his blindness. But Lear is not a good king like Shakespeare's Lear. He deserves this end and therefore the audience feels much relieved after watching a series of violence and bloodshed on stage.

Another major point to be noted is the use of anachronism in Bond's *Lear*. *Lear* is set in ancient Britain, centuries ago, but the devices used in the play are modern. The scientific device used to blind Lear is a relevant example. This could be a technique skilfully used by Bond to put forward his capacity of being futuristic. He could have anticipated all this in the future generation or at the time of a third World War.

To quote Edward Bond :

“Shakespeare has no answers for us at all.” (*Preface to Lear*)¹⁶

Bond was on his way to unlock all those answers which he felt Shakespeare never tried to reveal to his audience. His aim in composing *Lear* was rather different. His conception of art was that “it is the close scrutiny of reality and therefore I put on the stage only those things that I know happen in our society”¹⁷. Therefore, Bond through his theatre of cruelty was throwing light on the evil visible at all levels of power and authority and made it clear that the post-modern world is a place of despair.

The excellent becomes the permanent. Shakespeare's plays are excellent and it is for all the ages. The reactions to his plays were a mixed one. Many critics took up the plots and tried to bring in similarities with the earlier written works; while most of them were busy criticizing them for their grossness. When T.S.Eliot called *Hamlet* an “artistic failure” (*The Sacred Wood: Hamlet and His Problems*)¹⁸, Rhymer called *Othello* “a tragedy written on a Handkerchief” (*A Short View of Tragedy*)¹⁹. But these criticisms sought to dissect the plots and gave opportunities for the modern playwrights to make up its loose ends by inventing new techniques. Though, these modern dramatists found it implausible to gain the wide critical acclaim that Shakespeare received centuries before; they were successful in creating a new theatrical wave that paved way for a wider thinking.

Notes and references

1. Browning, Elizabeth Barrett. *The Poetical Works of Elizabeth Barrett Browning*. New York : James Miller Publishers , 1875. Print. (p.223)
2. Johnson, Samuel. *Samuel Johnson On Shakespeare*. London : Sangam Books Limited , 1985 . Print. (p.60)
3. Showalter, Elaine. *Women Writing and Writing About Women*. London : Croom Helm, 1979. Print.
4. Shakespeare, William. *Four Tragedies*. New York : Bantam books , 2004. Print. (p.341)
5. Morrison, Toni. *Desdemona*. London: Oberon Books , 2012. Print.
6. Same as 4, p.410, lines 57-67
7. Same as 5
8. Ibid
9. Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. New Delhi : Rama Brothers, 2013. Print. (p.218)
10. Stoppard, Tom. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*. London : Faber and Faber, 2013. Print. (p.85)
11. Same as 9. P.450
12. Eliot, T.S. *The Wasteland and Other Poems*. Canada : Broadview Press, 1965. Print.
13. Bond, Edward. *Lear*. London : Bloomsbury , 1971. Print.
14. Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. New Delhi : Rama Brothers, 2010. Print. (p.120)
15. Same as 13
16. Ibid
17. Ibid
18. Eliot, T.S. *The Sacred Wood*. London : Faber and Faber, 1997. Print.
Rymer, Thomas. *A Short View Of Tragedy*. London : Scholar Press, 1693. Print.

Myriad Shades of Motherhood: Infanticide as a Maternal Agency in *Macbeth*

I have given suck, and know
 How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me-
 I would, while it was smiling in my face,
 Have plucked my nipple from his boneless gums
 And dashed the brains out, had I so sworn as you
 Have done to this (*Macbeth* 1.7.58).

Shakespeare's unforgettable and most disparaged character Lady Macbeth's startling comment on motherhood and infanticide still remains one of the puzzling and perplexing moments in *Macbeth*. Dreading Macbeth's vacillating obligation to their succession scheme, Lady Macbeth audaciously declares with no sense of guilt and conscience that she would have “dashed the brains out”(1.7.58) of an infant to seize an otherwise unfeasible ambition. Lady Macbeth challenges to grab hold of a masculine power to supplement Macbeth's political agendas. She undertakes a machismo so as to get over her husband's effeminate reticence. Lady Macbeth's desire for power is definitely conditioned on motherhood, an equivocal status in early modern England. The portrayals of nursing and infanticide that border Lady Macbeth's Act One fantasy petition a maternal agency, transitorily sanctioning the achievement of an illicit political end.

Myriad colours of meanings shape the concept of motherhood. Motherhood is always associated with tenderness, kindness, compassion, empathy, benevolence and umpteen other qualities. Rarely do we associate motherhood to treachery, jealousy, unkindness, vindictiveness etc. There are countless well known instances of mothers who could threaten patrilineal consequences contributing to a sweeping ethnic angst about women's roles in the transmission of patrilineage. These mothers play a pivotal role in irreparably modifying patrilineage through adultery, nursing and infanticide and flourish in execution of a social and political concern for maternal agency. In this particular play, Lady Macbeth's wangled murder of King Duncan stimulates the unlawful succession of a bastardised Macbeth, disturbs both the patrilineal as well as the political order within the realm of the play.

The concept of motherhood was beheld as problematical in early modern England which can be easily detected in the conduct literature of the era such as Dorothy Leigh's *The Mother's Blessing* (1616), Christopher Hooke's *The Childbirth* (1590), John Larsen Klein's *Daughters, Wives and Widows: Writings by Men about Women and Marriage in England, 1500- 1640* etc. addressing the subject of good mothering. While mothers are immensely honoured for a selfless piety to their children, there are instances where some others are condemned for wounding the innocents entrusted to their care. There are countless examples

of critics making comments about the motherhood and specifically the bad mothers. Dymna Callagan points out “women were prosecuted as mothers: as bad mothers for witchcraft, and as bad young mothers for infanticide” (367). Another critic Naomi Millers observes that “mothers and other female caregivers appear as both objects and agents of sacrifice in early modern texts and images, sometimes represented as Madonna and monster at once” (7). Susan Frye illustrates in *In Maternal Measures: Figuring Caregiving in the Early Modern Period* that the maternal role has historically been an “unstable” one, that the struggle to “imagine a 'self'” rendered motherhood a confused, anxiety producing state in early modern England (229).

Most of the critics speak against the practice of wet- nursing as only an upright mother could fittingly care for her child. Elizabeth Clinton states numerous “annoyances” which deterred many an early modern mother from nursing. She points out “it is objected, that it is troublesome; that it is noisome to one's clothes; that it makes one look old, & c.” Whereas the wet- nurses were at a distinct financial benefit and accordingly acknowledged not the best caregivers, there arises the hypothetical query about the degree of nurturance believably accessible through an indignant nursing mother. If such a nurse “suckles the child reluctantly”, her milk, like that of Lady Macbeth, could turn to “gall”(1.5.46), hurting the innocent trusted to her care.

Infanticide is definitely a heinous crime as it wounds both the person and the lineage. This is treated as a sin during the period that brought the person death sentence. There are cases where mothers, out of utter desperation, ostensibly killed their babies rather than face the fury and contempt of the society. The crime rate during the epoch urged the officials to create the 1624 Infanticide Act and this act made infanticide a criminal offense. There are unbelievable incidents that exemplify the horrible and dark shades of motherhood during the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, Anne Boleyn etc. The innumerable cases of early modern infanticide epitomise these women as evil creatures who take sadistic pleasure in slaying their babies. For sure, the mothers represented in these assize records are Lady Macbeths, who readily dash out the brains of the babies entrusted to their care. These mothers at once make motherhood empowering and destructive.

The threat of maternal agency is fearfully revealed in the Shakespearean character, Lady Macbeth whose cruelty fosters social and political chaos. Maternal power is given its most lethal sway. Lady's invocation to evil in Act One elucidates well the threats of motherhood to the patrilineal order. The witches' prophesy hurries her to make the following prayer: “[...] Come you spirits/ that tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here, / and fill me from the crown to the toe top- full/ of direst cruelty” (1.5.38-40). What Lady Macbeth actually wants is not a gender change, but an alternative gender identity that permits her to slip free of the emotional as well as ethnic restraints governing women. She beseeches a maternal image when she says: “come to my woman's breasts/ And take my milk for gall, you murd'ring ministers” (1.5.45- 46).

Shakespeare uses the female characters- Lady Macbeth and the witches- to instill vaulting ambition transform that ambition into vehement action and thus cast doubt on ambition and agency as associated with violence. Whereas the witches do not obviously function as mother figures within the play, Lady Macbeth plainly does, invoking the image of a lactating mother. When Macbeth expresses reluctance in murdering Duncan, Lady Macbeth promptly appeals to the maternal calling up an unnerving image of infanticide.

This reveals one of the dark shades of motherhood which sharply contrasts the Renaissance images of Madonna and child. Lady represents the murdering mother in the assize records. Even though it is Macbeth who exerts the fatal dagger that finishes Duncan's life, one cannot forget the central role that Lady Macbeth plays which makes possible a succession rendered barren through inane nastiness and emotional wantonness. Lady Macbeth's terrible maternal agency secures not a coveted line, but a barren reign that swiftly crumbles when confronted by a legitimate political power.

Lady Macbeth's violent death at the conclusion of an equally violent reign of terror constitutes justice. Thus the plot –maker of the social and political strife perish at her own blood- stained hands. She is definitely the reason for Duncan's death as well as Macbeth's catastrophic fall from grace. The death of Lady Macbeth helps brings about the reunification of Duncan's scattered progeny. In this manner her death preserves life. Her solitary, anti-climactic death, not lamented either by Macbeth or his society, becomes fitting sentence for the chaos Lady Macbeth's infanticide fantasy inflicts upon the social and political order. Thus her maternal agency that facilitates the murder of patrilineage is by play's end supplanted by a rejuvenated, if altered political authority.

References

- Callagan, Dympna. "Wicked Women in Macbeth: A Study of Power, Ideology, and the production of Motherhood." In *Reconsidering the Renaissance*, ed. Mario A. Di Cesare. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992. Print.
- Frye, Susan. "Maternal Textualities." In *Maternal Measures: Figuring Caregiving in Early Modern Period*, ed. Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000. Print.
- Garber, Majorie. *Coming of Age in Shakespeare*. New York: Routledge, 1997. Print.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, ed. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*. New York: Norton, 1997. Print.
- Klein, Joan Larsen, ed. *Daughters, Wives and Widows: Writings by Men about Women and Marriage in England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992. Print.

**What's in a Name;
Hamlet, The Lion King of Pride Lands and Romeo
and Juliet in Zombie World of Warm Bodies-
a Study on Unconventional Appropriations of
Shakespeare in Modern Culture.**

According to Marjorie Garber, author of *Shakespeare and the Contemporary Culture* “The idea that Shakespeare is modern is ... hardly a modern idea” (Garber, 14). It has become a kind of dictum so as to say that “Shakespeare makes modern culture, and modern culture makes Shakespeare” (Garber, 14). His characters have become cultural types, his stories have seemed to fit fluidly into the bottles of each time and space where they are performed, read, debated, published, produced and indeed adapted. Shakespeare's sheer popularity drives the 'university wits' crazy, and when they seriously engage, his tales become case studies for psychology, politics, sociology and literary and cultural theory- just think about New Historicism. Even when one's so determined to stay away from Shakespeare, he can't really turn his back from exclaiming time and again with the word 'Shakespearean'- the adjective for something so magnanimous. Shakespeare features everywhere, and not surprisingly even in the virtual battlefield of advertisements- be it the much celebrated anti-fit campaign by Levi's, Which cleverly twisted *The Midsummer Night's Dream* or the Red bull ad which imagined a Shakespeare who says, “To fly or not to fly is not the question.”

Shakespeare, even when we are on four hundred and fifty years after his birth, is quite probably the most 'appropriated' author in the world. One may not want to list his/her work an open salutation for the bard, but most of them don't really shy away from proclaiming how it's 'Shakespeare- inspired.' Many traces of such phenomenon in fiction, films etc. have been recorded and extensively discussed nowadays. In fact, Shakespeare, these days, is that pinch of spice which can lend the flavor to each and every literary dish- its taste never fails. In skilled hands, it becomes a winner, sometimes, it boomerangs. But in that case too, it offers a good meal for critics and academics, bon appétit! –, it offers fame, and what makes it all the more interesting for us is the fact that, it gives us insights on how the bard himself gets an update on the way. It's about how the change in intended audience and the respective culture in which they are situated in makes him change. Ideological simplification may occur, most of the time opportunistic, but still Shakespearean in name; not to say that, I will risk a blasphemy, Shakespeare himself was least opportunistic.

That gets us to two works of our times. One arguably the most unique animated feature in Disney's canon, *The Lion King* (1994), and *Warm Bodies* (2010), the debut novel of Isaac Marion, a zombie romance set in a post apocalypse universe. While the former is a *Hamlet* in disguise for children, in the latter, a zombie Romeo 'R' is desperately in love with a 'living' Julie, whose clan is all set to extinguish zombies from earth.

Critics like Rosemarie Gavin have opined that *The Lion King* is “primal and

archetypal”(qtd in Evans), and the Disney executives themselves have claimed that it has certain “epic quality”, which stems from the influence of Bible, primordial images, in short everything under the sun. Still, when Scar was made a brother to Mufasa against the original intentions, Disney indeed got a *Hamlet*, as they were recorded saying in the special features 2004 DVD- they didn't turn away from acknowledging indebtedness to Shakespeare.

Parallels could be easily drawn. Mufasa equals Hamlet senior. His ghost has the same function of that of the latter one. Scar is in the same league of Claudius, Zazu is as verbose as Polonius, and a courtier. Nala could be Ophelia, Pumba and Timon, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, though Simba may never really think of getting rid of them. Sarabi may be Gertrude and Rafiki shows path to Simba much like Horatio. But make no mistake; there is no clue that Sarabi could be married to Scar, though her status suggests that she could still be the Queen of Pride Lands. Nala doesn't commit suicide here, Timon and Pumba never cheat the Prince, nor are they killed, Simba doesn't show any methodical madness or oedipal complex, and most importantly it's not a tragedy. Being a bonafide Disney feature, it's true to its code of conducts.

The Lion King is dark in appeal, when compared to other Disney movies, and as some people observe it could be the one and only movie by Disney, which doesn't centre on romance. It's primarily Simba and Mufasa, not Simba and Nala, much like the play. But still it can be argued that it's a diluted Shakespeare which, not surprisingly and in a very unapologetic fashion, it is. There are corporate and conservative interests which rule all Disney features of all time looming on *The Lion King* too. One cannot really help but pay heed to the politics of casting of Whoopi Goldberg, Cheech Marin and others as the crooked hyenas, while the royal villain and prey sounds like they are just out of Shakespeare.

Talking about the Characterization, and the villain, we come to realize that we have so little of Claudius in the play, but Scar quite literally rules the film; at least in screen space. His is the opening line of the movie- “Life's not fair” (*The Lion King*, 1994). He is an outcast, even his name suggests that. It's a physical deformity, a scar, which lends his name. He is not 'somebody important', not only in the family, but even among hyenas, and for them he is nothing like Mufasa, whose very name gives a shudder to them. Mufasa has physical power, which Scar lacks. But he claims to have brains which he proves with his meticulous planning and improvised execution of the scheme to usurp the throne, which was much clever than that which Claudius did. Unlike what that Elton John song proclaims, Scar takes extreme care not to let his “teeth and ambitions...bared” (77). Disney people have taken utmost care to not to allow the audience, children, to feel any sympathy for Scar which Claudius enjoyed from the critics. Claudius was guilt-ridden, but Scar, though he won't have anyone utter Mufasa's name, doesn't seem so. But still, it won't be an impossible task to argue that by the way in which *The Lion King* ends, it glorifies the aristocracy and mainstream. We are lead to believe that Simba could be an ideal king only because he is Mufasa's son. We would be shown with the image of 'green' Pride Lands in the climax for a further proof, and thus directed to compare and contrast it with that 'Prideland turned Wasteland' realm of Scar. Then too it is hard to digest that Simba, who wasted more time in self doubt than Hamlet would have it, could be a better ruler. But maybe that's too much to ask for- and no matter what and how much we may say against the escapism and forgetfulness Simba fed from 'Hakuna Matata', which indeed could easily be declared the motto of Disney themselves, let's admit it, we love Timon and Pumba.

The Lion King, to be honest, is not without some shooting star moments. Nala may be the most fascinating female one could ever find in Disney features. She is stronger, both physically and emotionally than her fiancée. She is Ophelia by status, but she is not a whiner like her. In fact she could be another Horatio, for she shows light to Simba even before Mufasa does, or even a Fortinbras, “the only other character who even approaches Mufasa's Perfection” (Tim). It's relaxing to see that even when the 'circle of life' of Disney movies fit so well within predictions, there are some elements which are so pleasantly odd, which go beyond Shakespeare in a very positive way.

Much like *The Lion King*, *Warm Bodies*(2010) also doesn't end in everyone dying-but the twist is that most of the characters including 'R', the narrator, are already dead. It is easy to dispel *Warm Bodies*, which recently had an onscreen outing in 2013, as one of those cheesy romances that sprang on earth in the remains of *Twilight* series, but Shakespeare is the fuel on which this novel runs. Here, Juliet is a post-apocalypse scavenger and Romeo is a zombie who ate Paris' brains. Unlike *The Lion king*, which decidedly distilled violence out of *Hamlet*, *Warm Bodies* despite not being a tragedy, is a gory affair, but still funny and never leaves the track of romance. Of course, the target audience here is different- it's teenagers and that allows for some comparative gruesomeness.

Isaac Marion's post-apocalyptic world is in rumples much like Shakespeare's Verona. 'R' says;

It didn't take much to bring down the card house of civilization. Just a few gusts and it was done, the balance tipped, the spell broken. Good citizens realized the lines that had shaped their lives were imaginary and easily crossed. They had wants and needs to satisfy them, so they did. The moment the lights went out, everyone stopped pretending.

(Marion, Ch 12)

Just as Friar Lawrence hoped that Romeo and Juliet may bring peace in the disturbed Verona, 'R' and Julie's relationship brings a new ray of light in their dystopian world. But their relationship is doomed from the start. Because Julie's status as living is of no help, and to make matters worse, she is the daughter of Colonel Grigio, the leader of their military government, whose sole aim is to wipe out zombies from earth, the creatures who make a meal of living humans, and who are responsible for his wife's death. But Julie is as willful as Juliet in going on with her relationship and she has a confidante in Nora, who is a nurse and one who acts much like the 'nurse' of the play. We do have a Mercutio 'M', who is a monosyllabic, a friend to 'R', though their conversation most of the time consists only of grunts and moans. R's commitment to Julie leads him to infiltrate into the human settlements and give a call to his beloved from beneath her balcony, which reminds us the play. Even Julie's “what are you?” (Marion, Ch 3) refrain which she puts to 'R' several times seems like an echo of Juliet's “Wherefore art thou?” (Shakespeare, 2.2.37) Juliet was baffled by Romeo, a Montague, and by the very thought that she could be in love with someone from the sworn-enemy camp. Here, Julie is surprised by 'R' and “knowing what he is or what makes of him different from other zombies is essential to her survival and possibly his”

(Cameron).

Author Isaac Marion once in an interview claimed that the decision to work with the tale of star crossed lovers, *Romeo and Juliet*, was quite an accidental one. He said that he “was fairly deep into plotting” when he realized that his story “assembled itself around that classical arc” and “decided to run with it” (Marion). Shakespeare indeed has become a collective cultural property, and it's evident from his words, and it should also be noted that though this 'Shakespiration' was claimed to be purely coincidental by the author, it's obvious that the connection has helped in marketing the work. The author himself never really says that the story is purely 'original' and if someone misses the parallels with the classic play, it could be, most probably, because of the fact that, unlike the earlier adaptations of the work, it is a complete revamp which seeks to resonate with the youth of our times and also may be because that while *Romeo and Juliet* rooted for tears, *Warm Bodies* plays for laughs.

Like *The Lion King*, *Warm Bodies* too can be called 'Shakespeare in context.' One could hardly imagine Romeo eating Paris' brains, quite literally, but for a zombie 'R', it's kind of a necessity. When a zombie eats a victim's brains, he acquires prey's memories and feelings, which is kind of a relief for their lethargic existence, and when 'R' makes a meal of Perry, who is a curious cocktail of Paris and Tybalt, he takes on the late Perry's attachment to Julie, and Julie falls for him.

Warm Bodies is as contemporary as its 'Shakespearean', if one can say like that. Our culture, and our age has become more “comfortable with moral ambiguity” (Marion) to quote the novelist himself from an interview. 'R' simply could be one of the most un-likely heroes of a romance, and Julie could be much of an excuse for a damsel for falling to the charms of the murderer of her boyfriend, and yet we root for them. *Warm Bodies* is not trying to play by the old rule of the game –too good versus too evil, because our teenagers don't really believe in it. In fact, Shakespeare himself was the master of the sensitive and the ambiguous. Interestingly, Disney, a production firm keen on playing with the binaries, and downplaying complexities, too went for Shakespeare. Shakespeare has become a sort of signboard to 'high culture', and Disney went for that. Either way, it becomes evident that how much of an appeal and sway The Bard enjoys in our times.

If *The Lion King* was banking on to the old world charm of Shakespeare, *Warm Bodies* focused on the themes his tales indulged on. But the struggle for something better, however escapist it may be, is at the heat of both films. 'R' is a struggler trying not to give up to his imminent destiny of being a Boney, zombies stripped of skin, concerned only about hunger. His pre-apocalypse souvenirs, his vinyl records of Frank Sinatra and others, are a sign to his 'hunger' to be alive. Julie too fights a battle against the stagnant sort of life that she leads in the stadium-she dreams of planes, books, and of everything beautiful; and if *Romeo and Juliet* was not about hope, then we would be missing the point of the whole play. True that Romeo and Juliet die in the play, but their sacrifice didn't go wasted. The feuding families reconciled and thus if one is ready to go beyond Romeo and Juliet in *Romeo and Juliet*, then we can say that the play indeed had a happy ending, like its unconventional appropriation, in which zombies join hands with humans. *The Lion King* meanwhile shows us a spectacle of everything returning to green and it may touch a chord with many. Genres are subverted, contexts are changed, treatment differs, but Shakespeare still lives in the veins of both the works. After all, it was the bard himself who asked, “What's in a name?” (*Romeo and Juliet* 2.2.43)

References

- Evans, Cameon. "Romeo and Juliet and zombies." *Art and Storytelling*. February 18, 2013. Web. 10th July, 2014.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Shakespeare and Modern Culture*. New York; Anchor, 2009.
- The Lion King*. Dir. Allers, Roger and Rob Minkoff. Walt Disney, 1994. Walt Disney, 2004. DVD.
- Marion, Isaac. "Interview with Warm Bodies author Isaac Marion." Tara C. Smith. *Aetiology*. March 7, 2013. Web. 10th July, 2014.
- Marion, Isaac. *Warm Bodies*. London; Vintage. 2010. EPUB File.
- Modenessi, Alfredo Michel. *Disney's "war efforts": The Lion King and Education for Death, or Shakespeare Made Easy for your Apocalyptic Convenience*. PDF. Web. 10th July 2014
- Pryde, Jessica. "From Classic to Contemporary: Romeo and Juliet to Warm Bodies." *The Hub*. March 12, 2013. Web. 10th July 2014.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. Ed. Cedric Watts. Hertfordshire; Wordsworth, 1992.
- Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Cedric Watts. Hertfordshire; Wordsworth, 2000.
- Story Origins. Dir. Unknown. Interviews with Roger Allers, Don Hann, Thomas Schumacher, Jonathan Roberts and Rob Minkoff. DVD Extra, The Lion King Special Edition, Disc 2. Walt Disney, 2003.
- Tim. "Mere Anachrony: The Lion King and Disney's Greatest Villain." *No Pun Intended*. August 8, 2009. Web. 10th July, 2014.

Shakespeare through the Lens: A Socio- Cultural Study of *Hamlet* Adaptations

Hamlet (2000) is a Hollywood movie adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* directed by Michael Almereyda which is set in New York City of the beginning 21st century, starring Ethan Hawke who plays Hamlet, a film student, Kyle MacLachlan co-starring as Uncle Claudius, Gertrude by Diane Venora, Laertes by Liev Schreiber, Ophelia by Julia Stiles, Rosencrantz by Steve Zahn, and Hamlet's father by Sam Shepard. The major themes include revenge, love, indecision, etc. In the movie, Elsinore Castle, the seat of power of the kingdom of Denmark in the play is being portrayed as Hotel Elsinore, the headquarters of Denmark Corporation. In the movie, Hamlet is a very gentle character whose emotional expressions are different from the Hamlet of the play. Hamlet is mad because of his father's death and mother's sudden marriage to Uncle Claudius who instantly becomes the king and CEO of Denmark Corporation. The movie doesn't open up with the guard seeing the ghost of Hamlet's father. The representation of the ghost is a lot more different in the movie. The ghost meets Hamlet alone in Horatio's apartment. The ghost seems a bit more emotional and it even hugs Hamlet at the point where it leaves him goodbye. The movie gives out a rather different and frequently protesting character of Ophelia who disagrees with Polonius in a lot of instances. The love and respect given by Hamlet to Ophelia is a bit more compared to the original work.

Ophelia is an amateur photographer in the movie who carries around Polaroid photographs of various flowers and unlike the movie she gives photographs of the flowers to Gertrude and Claudius before drowning herself in a fountain in front of Hotel Elsinore, surrounded by the photographs of her memories with Hamlet. The character of Claudius unlike the play, physically expresses his hatred towards Hamlet. He even hits the truth out of Hamlet when he refuses to reveal the location where he dumped Polonius's dead body. Corporate espionage, lust, greed etc are clearly portrayed through the character of Claudius. The captain of Fortinbras' army is replaced by a flight attendant on Hamlet's flight to England and Fortinbras' victory are not by military force but the corporate takeovers with the help of his armies of lawyers. The first intervention of the character of Osric is recreated as a fax machine in the apartment of Hamlet and Horatio delivering the message by Laertes just before the duel. The character of Osric however appears during the final duel between Hamlet and Laertes. The character of Marcellus who is one of the soldier's is replaced by Marcella, Horatio's Girlfriend. Before delivering the "to be or not to be" monologue, Hamlet is seen watching a video by a Buddhist teacher Thich Nhat Hanh explains the principle "to be is to be with others, to be is to inter-be". Laertes doesn't organize a revolution instead confronts Claudius directly and duel in the play gets re created to fencing in the movie where he at the end shoots Hamlet with a pistol and then shoots himself to death unlike the play where he kill Hamlet with a poisoned rapier. Claudius gets shot at the end of the movie and thus the revenge gets fulfilled. The dialogue in the movie and the play is more or less the same but at the same

time the way Hamlet mumbles with his lines with tired and depressed voice expresses his utter frustration and desperation. The use of modern technologies like Polaroid cameras, Surveillance bugs, and Video cameras is a peculiar feature of the movie. The Mousetrap or the play within the play is in the form of a video montage made by Hamlet himself. The extensive use of Polaroid cameras by Ophelia to store her memories and the surveillance camera which captures the image of the ghost are all perfect examples. Almerayda's 2000 Hamlet adaptation in the round the clock busy New York city was the hollywood'ized' Hamlet well played by Ethan Hawke is a faithful adaptation of *Hamlet* the play manifesting the greatness and creativity of the director.

Karmayogi(2012), is a Malayalam movie adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* by the well acclaimed director V K Prakash which is set in a small area in Northern Kerala where the major characters belong to a clan called Yogis who are been believed to be the descendants of Lord Shiva. The protagonist or the Malayalam counterpart of Hamlet or Rudran Gurukkal played by Indrajith is the lone male descendant of the Chathothu family representing Yogi community. In the movie, Rudran Gurukkal (Indrajith) is Hamlet, Rudran Vailiya Gurukkal (also by Indrajith) is King Hamlet, Bhairavan (Thalaivasal Vijay) is Claudius, Mankamma (Padmini Kolhapure) is Gertrude, Moonnumani (Nithya Menon) is Ophelia, Kidathan (M R Gopakumar) is Polonius, Kanthan (Saiju Kurup) as Laertes and so on. Written by Belram Mattannoor, the script and characterisation is greatly modified to suit the taste of Malayali audience. The movie uses the vernacular translation of Shakespeare's dialogues in Hamlet here and there in *Karmayogi*. The place names and character names are completely different from the original work. Laertes or Kandan goes to Thulunaad whereas in the play it is France. A lot of cultural elements like Kelipathram, Bhairavantheyyam, poorakkali, kalaripayattu etc are being introduced in the movie. The ritual of kelipathram which symbolises Lord Shiva's tryst with penance a silence in order to repent for the beheading of Lord Brahma is an important element in the movie. Rudran's ancestral tharavad used to be the centre of Kelipathram where his father Rudran Valyagurukkal used to be an ardent follower of this custom of begging alms without uttering a word. He gets killed by Bhairavan during his journey as a Kelipathram, where he rests in a temple on the way. The beginning of the movie shows a romantic encounter of Bhairavan and Mankamma which gets interrupted by the people who wait outside the tharavadu to hear about the sudden marriage between the two. The character of Rudran gets introduced later when the tharavad witnesses a Bhairavantheyyam. There is a new element of duet between Rudran and Moonnumani when the movie progresses which is completely against the original Shakespearean plot. Rudran Gurukkal lives in agony and tries to maintain almost a single mood throughout the movie. Bhairavan is the character that hasn't been lost in adaptation. He is shrewd, cunning, venom and lust. Mankamma can be considered a rather passive woman till the end of the play where realization dawns for her and she knowingly consumes the poison meant for Rudran and tries to strangle Bhairavan before her death and at the same time revealing to Kanthan that it was Bhairavan who killed Kidathan. Ophelia tries to be a loving and consolidating presence to Rudran and this is evident in the scene where Rudran compares her presence to the chillness of a holy water. Kidathan is the chief councillor of Bhairavan and is a character of shrewd, cunning, stupid layman, who gets killed by Bhairavan in the movie, which is different from the

original plot by Shakespeare. The character of Sahyan which is the Malayalam counterpart of Fortinbras, unlike the play, is degraded to a level of all-lost, desperate revengeful warrior who wanders along with martial arts savvy warriors to take revenge against Rudran. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are recreated into a martial art warrior Marmaani and his disciples who are being hired by Bhairavan to kill Rudran but later realises the plot of Bhairavan to kill them along with Rudran. They instead of getting killed turn against Bhairavan and helps Rudran to rescue Shankunni, the character of Horatio who is from nowhere. Moonumani loses the significance in the movie to the extent where we aren't even sure how she met her end. Only a scene where her corpse being carried away is been shown towards the end. The play within the play is in the form of a poorakkali where the circumstances leading to Rudran Valya Gurukkal's death is being presented in the Tharavadu in front of all the other characters. Unlike the play, in the movie, Bhairavan sees Rudran with the sword that came to kill him while he was praying with a repenting heart. The final duel between Rudran and Kandan is a traditional Kazhchapayattu at Shivarathri night where Kandan uses a poisoned sword. The importance difference made by the movie makers is at the climax of the movie where Rudran survives death. During the Kazhchapayattu, Kandan gets hit by the poisonous sword. Mankamma before dying asks Rudran to kill Bhairavan. Bhairavan has a narrow escape from the scene and Rudran chases him to the Rudrabhoomi, a sacred place where Rudran Vailya Gurukkal used to dwell. Rudran kills Bhairavan by punching him in the stomach. After the death of Bhairavan, Rudran meets Shangunni and Sahyan and he gives away all his inheritances and rights to Sahyan and leaves chathothu as a Kelipathram. The critically acclaimed movie had both the elements of a classic and a commercial movie which made it possible for it to reach a large number of audiences.

The Bad Sleeps Well or *Warui Yatsu Hodo Yoku Nemuru* (1960) is a Japanese movie by Akira Kurosawa, the world renowned Japanese director of critically acclaimed blockbusters like *Seven Samurai* (1954), *Rashomon* (1950), *Ran* (1985) etc. The major characters are Koichi Nishi (Toshiro Mifune) as Hamlet, Iwabuchi (Masayuki Mori) as Claudius, Yoshiko Nishi (Kyoko Kagawa) as Ophelia, Tatsuo Iwabuchi (Tatsuya Mihashi) as Laertes and so on. The movie has its roots in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* but the roles of the major characters are all rather reversed or rather vague for a certain extent. The protagonist of the movie is Nishi, a Hamlet like figure who gets a prominent position in a post war corrupted Japanese company in order to expose the men who are behind his father's death. The protagonist marries the lame and fragile daughter of Iwabuchi the hypocrite corporal emperor who with his colleagues forces Nishi's father Furuya to commit suicide in order to cover up a major corruption by the officials. In the movie the characters of Claudius and Polonius in the original work are indeed the same character, whereas in the place of an incestuous Gertrude like figure is absent in the movie. Unlike the Hamlet in the play, Nishi is not reluctant or indecisive in pursuing revenge. He plots his revenge in a very precise and careful manner which is evident from the beginning of the movie where an enormous cake similar to the company building in been bought to the function where a rose is being kept to indicate the window from where Furuya committed suicide. This and the scene where Wada is being presented before Shirayi, as a ghost can be compared to the "mousetrap" scene in *Hamlet* where the immediate response being felt in the faces of

the guilty. The scenes where Shirai is being framed guilty can be related to the scene in Hamlet where Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are being put to death. But at the same time the major contrast with the character of Nishi and Hamlet is that Hamlet is not concerned with the people around him at the time Nishi is more or less concerned about them. This is evident from the scene where Nishi drives Shirai to madness where Nishi never resorts to physical torture, he scares Shirai by making him drink the so-called poisoned whisky but in real which was not poisoned. Hamlet treats the people around him with cruelty especially Ophelia at the same time Nishi falls in love with his wife who is also his enemy's daughter. The character of Laertes in the play is worried about the lovemaking of Hamlet and Ophelia but at the same time the Laertes-like figure Tatsuo in the movie is worried about them sleeping apart in different rooms. The character of Nishi is a kind of person who doesn't engage in verbal jousting but who actually does things or acts according to the situation unlike Hamlet who overthinks and doubts every action. The movie also talks about the evil tendency that existed in the corporate world of Post-war Japan where a subordinate will die rather than exposing a corruption or anything of that sort by the higher officials. The major difference comes at the climax of the movie where the Hamlet figure Nishi gets murdered by Iwabuchi along with Wada who was an extremely loyal subordinate of Iwabuchi and supposedly committed suicide. Yoshiko and Tatsuo confront and denounce their murderer father who calls his superior to apologize for the recent air of chaos and that he is retiring from the company and all his and his superiors' secrets are still safely hidden from public exposure. This indeed stresses on the title of the movie that the bad 'always' sleeps well.

The three movies born in different parts of the world, set in different cultural backgrounds and at the same time effectively conveyed the mental state of Hamlet gives the idea that Hamlet or any other Shakespearean character so to say are basic human beings whose mental state can be related to people all over the world no matter the culture, race, language or place of birth.

References

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt2236636/>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0054460/>

http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0171359/?ref_=nv_sr_4

<http://kickass.to/warui-yatsu-hodo-yoku-nemuru-the-bad-sleep-well-kurosawa-196-t6041736.html>

<http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0000041/>

Shakespeare's Appropriations: Polyphony

1. Introduction

1.1. General Overview on Appropriations

World Wars, Slavery, Colonialism, Technology, Media and the Liberalisation, Privatisation and Globalisation concept (LPG) have inevitably left their scars on the modern and postmodern psyche, particularly, in the literary domains across the global village. The world of literature has undeniably been touched by the need to create, but most importantly by the burning urge to re-create, re-assess, re-examine and re-style the already available primary sources. It is difficult to give any fixed definitions of appropriation. The Oxford Dictionary defines 'Appropriation' as "the deliberate reworking of images and styles from earlier, well-known works of art" (OED, 23). Literary adaptations are very linked to the cinematographic re-creation of many literary creations while appropriations are closely connected to the transferring of the original texts onto pages whereby new approaches, perspectives, and scholarships have been merged or brought in. Adopting a critical eye, we can note that though the media of interpretations vary accordingly to the needs of the deconstructionists, the original text, whose "story (the *fabula*) is the common denominator" (Huntcheon, 2006) remains the pillar for both adaptation and appropriation purposes. Therefore, this calls for the postmodernist sensibility to the "reading of [sic] the text against itself" (Barry, 71). Appropriations seek the attention of the authors to engage into a productive dialogue with the readers across the palimpsest of culture, language, education, society, religion; politics so on and so forth. Many prominent writers, poets, critiques and playwrights have caught the attention of the readers. But, none could hold our interests as Shakespeare, the 17th century Universal and Humanist Bardic figure has successfully done.

Though born 450 years back, we still wonder why Shakespeare is important in the modern and postmodern worlds. How can the Shakespearean influences impact on our daily life? And why do we need to read, assess and understand the emergence of Shakespearean appropriated creative works? Academicians ponder over whether the appropriated works still remain the same or become entirely new and other different cultural constructions? Or, is the process of appropriating Shakespeare a mere phase of textual development? Or, to make it simple: is it solely an enterprise of re-invention? As such, the innovative world of Shakespearean plays brings a new dynamics of conversation, that is, a triangular dynamics takes birth whereby, the author, the readers and the text (characters) are undoubtedly engaged. Martin Orkin, in *Local Shakespeares*, his 2005 book, openly points out that "readers who are situated in locations outside the scholarly Shakespeare metropolis might bring to the text [is ...] worth exploring so long as the global reach of the Shakespeare text continues" (Huang, 2006). Orkin reinforces the parameters within which Shakespeare's works are brought closer to the readers. The wide scholarships on Shakespeare adopt two differing stands

when it comes to the acceptance or rejection of Shakespeare's appropriations based on multiple disciplines.

Shakespearean anthology of plays widens the avenues for alternative readings and receptions of the novel literary creations. In this way, Shakespeare has not solely come to the forefront for the past years but has altogether allowed a gamut of novel write ups to be visible and accessible to the world at large. The manifold appropriated Shakespearean works is a proof that the 17th century playwright is not a stagnant or dormant one but has certainly brought about a tsunami in the literary nation. The waves of Shakespeare have touched the four corners of the world. In this way, the demanding task of appropriations has led writers to adopt deconstructionist lenses in order to fit Terry Eagleton's remark where he opines that "Shakespeare remains somehow ahead of us, and "we have yet to catch up with him" (Eagleton 1986, x). The new writings posed on Shakespeare's original ones allow us to understand that "appropriation can take multiple forms, as each generation attempts to redefine Shakespeare in contemporary terms in an ongoing process of mutation" (Marsden 1991, 9). The world of Literature is immersed in a reshuffling process as the new writers have to find their stature and identity in the already settled old space. As a matter of fact, the new works of art and literature compulsorily need to adjust themselves to the gamut of existing writings where "the *whole* existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered; and so the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted; and this is conformity between the old and the new" (Eliot, 1921). In order to settle in the accepted system of values, appropriated creations have to deconstruct the basic standards and flout voluntarily or involuntarily the established literary canons of Shakespeare's ideologies. Through deconstructionist tactics, the authors are normally "associated with a disruption of traditional oppositions – man/woman, speech/writing, philosophy/literature, truth/fiction, outside/inside, form/content and so on"(Graham, 67). Accentuating on Shakespeare, Ralph Waldo Emerson stipulates that "we are still out of doors. For executive faculty, for creation, Shakespeare is unique." (Emerson, 1883). Critically assessed, it may be the reason which nurtures the cropping up of appropriations. In order to establish innovative consensus about Shakespeare, postmodern writers need to face the shooting challenging of keeping the Shakespearean essence which is deemed to be almost impossible in the fissures the newly collated works bring about. As such, the malleability of Shakespearean creations leads us to Jyotsana Singh who states the postmodern tendency to disrupt and decentre the set value system has promoted the inevitable alterations of the established conventional norms;

"the Shakespearean text is no longer sacrosanct: instead
it is invaded by heteroglossia, or multiplicity of styles
and forms in the Bakhtinian sense, that the cultural
authority of the official English Shakespeare"(Kerr et alii, 39)

Singh's poignant statement shed light on Terry Eagleton's opinion on appropriations where "we are now finally convinced that Shakespeare's work is changeable, multiple, unfixed, and unstable, we nonetheless find ourselves seeking an origin for that work in the indefinable, the invisible, the limitless". (Eagleton, 1986).

2.1 The Fissured Family Structures

One of the vital five institutions of the society, the family is considered to be primal in the healthy development of not exclusively the individual self but the community at large. The family can even be seen to be the microcosmic epitome of the whole society and world. The family structures reinforce the personality, mental, emotional, educational, political, religious, and social advancements. The 17th century family set up designed by the Bard becomes a promised space and “‘material’ to be refashioned” (Marowitz, 5) for postmodernists to re-create a familial cocoon. Readers across the racial, linguistic, religious, socio-political, educational and personal borders receive the appropriations of Shakespeare accordingly to their contextualised family milieu. Shakespeare fleshes the gamut of human emotions, vices, prejudices, jealousy, and love/hatred among the many human existentialist purports within the family space. The Shakespearean family drudgery and mechanisms have been well depicted in all his plays, particularly his tragedies namely *Othello*, *Hamlet*, *As You Like It*, *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Tempest* to mention a few. The poignant aspect of his dysfunctional family ties is intertwined with the father-daughter relationship which has credited many scholars' attention. Centred on patriarchy and the male conceived values and power dynamics, Shakespeare's family unit is aptly manipulated to re-invent a new family structure where many writers take a stand to flout the original texts according to their own requirements. They do not destroy the flair of Shakespearean plays but rather re-style them.

In order to discuss how the Elizabethan family tree is flouted and parodied, we have chosen Jane Smiley's *A Thousand Acres* which give a break from the usually expected norms. Readers, from different family background can easily identify themselves within the Iowa agrarian Cook family comprised of Larry Cook, the father, Ginny, Rose and Caroline, the three daughters, Ty and Pete, Ginny and Rose's husband respectively. Transported into an American agricultural space, Jane Smiley forces us to ponder the dynamics of human relationships tossing about within the institution. The family is galvanised by Smiley to disrupt the patriarchal dynamics whereby the women restricted to the evil roles associated to them. The father is the epitome of the fatherhood, kingship and master whereby his authority is absolute and cannot be contested. Cordelia refuses to abide to the flattery of her elder sisters, Goneril and Regan openly favouring the real state of affairs than the do-belief. She stands in direct challenges to her father, King Lear's power and states that:

“Unhappy that I am, I cannot heave
My heart into my mouth: I love your majesty
According to my bond; nor more nor less” (Kelly, 6)

While the pure love of Cordelia is rejected as a direct threat to Lear's stature, he favours Goneril and Regan, the two Shakespearean evil female representations. With an absent mother and a tyrannical father, egocentric and power lusty, Lear failed drastically to offer a warm family circle as protection to the girls. The latter are caught within the male-dominated created world whereby their human evil nature knows no limit, to such an extent that, Goneril and Regan are ready to kill each other for another man, Edmund, the one who sows conflicts between them and in the family.

Transposed into an American agricultural land, time and space, *A Thousand Acres* is aptly manipulated to by Smiley in a postmodern approach to spouse the fragmented self of the family unit. Jack Kirby puts forth that the female American writer flouts the agricultural and rustic ideologies which focalises on the family farm and farming “as a superior way of life” (Kirby, 582-584). The Iowa farm was not selected haphazardly as Smiley extricates her family conflicts and anarchic condition through the land. As a befitting reply to Shakespeare, the female writer sets out “to question the insistence that the family farm insure succession to the males rather than the welfare of the family” (Jensen, 25-26). Critically assessed, the farm, a public territory metamorphoses into an epitome of the minuscule world of the family. She posits that “the crisis on farms... comes from within as well as without”, as a contemporary woman seek “a usable past, a more viable present, and a central role in rural development of the family units” (Jensen, 25-26). This daring statement allow us, readers to remark the noteworthy usage and exploitation of the farm as a metaphor to establish the varied dysfunctional ties of the family unit throughout our reading. Smiley remaps the family as a rustic one which brings us closer to the rustic time and space of Wordsworth and Thomas Hardy. The sharp contrast is drawn between the British and the Iowan arenas for distinctive reasons of underpinning the family structures which differ according to the contexts. The farm defines the chaotic internal conditions of the family as the recurring pollution smashes Ginny's hopes and greatly desired wish for motherhood to the earth as she is the innocent victim of the farmers and the modes of production. The many miscarriages of Ginny are in themselves a crucial element in understanding the fissures of the family unit on the farm. The inability of conceiving not only forces Larry Cook to call her a “barren whore” (Smiley, 181) but also pushes Ginny into the abyss of secrecy as she is seen as a failure in reproducing male heirs for the continuation of the family lineage as expected by her father. Smiley presses us to note that the failure to construct a family in her appropriated novel is the outcome of the male agrarian production techniques which leave the women as an empty land. Ginny is turned into a silent empty being that “had been shaken to a jelly” (Smiley, 189) where she has to keep her miscarriages and the inability to beget a child secret. The disrupted family unit here is noteworthy as the absence of a baby, the woman; the family and the whole farm remain unproductive. She represses her agony of having to deal with an incomplete family set up and of being her father's “dried-up whore bitch” (Smiley, 181). In the attempt to follow Shakespeare's external storm, Martha Tuck Rozett argues that “by writing the storm scene in her book [...] she is less convincing than when she uses her own fiction-writing strategies” (Rozett, 170-171). As a matter of fact, the storm scene is nothing but a representation of the internal tempest face and endured by the women in particular Ginny. The multiple unborn children of Ginny capture the inner individual storm and at the time, project us into the wilderness of the family skeleton which is highly disrupted.

Smiley re-evaluates the strained family bonding in a family where the absent mother is strongly felt while the domineering father's power is stifling as he failed drastically to play his role as assigned. The generational, siblings and couple's family ties were needed in order to counteract the internal family tension of *King Lear's* private affairs. The family unit is disrupted when Rose caught up by breast cancer, voices out the incestuous relationship committed by their father, Larry Cook who “did f--- us and he did beat us. He beat us more than he f--- us. He beats us routinely. [...] and f--- his daughters can go out into the community and get respect and power” (Smiley, 302) while the repeated

private sexual exploitation of the women remains under cover. Confined to the domesticity of the farm, Ginny and Rose do not really enjoy a happy family life as they are bound to be treated like appendages to the males on the farm. This brings us to Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, whereby the male writer designed the stature of the male in the Igbo society in regards to yams, cattle and women he possesses. In such a polygamous society, the family unit looks like a communal set up whereby the members are close knit together. This inter generational discord becomes an important trope in Smiley analysis of the family breakdown to bring us, readers, closer to the characters. As modern or rather post modern readers, we can easily identify ourselves with such shattered families as technology, the rate of rape on daughters, death of one parent, re-marriages of divorced parents, divorce and social evils directly impact on the family as a laced institution.

2.2 History

The world has gone through different phases of history across time. History did not spare the world of literature starting from Chaucer up to now. Shakespeare plays a critical role when it comes to the cropping scholarships about how History is represented in the Elizabethan context. Being a major field of human and literary lenses, appropriated texts did not remain indifferent to the historical perspectives in our modern and postmodern milieus. The rewriting of historical perspectives offers novel scope for readers to grasp the interchanging temporal notions within a new creation. Based on a remote cultural, socio-political and historical basis of the 17th century, Shakespeare, the Bard, promotes those particular historical assertions of his time. As readers, we are systematically alienated and defamiliarised with such purviews as we cannot instantly associate ourselves with the current state of affairs of Shakespeare's plays. Thus, we feel distanced from the szujet, the fabula, the context and the characters at large. Italy, France, Ireland, Greece, Egypt, London, Italy, Rome, and Scotland among other commonly recurring places in Shakespearean plays have successfully allowed him to become a transnational figure. Simultaneously, it has allowed us an insight into the different historical nerves of the world to which the Bard was not blind. As a matter of fact, his presentation of a heteroglossic historical collage which he masterly exploits as the setting of his plays, did not hinder writers from Mauritius, Tunisia, Japan, Bulgaria, Russia, the United States of America, the Caribbean islands among others to come up with new versions. The multidimensional approach towards histories allows readers to grasp the different gist and ruling zeitgeists of the appropriated works in order to fuse with or parody with the original texts. While Shakespeare emphasises on the aesthetics historical aura well fused in his plays, the appropriations give a different flair as the contexts of each writers are taken into consideration. The historical topographies of the modern and postmodern writers undoubtedly do not write in a historical vacuum as no one can escape from the scars of History.

The revisionists of Shakespeare adopt a multidimensional stand in dealing with the sensitive issues of their particular contextualised historical polemics. The reworking of the past for these writers not only shuffle the whole literary cosmos but certainly leave the readers into a labyrinth of never-asked questions about Shakespeare. The fragmented self and existence of the Caribbean islands, the Communist tendencies of Russia, Czechoslovakia, the racial dynamics of the Arab circle, the inhuman practice of Slavery, Holocaust-the systematic genocide of the Jews, the colonial encounter; Caliban-Prosero

image, phenomenon of Refugee and immigration, the political outcry of the devastated countries, usurpation and coup d'état among such disturbing historical occurrences did not evade neither Shakespeare nor the deconstructionists in the attempts to tackle with History. The gendered history becomes the foundation for the female revisionists like Jane Smiley, Marina Warner so on and so forth to juggle with the male dominated historical grounds in order to give themselves a history, that is, they try to deconstruct History into what feminists call her story. The need to revisit history becomes an imperative act for women writers as they become the biographer of their own lives, voice, space and truth. The long tradition of depicting silent and silenced women throughout male narratives has become a cliché. With the upsurge of feminists' suffrage, history is aptly deconstructed to give way to the female to recapture their losses especially their voice. History did not give much coverage to the 17th century women characters like Jacosta, Ophelia, and Lady Macbeth so on and so forth as the concentration was on the male absolute domination and control over History.

In support of this statement, we have chosen to take Jane Smiley and Marina Warner respectively as both female revisionists, though hailing from different background, can be seen to be preoccupied by the unfair historical representations of women in the Elizabethan sphere. The stifled female self is given a voice in *A Thousand Acres* and *Indigo* respectively. Both Warner, the Caribbean female revisionist of *The Tempest* and Smiley, the American female writer who appropriates *King Lear* recuperate the lost voice and the fragmented selves of the women in their novels through storytelling. The urge to recount the Historical happenings through the female perspectives and voice is so poignant that they are allotted a textual space to speak out the suppressed female self. Smiley's Ginny reflecting upon her life, a life in the shadow of the male, torn between "toe lives, to be two selves" (Smiley, 26) finds herself cracking out of the clutches of silence. Her voice breaches the conventional male representations of silent and/or silenced women of literary History when she bravely tosses on a new quest to recount the life of her mother. Through the flouting of the opaque history, she becomes her "mother's [...] biographer" (Braumer, 657). Automated by the ideology that she was "after all, her [...] father's daughter" (Smiley, 94), she drops the agenda. But, Smiley brings out the urge to speak out through the story telling of her mother as she goes deeper into the enquiring of her maternal history, which is in fact, a means for her to question, visit and flout the acquired male version of history of the family. Here, the national History is fused into the personal history. Unlike the African silenced women under patriarchy, the Ginny is given control over her voice and thoughts. Ginny's paternal grandmother Edith "was reputed to be a silent woman [...]" (Smiley, 132-133) and she wondered "if her reputed silence wasn't due to temperament at all, but due to fear" (Smiley, 132-133). All the details about the old lady who possible was not empowered enough to drive a car, to have money of her own and to live freely in a land surrounded by males remain blurred or rather invisible in male stories. Smiley offers the possibility to breach the male historical factor through the maternal stories, Warner, on the other hand, is the one who truly masters the storytelling through her textual imaginings to flout Shakespeare stereotypical speechless women. The male oppressive Historical accounts are given new twists. The use of storytelling victoriously "deconstructs [...]" that boy's own" tradition (Rutter, 506). Warner, in her Caribbean manner to disrupt the male historical voiced narratives.

In her 2002 Amnesty Lecture at the Oxford Sheldonian Theatre, Warner espoused that since 1980s, women writers across borders have exploited the concept of "Negative

Capability” (Propst, 330) to revisit, to recount, to readjust, to counteract and to reconstitute the many lost histories (Warner, 467). The textual fabric is an interwoven space to allocate both men and women throughout history but Warner intricately catalyses the male historical space to delve into the voice of the women. Storytelling is a wise technique to chronicle the lost female voices of Shakespearean plays. The collective History is juggled by the revisionists to recreate a more personal female history through stories. The absent and fragmented histories of the Caribs and Arawacks of the West Indies are fictionalised in her *Indigo*. Due to the historical invisibility and absence of a 'grillot' to record and pass on the historical treasures, Serafine takes up the role of the storyteller to lend her voice to the missing, erased and lost histories of the populace. *Indigo* is reconstituted around the storytelling throughout the narrative web. The storytelling framework of Warner's creation affirms the female crucial stature. The intertwined personal stories bring out a polyphonic lens of History, recounted through Serafine. The latter asserts the centrality of oral lore in such traditional communities. Stories are elevators of a History which are linked to human existence and emotions. They also express the historical realities of the context and people. Readers are acquainted to the oral traditions and manoeuvres which tie us to Rene Descartes who believes that “the delicacy of fiction enlivens the mind” (Shah, 15). It seems that we are not reading the text but we are listening to the characters as real and existing personae. The story takes the form of a fairy tale which makes *Indigo* easily accessible to adults and children respectively.

Similarly to *Indigo*'s Serafine, Warner's Leto in *The Leto Bundle*, becomes the story teller to impart moral mores to the readers and society but most importantly to revisit the male historical purports. Though partly a story teller, Leto's voice and words resound across the narrative to reach us when Leto utters that “and I'm told that, in consequence, Enoch prides itself that it is the market and factory of the world, but that its people are always paid a fair wage This happened some long time ago, but the story hasn't been forgotten and its effects are still felt” (Warner, 222). The female takes control of the authorship in History blurring completely the male resonance of Shakespearean historical notions. As a matter of fact, Warner's endeavour was not only to represent neither Leto nor Serafine for the textual purposes, but to create both characters as a medium of oral expression to define the female self using History. However, the failure of attempting to “tell the stories” of single mothers and refuges paradoxically disunifies the authorial self, opening the writer to those stories in a state that involves “the abandonment of the self, a relinquishment of identity” (Blanchot, 17) is not absent.

2.3 Language

Over the hundreds of years political, socio-cultural and historical incidents have influenced languages promoting prominent changes at different stages of History. The Fifteenth century Renaissance which had originated in Italy is a very good instance for that process of changes in language. Writers, academicians and thinkers of England rehabilitated their contact with the ancient classical culture to intend for learning from Latin and ancient Greek texts. In the meantime, William Caxton introduced printing press in England about 1476, so that many people reach the books in the territory very easily. Then, they were able to communicate with the people from various parts of the world and enlarged their commercial relations. All these issues influenced many facets of daily life, including communication and in particular one aspect of it, that is, language. It also caused for the

rapid expansion in the lexicon depiction as well as linguistic setting of the Renaissance. In the Elizabethan period, Shakespeare lived and was able to exploit language changes by means of his intelligence, ability and compassion. Several studies have sought to explicate or theorise about Shakespeare's language and still many investigations are being carried out. Perceived as complex, complicated and at times difficult to understand, the language encompassed in Shakespeare's works is a mine of linguistic phenomena which can be analysed from various points of view.

It is impossible to indicate the nature of his genius in a short notice. To realize the greatness of Shakespeare, one must read his plays, feel the Shakespearean atmosphere, and feel the breadth of Shakespearean spirit. He has a remarkable power for sympathizing with any and every human experience. His impartiality led him to see both sides of a question and it is this that made him to see both aspects of a question and enabled him to represent different characters- Hamlet and Falstaff, Othello and Thersites, Imogen and Mrs. Quickly, Dogberry and Julius Caesar, Cleopatra and Audry –with the immense imaginative sympathy. Shakespeare strikes our attention by his wonderful mastery over the English language. He can by various stylistic devices through special skill in using verse and prose at just the most appropriate times. He has coined a number of separate poetic phrases which have become household words in the English language.

As Hazlitt says “Shakespeare's language and versification are like the rest of him. He has a magic power over words: they come winged at his bidding; and seem to know their places. They are stuck at a heat, on the spur of occasion, and have all the truth and vividness which arise from an actual impression on the objects. His epithets and single phrases are like sparks, thrown off from an imagination, fixed by the whirling rapidity of its own motion. His language is hieroglyphical .It translates thought into visible images.”(Hazlitt 1818, 59). He is a man of magical writing. He is a cultural icon. For him, language is a treasure. He defamiliarises everything .He used uncommon language even in common situations. Originality and peculiarity are the main features of Shakespearean language and they resolve the efficiency in communication. Most of his writings are linguistically unusual and show Shakespeare's reliable and rising desire to experiment with the resources of the language and in particular with the lexicon.

The complexity of Shakespearean language has brought about many scholarships around the world as the level of understanding, especially in the educational domain, demanded considerable effort and manifold attempts. The 17th century Shakespearean language comprising of unfamiliar terms definitely do not allow the readers and audience alike to grasp the gist of what is being conveyed. For instance, in *Romeo and Juliet*, Shakespeare uses the term '**wherefore**' (why) when Juliet questions about Romeo's name “*Wherefore dost thou leave?*” OR “*Romeo, Romeo, wherefore art thou Romeo?*” (Shakespeare, Act 2, Sc.2). These utterances lead the recipients to a toss as we wonder about the exact concise meaning of what is being said. In this way, the Bardic figure was beyond the reach of many. However, with the emergence of linguistic devices, revisionists of Shakespeare's plays did not forget to tackle the complicated language to reach a wider audience and readership. With the plethora of Appropriations namely Smiley's *A Thousand Acres*, Warner's *Indigo*, Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* and Cahoot's *Macbeth*, among others have aptly juggled with the language whereby they adapted it into modern accessible English which can touch anyone. The level of difficulty

has considerably reduced in the better understanding of the original texts of Shakespeare. The simplicity of the appropriated texts though laced with preoccupying issues is no longer a mental slavery for us. The propensity of the contemporary appropriated Shakespearean scholars has even touched the world of children's narratives through comics.

3.1 Conclusion

The polyphonic modern and postmodern writers have made metamorphoses Shakespeare within both time and space, and content and form to reach out to a wider number of audience and readers. The debate about Shakespeare is an infinite one as we still wonder why he is relevant to us in our highly sophisticated world. Why is it that writers feel the need to deconstruct his plays apart from the many reasons already discussed in academia? We can even go to the extent of thinking about a 'Shakespeareless' Literary world!

References

- Arnold, Matthew. *The Poetical Works of Matthew Arnold*. Ed C. B. Tinker and H. F. Carey. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1950. print.
- Banerji, Sankar. Lal. (ed). *An Outline History of Literary Criticism (Theory and Practice)*. Delhi: Signature Books International. 2011. Print.
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory*. 3rd ed. London: Manchester University Press, 2009. print.
- Blanchot, Maurice. *The Writing of the Disaster*. Trans. Ann Smock. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1986. print.
- Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: the Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead, 1998. print.
- Bradbrock, M. C. *The Sources of Macbeth. Aspects of Macbeth*. Kenneth Muir & Philip Edwards, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. print.
- Brassel, Tim. *Tom Stoppard: an Assessment*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985. print.
- Eagleton, Terry. *William Shakespeare*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986. print
- Eliot, T. S. *Elizabethan Essays*. New York: Haskell House, 1964. print
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Representative Men: Seven Lectures*. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1883. Print.
- Gross, John, ed. *After Shakespeare: An Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. print
- Hawkes, Terence, ed. *Alternative Shakespeares*. Vol. 2. London: Routledge, 1996. print
- Hazlitt, William. *Lectures on the English Poets*. London: Taylor and Hessey, 1818. print
- Holderness, Graham. *Textual Shakespeare: Writing and the Word*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2003. print
- Huang, Alexander. *Shakespeare, Performance, and Autobiographical Interventions*: New York Pennsylvania State University, 2006. print
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York and London: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Marowitz, Charles. *Recycling Shakespeare*. London: Macmillan, 1991. print
- Marsden, Jean I, ed. *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991. print.
- Marsden, Jean I., ed. *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: The Works and the Myth*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheat sheaf. 1991. print.
- Morgan, Kenneth O. *The Oxford Illustrated History of Britain*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. print.
- Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London: Routledge, 2006. print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Romeo & Juliet*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Classics. 1957. Print.
- . *King Lear*. New York: Signet Classics. 1963. Print.
- . *Tempest*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books 1623. Print.

Singh, Jyotsna. *The Postcolonial/Postmodern Shakespeare. Shakespeare: WorldViews*. London: Associated University Presses, 1996.print.

Smiley, Jane. *A ThousandAcres*.New York: Alfred A.Knopf, 1991.print.

Stoppard, Tom.*Cahoot's Macbeth*. London: Faber, 1980.print.

Taylor, Gary. 1989. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present*. London: Hogarth Press, 1991.print.

Taylor, Gary. *Afterword: The Incredible Shrinking Bard,Shakespeare and Appropriation*.Ed. Christy Desmet and Robert Sawyer. London: Rout ledge, 1999.print.

Warner, Marina. *Indigo/Mapping the Waters*.London: Vintage, 1993.print.

Web Sources

Brauner, David."Speak Again":The Politics of Rewriting in "A Thousand Acres".
Web.www.jstor.org/stable/3736736.10/07/2014

Camati, Anna Ategh. "Textual Appropriation: Totalitarian Violence in Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and Tom Stoppard's Cahoots' *Macbeth*". Web.<https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/desterro/article/download/.../6725>. 14 July 2014.

Clara, Calvo."Shakespeare and the Press: the Ideological Appropriation of Romeo and Juliet".Web.http://www.sederi.org/docs/yearbooks/06/6_2_calvo.pdf. 10/07/2014

Graham, Holderness. "Dressing Old Words New": Shakespeare, Science, and Appropriation".
Web.<http://www.borrowers.uga.edu/781442/10/07/2014>

Hall, Kelley J. "Putting the Pieces Together: Using Jane Smiley's "A Thousand Acres" in Sociology of Families". Web.<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1318586>. 10/07/2014

Huang, Alexander C. Y. "Shakespeare, Performance, and Autobiographical Interventions". University of Pennsylvania. Web.https://www.academia.edu/311890/Shakespeare_Performance_and_Autobiographical_Interventions. 15 July 2014.

Kelly, Philipa. "What Breeds about Her Heart: "King Lear", Feminism, and Performance".Web.<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41917389>. 10/07/2014

Propst, Lisa G. Unsettling Stories: Disruptive Narrative Strategies in Marina Warner's "Indigo" and "The Leto Bundle". Web. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29533934>. 10/07/2014 Richard, Wilson. "Voyage to Tunis: New History and the Old World of "The Tempest". Web<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30030140>.10/07/2014

Taylor, Patricia R. "Criminal Appropriations of Shakespeare in Jasper Fforde's "Something Rotten".
Web.<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27917763>. 10/07/2014

Comic Anagrorisis in Shakespeare: A Reading of *Goodnight Desdemona (Good Morning Juliet)*

Re-writing Shakespeare is justified in Ben Jonson's statement that Shakespeare "is not for an age but for all time". The writings of Shakespeare assume space in every theoretical and critical innovation down the ages. Modernism and Post-modernism contributed much to the fresh readings of Shakespeare breaking all the spatio temporal fixation of his dramatic ambience. The present paper is on a contemporary reworking of Shakespeare's *Othello* And *Romeo and Juliet* bringing them to realms of psychology, gender studies, archetypal concerns, post structuralist notions like intertextuality and above all the postmodernist notion of anti-foundationalism of genres.

Goodnight Desdemona (Good Morning Juliet) is a revision of Shakespeare's *Othello* and *Romeo and Juliet* where Constance Ledbelly, a drab and dusty academic, deciphers a cryptic manuscript she believes to be the original source for the tragedies, and is transported into the plays themselves. She visits Juliet and Desdemona, has a hand in saving them, and finds out what these women are about. In true Shakespearean spirit, Constance plunders the plays and creates something new, all the while engaging in a personal voyage of self-discovery. With an abundance of twists, fights, dances, seductions, and wild surprises, the play is an absolute joy of theatricality

Constance Ledbelly, an assistant professor at Queen's University and ghost-writer for Professor Claude Night. She's struggling to finish her doctoral thesis in which she tries to prove that Shakespeare took the plots of *Romeo and Juliet* and *Othello* from an unknown writer who had written them originally as comedies. The play begins when Constance is trying to decipher what she considers to be the original manuscript which would prove her hypothesis. Then, after receiving several bad news, on the day of her birthday she falls directly into the plays she was studying, literally, going on a journey through time, becoming a character in both stories. The simple fact of her presence takes the power of deciding the destiny of the story from Shakespeare, changing the canonical plays. But that is not enough for her, who begins to interfere consciously in the course of the plots, altering the situations imagined by the author, changing the destinies of the female characters, saving Desdemona and Juliet from death

These characters are parts of her inner world, figments of her own active and creatively green imagination and hence aspects of herself. The obvious and the most meaningful of them are Desdemona and Juliet, for Constance's versions of Shakespeare heroines are different from Shakespeare's and this is part of *goodnight's Desdemona's* wise foolishness or serious delight.

Constance hopes to prove that Shakespeare's Desdemona is a "watered down" version of character who, in Shakespeare's lost source text, is a fearless amazon- a female warrior eager to meet the Turkish foe on Cyprus.

In the same way Constance's comic revision of Juliet takes the impetus and intense love of Shakespeare's fourteen year old heroine-and the fickleness for which teenagers are famed- and turns her into an insatiable seductress whose sensuality makes sailing "straight" a comic impossibility in gender-bending Verona. If Constance's Desdemona is an Amazonian warrior, a female version Mars, God of war, her Juliet is a version of Venus, Goddess of love and sensuality. Through the course of the drama we revel as Constance finds and reaffirms her self-confidence and frees herself from the harmful influence of her mentor, who up until then had manipulated her and passed her work off as his own.

In Constance theory these versions of Shakespeare's excellent heroines belong in happy comedies rather than in tragedies about ill-fated or star-crossed love. Constance believes that she can explain certain flaws in Othello, and in Romeo and Juliet. At these weak points in their plots, and she theorizes, Shakespeare removed a Wise Fool, a character who was present in the lost source texts for these plays. The timely intervention of this Wise fool in Act III, scene III of Othello would have prevented the moor from believing Iago's lie about the handkerchief. A similar kind of intervention is speculated by Constance in Act III, scene I of Romeo and Juliet that would prevent Romeo from accidentally allowing Tybalt to slay Mercutio, the dramatic moment that turned the lovers' wedding day to a tragic blood bath. In the lost original versions of these plays, Constance believes, a Wise Fool defused these climatic moments, thereby assuming center stage as a comic hero.

MacDonald uses the technique of play-within-a-play; the protagonist in this play investigates the authorship of two Shakespearean tragedies and mentions several fictional dramatic characters. Constance comments on the plot structure and characters of both Othello and Romeo and Juliet. In the second act, however, things become more complicated. Constance is transported into the Shakespearean world and enters the two plays. She is certainly aware of the fact that she has been warped into a fictional world and even comments on the act and scene division: "My god. Perhaps I'm on an acid trip. / What if some heartless student spiked my beer?! / [stops counting] Nonsense. This is my head, this is my / pen, this is Othello, Act III, Scene iii" (34). Furthermore, Constance, the protagonist of the frame play, actually interacts with both 'interplays'. She rewrites the Shakespearean stories by intervening in the plot. According to Bradley, this play "draws our attention to storytelling . . . and the extent to which stories can be changed, re-written, and re-told" (337). Constance is aware of the destructive consequences of her actions: "I've wrecked a masterpiece. I've ruined the play, / I've turned Shakespeare's Othello to a farce". Meta-comments like this one, indicate the character's awareness of what is happening and remind the audience of the fictional nature of the play.

Moreover, Constance also interprets her own role in the play. She compares herself to the commonly used 'deus ex machina' device of Greek tragedy, a higher force or divinity (deus) that suddenly intervened and provided a contrived solution to the conflicts of the characters: "I entered, deus ex machina, / And Desdemona will not die, / Because I dropped in from the sky ..." (33). At the end of the play, she realises she "defuse[d] the tragedies by assuming centre stage as comic hero," and re-examines her role: "*I'm the Fool!*"(14,87). This is a clear example of meta-comedy: a comic figure that comments on its own comic role as wise fool. When Constance wants to leave the interplay, she asks: "Where's the exit?!" She positions herself as a spectator, a member of the audience who can leave whenever she wants. However, Constance has altered the original development of action

and is now trapped as an active character in both stories. She argues it is “just a play,” it is merely an illusion.

Constance experiences the events from the sidelines, like the audience. She continuously shatters the dramatic illusion and undermines the verisimilitude of the events to reassure herself. She even mentions the artificiality of the special effects, for instance, the use of fake blood. Throughout the play, Constance is aware of the improbability of her own experience. When she enters into contact with a ghost, she asks “What play is this?,” since the ghost reminds her of another play, *Hamlet*. It is worth noting that both Shakespeare and MacDonald make use of asides, soliloquies and monologues.

The most important of MacDonald's postmodern script that sees key characters as conflicting aspects of Constance's own psyche is that self reconciliation will be a driving energy in the action. MacDonald displays her abilities as an intellectual playwright in this dense and intertextual play. The humour of this adaptation plays on the audience's knowledge and expectations. Therefore, the readers and spectators who have advanced knowledge of the source plays and intertexts will derive more meaning and enjoy the performance to a much higher extent. This analysis departed from the published script; however, the amount of stage directions and descriptive elements made it possible to paint a broad picture of the play, as the playwright includes information on the stage properties, scenery, costumes, and cast division.

By comparing and contrasting this adaptation with Shakespeare's works, we can see how MacDonald ingeniously recycles and transforms elements from the preceding plays. The two main source plays are *Othello* and *Romeo and Juliet*. This comparative study shows that MacDonald applies a collage technique on multiple levels. On the textual level, MacDonald undermines canonical scenes by rearranging and reassigning lines and speeches. Textual appropriation is of course also “a form of artistic recycling” (Hutcheon, *Parody* 15). The effect of this approach and illustrated the subversive technique by placing different versions of particular scenes next to each other.

By neutralizing the turning points in both plays, the Canadian playwright successfully turns Shakespeare's tragedies into comedies. MacDonald also recycles theatrical devices and conventions. The most striking aspect of this reworking, however, is on the level of characterisations. MacDonald parodies and subverts the classical representations. In this adaptation, for instance, Romeo and Juliet are no longer the idealized romantic couple. She completely reinvents the Shakespearean protagonists. By exaggerating and inflating particular characteristics, ultimately, the characters become more real, their behaviour more plausible. In addition, the foregrounding of female characters and downsizing of male presence and authority can be interpreted as MacDonald's attempt to break the Shakespearean gender stereotypes down. Similar to Shakespeare, she also uses cross-dressing as comic device. The gender bending gives rise to the exploration of sexuality and gender preferences, and results in many sexual intrigues. In short, MacDonald bends Shakespearean conventions, and blends three stories.

Goodnight Desdemona (Good Morning Juliet) parodies *Othello* and *Romeo and Juliet*, and appropriates many Shakespearean features. MacDonald preserves Shakespeare's characters, lines, style, and comic devices, but exaggerates, decontextualises, and even reinvents them. The subversion of these two canonical plays

often leads to hilarious scenes. The many witty remarks and word puns contribute to the playfulness of this play. Frequently, the subverted scenes also imply a criticism toward Shakespeare. For instance, this adaptation challenges the victimisation of female characters and highlights the improbable relationship between Romeo and Juliet. The modern playwright subverts well known scenes and characters to question the common assumptions and proposes alternative interpretations.

Shakespeare's plays were a source of inspiration for MacDonald. She revealed that her play began as a mockery, but ended up as a tribute. Indeed, the traditional adaptation model does not suffice to represent this play's complex relation to Shakespeare. On the one hand, this play challenges him, because it criticizes and subverts his plays. On the other hand,

MacDonald imitates many elements of his plays and relies on his universality, thus reinforcing his status. Bradley's new model aptly reflects the ambivalent relation between this adaptation and Shakespeare's works. The postmodern play both reaffirms and challenges the Shakespearean version at the same time. In her play *Goodnight Desdemona (Good Morning Juliet)*, MacDonald clearly assumes a double gesture toward Shakespeare: she imitates *and* distances, celebrates *and* rejects, she pays tribute *and* ventures in iconoclasm.

References:

- Bentley, Eric. *What Is Theatre?* Methuen: New York, 1952.
- Bradley, Lynne. "Meddling with Masterpieces: the On-going Adaptation of *King Lear*." Diss. University of Victoria, 2008. 20 July 2009 <<http://dspace.library.uvic.ca:8080/bitstream/1828/1343/1/Meddling%20with%20masterpieces.pdf>>.
- Burnett, Linda. "Redescribing a World: Towards a Theory of Shakespearean Adaptation in Canada." *Canadian Theatre Review* 111 Summer 2002: 5-9.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero With a Thousand Faces*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968.
- Carson, Christie. "An Eclectic Collection of Adaptations." Rev. of *Adaptations of Shakespeare: A Critical Anthology of Plays from the 17th Century to the Present*, by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier. *Canadian Theatre Review* 111 Summer 2002: 101-103.
- Cohn, Ruby. *Modern Shakespeare Offshoots*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1976.
- Djordjevic, Igor. "Goodnight Desdemona: from Shakespearean tragedy to postmodern satyr
- Hortmann, Wilhelm. "Hybridization: A New Trend in German Shakespeare Productions." *Shakespeare and European Politics*. Ed. Dirk Delabastita, Jozef De Vos, and Paul Franssen. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008: 196-211.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York and London: Routledge, 2006.
- . *A Theory of Parody: The Teaching of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*. New York: Methuen, 1985.
- Keunen, Bart. *Verhaal en verbeelding: Chronotopen in de westerse verhaalcultuur*. Ghent: Academia Press, 2007.

Enigma in Representation of the Other: a Critical Analysis of Shakespeare's Othello.

'Orient' - the land to the end of the West is realm of mysteries, muddles and source of factitious and historical stores knowledge for the west. Western civilization since became the yardsticks of the progress and of the humanity – the binaries of the orient and occident turned out to be a content of position and counter positions in the academic realm of discourse. The western discourse based on superiority of the west over its eastern counterpart captured even the domain of the creative writes from time immemorial. The fact of the matter is that the west has failed to catch the merits of oriental culture and civilization in their true letter and spirit. Instead they tried to explore a myopic and distorted picture of this exotic world of religion, culture and their offshoots. This discursive practice has a number of limitations in understanding the other cultures especially Africans and Arabs etc. their biased notions are spread through histories, creative writings, travel writings, and chronicles of politics and religion.

Shakespeare, the prolific playwright of all times, is unable to come out of the notions of western prejudice against the oriental other, a historical unending racism practiced by the west. The alarming twister in this continual aberration is that those who studied with vehement criticism like Edward Said and others also failed to do justice to sympathetically treat the Moors- Moroccan African aboriginals this in more systematic way despite being more homogeneous with European culture, distinguished from Arab ethnic attributes. The European travelers also did not throw light on the cultural diversity and positive characteristics illustrated in their ways of life. He draws the Oriental sources as one of the major sources of his plays. The distinctive feature of the representation of Orient in his works informs diverse critical perspectives. His characters based on Arab ethnicity is marked for their distorted images they project themselves with their respective cultural manifestations. The character of Othello in the play Othello as Moor reflects the general tendency recurrent in the European towards the portrayal of Oriental characters in general Muslims in particular. In some of his plays he shows some positive traits of the Islamic world especially Arabs in particular within its cultural and heritage of the civilization in addition to natural resource; nevertheless, the racial complex crated out of some his works point out lack of proper attention, ambivalence and uncertainty in creating accuracy of the knowledge about the other culture and its attributes. His treatment of Arab characters is basically focused on the ethnic intricacy existed between Europeans and the other parts of the world especially the East. The representation of the character of Othello epically the way Iago's words of diatribe and expression of animosity explicitly reflect the age-old conspiracy of the west against its alter-entities say east, Islam, Arabs and Africa. This rendering brings into focus the recurrent aberrations existed /existing in western derivative cultural constructs including European drama. A creative genius of Shakespeare's stature also succumbs to this erroneous move of allusions of misconceived and misjudged nature written out of the chronicles, annals and other sources of history based on mediaeval kings,

princes, captains and other noble personages. Moreover, imagery of darkness and light-binaries of white and black as in America are also repeatedly used in the play. In the very beginning, Iago and Roderigo by calling him as Moor. He is described as dehumanized or as even animal. Thou make your daughter covered with a 'Barbary horse'; you'll have your nephew reign to you Moreover, imagery of darkness and light.

Representation of Othello as the European Alterity :

Other / otherness used in critical discourse in different ways recently. Otherness indicates the quality or state of existence of being other or different from established norms and social groups, the difference in terms of one's self and others with special in matters of related to sexual, cultural, ethnic and even religious distinctions frequently referred since Lacanian psychoanalytical critical tools became popular. According to this there are two polar meanings of the two terms – the other and the Other. The former relates to one which is not really other, but it is the reflection and projection of the ego and the latter signifies a radical alterity irreducible to any imaginary or subjective identification. Here in Othello as a Moor is repeatedly referred in the play as the alter-ego of Iago who in Coleridge's phrase 'is motiveless malignity' turns out to be a meaningless reference as repeated allusion to him as 'Moor' 'black',. The image of Oriental characters in general and Arabs in particular in the Elizabethan audience was not to be educated as much Shakespeare does in his plays. There are many references to his colour in the play by emphasizing on the darkness versus fairness or light. The choice of words largely indicates the racial or genealogical origin of Othello, as the Moor by reminding the Elizabethan audience about an outside like him. As Clifford Geertz (2000: 51) puts :

'... The approaches to the definition of human nature adopted by the Enlightenment and by classical anthropology have one thing in common: they are both basically typological. They endeavour to construct an image of man as a model, an archetype, a Platonic idea or an Aristotelian form, with respect to which actual men-you, me, Churchill, Hitler and the Bohemian headhunter – are but reflections, distortions, approximations.. The differences among individuals and among groups of individuals are secondary. Individuality comes to be seen as eccentricity, distinctiveness ... as accidental deviation from the only legitimate object of study².

Racism as a phenomenon has created much hue and cry in the Cultural history of Europe in particular, as it is assumed that people can be judged as per the racial stereo types, attributed to them. Othello the central character is presented with his positive personal attributes; nonetheless, when he is described by Iago his entire personality is undermined or looked down upon as inferior to any other character of the play. The playwright describes his strength as the military hero with vigour and vivacity and it comes to throw light on his past, he is represented as a an alter-ego to European schemes of things with all those negative tenets of an African barber, circumcised as a Muslim, religiously other Christianity. The play highlights the racial tension and increases hatred towards the ethnic other character like Othello especially when Iago speaks about the perils involved in having sex with human beings and animals. This hints the jealous Iago who wanted to marry Desdemona. He describes Othello as 'beast with two back'. This vulgar expressions used for Barbaric people is not natural but a deliberate. Having in mind the Structuralist critical perspective of binary polarities, this play is a clear illustration of analogy. According to

Saussure, words are arranged in pairs where a contradictory relationship links between them. The binary of light and the dark is more important in this regard. Desdemona is a representation of fairness and she is the other of darkness of her protagonist. The relation between the main characters is described to distinguish this binary polarities.-not only dark and fair, black and white, European and African, Christian and Muslim and oppressed and oppressor etc. Throughout the play this schism overrides above everything. For Elizabethan audience it is obvious to cannot the word 'Moor' nothing sort of positive sort of attribute; rather, a mean and dubious character with Oriental bearing, uncivilized kind of voluptuous human physique with much power and vitality devoid of so called 'enlightenment' the European countries possessed for the last many centuries. This may be also looked in terms of the history of the west which was in deep crisis due to the spread of enlightenment across Spain and Sicily during the Arab occupation of Spain for few countries and dismantling of some of Europeans countries especially Portuguese and France in during fourteenth century. Frederici S.(Sardar,1997) writes :

Only in the aftermath of the nineteenth century colonial penetration of India, China, and the Middle East did the West take on a more prominent political rule, as the signifier of Europe's imperial project. It was at this time that it began to include the United States, previously referred to as the 'New World' and to merge with the concept of 'civilization', the term coined by the Enlightenment philosophers to describe the aim of social evolution, which they identified with the processes and institutions marking the development of private property, the family and monetary relations³

In the play Act 1, scene 1 Rodrigo calls him as Moor and Iago says 'I the Moor, I would not be'. He abuses him as 'black', 'lascivious' gross clasps of a moor', as 'damned' and 'the beast with two backs'. Brabantio is also not less calls him as 'down with him, thief'. In the Act 1, Scene 2, Desdemona praises Othello who confesses himself his 'the vices of my blood' and in the next scene, he tells his past as he was 'sold to slavery, and my redemption thence'. Shakespeare has a smack of this colonialist European agenda of depiction of the polarities of the Self/Other throughout the play as Iago turns out to be his mouth piece. The very redemption, biblical in connotation informs the religious strategy of the text underlines. His use of the word, 'lust of the blood' once again reinforces the calculated motives of the villain who says about himself as nothing, if not critical' (Act 2, Scene 1). This criticism is not individual centric, rather racial and religion, colour and skin –centric. He calls him lust, lascivious, lecherous and black, all associated with venomous hate-speech. F.R.Leavis finds him knave and sans wisdom; Coleridge does not see his motives which are otherwise malign, unwarranted and biased. This diatribe is not in this play only. In Titus Andronicus and other plays also this tirade with racial mindset is intensified the hero Andronicus is regularly described as a moor, (2.3.0 Aaron will have his soul black like his face (3. 1. 205) coal-black is better than another hue (4. 2) look how the black slave smiles upon the father (4.2.121) you thick –lippd slave (4.2.177) and the phrases like these compounding words such as veritable negro....(3.3)

The recurrent allusions to elements of otherness inform invariably the agenda of Eurocentric epistemology and discursive strategies based universalism and essentialism – the first one discerns the dominance of the west on the colonies and other economically backward countries on the world in all spheres of knowledge and the second one

substantiates the justification of the imperialism on the subjugated nations for their so called impoverishment over the years as a saviour. Shakespeare also seems to be inconsistent and uncertain while dramatizing the characters of Oriental backdrop. Sometimes he looks vague and a few other times he is so contradictory as well. This enigma needs to be deeply analyzed when Eurocentric literary and critical practices are scrutinized in the era of post-colonial discursive practices getting momentum still in countries like India and Canada. Otherness is also sometimes described as noble and brave; yet his race is the major marker of his identity. There are many instances that clarify this point from the text of the play when they addressed Othello “valiant Moor”, “brave Moor”, and “noble Moor”. The emphasis on the fact that he is a stranger or as mentioned in the play as a Moor is apparent. A fact that reveals his alienation being an outsider, someone who does not belong to the self provides him an odd space in the Venetian society. All his noble and positive features couldn't convince the Venetian society to accept him away from any racial discrimination. In Making more of the Moor the writer states that there is a contradictory vision of the Moor”, the Moor was characterized simultaneously in contradict extremes as noble or monstrous, civil or savage.

Religious Discrimination in *Othello*:

Another dimension of discrimination is at the religious grounds. Shakespeare aspires to remind the audience that Moor is not Christian. To do so, he presents many words that signify anti-Christian association. The sectarian distinction is so obvious and central in the entire make up of Othello's character as he does not believe in Christianity. Sometimes he is described as 'devil' or even more he is related to 'sin'; all these are signs signifying religious hatred and insularity against the Muslim Moor. This contrast, also points the negative moral associated with his character. So, there is an obvious that racial discrimination of Oriental character reveals the attitude towards the Other culture in the Elizabethan period. The Moors were looked down upon, then, as barbaric and uncivilized; while the west is distinguished as superior and enlightened.

Othello believed that his conversion from Islam to Christianity would give him a special privilege amongst the fellow Christians more civilized and reformed. But, ironically this did not give him any edge over the other blacks; on the other he was demonized as he is a Moor, an Arab or an outsider. His positive attributes do not give him any significance in the representation of 'exotic' and energetic. He is regarded as an honourable murderer. The references which focus him as a person with extraordinary bravery and valour. Even more, he is identified himself as warrior, brave leader and courageous soldier. His romantic nature is also idealized in the play apart from his military eminence and a tough fighter. This point, as put by Bradley in *Shakespearean Tragedy* as he is the most romantic figure amongst Shakespeare's heroes. Here in this play his romantic nature is under question due to 'emotions excites his imaginations, but it confuses and dulls his intellect'⁴ 'He does not belong to our world, he seems to enter it, we know not whence... almost as if from wonder land. There is something thing mysterious in his descent from men of royal siege' (Bradley 187)

Not only his mysterious nature but negative attributes create damage on his character. His cruelty is much more highlighted in hyperbole. He is seen as one who does not deserve the noble and fair Desdemona as he does not know how to deal with Venetian lady with sophisticated as he 'is not Italian, nor even European; that he is totally ignorant of

the thoughts and customary morality of Venetian woman' (ibid 193). Uncertainty, ambiguity, mystery and muddle of portrayal of Othello lies in the fact there is an enigma of how to depict the Other with all its negative attributes and occasional allusions to the Arabian perfumes, resources, exoticism associated with Orient only in terms of its enchanting beauty without any humane feelings of sympathy, compassion and fellow-feeling as equal as any one.

Like other European writers, Shakespeare also presents a distorted image of Moors, Turks and other Muslim ethnic characters. Even the allusions have some semblance of ambivalence and uncertainty. The prejudiced image of the cultural other as a historical legacy of the representation of the West turns out to become a continuum with Shakespearean characters of Morocco, Aragon, Othello and other characters with an ambience of Orient. Othello, though not popular as Macbeth, King Lear or Hamlet, is so profound and deep as a work of art with beautiful imagery, human instincts of love, jealousy, hatred, politics and animal imagery, the exploration of the racial stereotypes Arab character as superstitious dealing with superstitious and naïve who could easily be tricked, religious and racism with ideological bearing, Islam phobia is dominant through the whole play. While analyzing the new historicist critical tools of Stephen Greenblatt and Foucauldian critical practices, we reach to find some alarming but disturbing truths that European agenda of the 'Masques of Conquest' unearthed such as threat of Europe with colonial mission, so called enlightenment mission initiated by the West on the East and above all, the impact of the fall of Constantinople on the geopolitics of the world in the fifteenth century.

Briefly speaking, the Shakespearean plays have to be analyzed not simply in terms of Elizabethan world picture as Tyllard, nor simply analyzing the psychological connotations as Coleridge, Bradley or in terms of hypothetical counting of the children of lady Macbeth as done by L.C. Knights or merely discussing them as per the wheel of fortunes engaged by Wilson Knights; they may not merely be confined to the moralistic or dogmatic conjectures negotiated by F.R. Leavis. Rather, they are to be discerned as a discourse inter-linked with their large and diversified perspective the focus of which should be by locating the texts to their socio-political and cultural poetics of the time. They are to be negotiated not simply with Tudor Dynasty or Elizabethan era with glorification of beauty or the phenomenon of Renaissance, on the other hand, their ramifications foregrounded by colonial interests of the European expansion, large-scale human miseries associated with imperial designs with hatred propaganda against the racial other and sectarian positions and counter positions. Justice is not done to the Shakespearean criticism as it was a limited exercise to the European domination on the non-European socio-political and racial-geographical entities.

1. Othello, The Shakespearean Arden Edition. E.A.J. Honigmann (ed.), 1967.
2. Clifford Geertz : The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books, 2000, p.51
3. Ziauddin Sardar, Orientalism, It is the work discussing the impact of Eurocentric discursive practices on the Other in detail. He starts from where Edward Said (1977) stopped with special focus on Islamic communities, Arabs and Africans who are not referred much in Said's magnum opus work.

4. (A..C.Bradley , Shakerpean Tragedy 1905: 186, 187) . His studies are limited with psychological insights interlinked with the major characters of Shakespearean's tragedies. His studies are consciously silent the under currents of racism, essentialism and Euro-centrism implied in these texts

References

Said Edward (1977) : Orientalism : London : Kegan Paul.

Kidwai, A. R (2007): The Crescent and the Cross : Image of Orient in English Literature up to 1832:Aligarh

Sardar Ziaudheen(1997) : Orientalism: London :Open University Press..

Shakespeare William : Othello. Arden Shakespeare Series, E.A.J.Honigmann(ed.),1967 Edition.

Geertz : The Interpretation of Cultures.New York: Basic Books,2000Print.

Kochler Hans: 'Colure and Empire : The Imperial Claim to Cultural Supremacy versus the Dialectics of Cultural Identity“ Second Peoples Forum ,International Progressive Orgaizations, March 2000, Web, 18 Nov 2011.

Drakakis John(ed) (1985): Alternative Shakespeares: London: Routledge, . 2002 edition

Pennycook Alastair (1998) English and the Discourses of Colonialism: London and New York, Routledge.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM



Singularities
a transdisciplinary biannual research journal

ISSN No: 2348 – 3369.

Name : _____

Address : _____

Tel : _____

Mob : _____

E-mail : _____

Choose the type of subscription required :

1 - Year - Rs. 800
[2014 Volume 1 Issue 1 (January) & 2 (July)]

2 - Years - Rs. 1500
[2015 Volume 1 Issue 1 (January) & 2 (July)]

Mode of payment towards subscription is as follows :

Online transfer on State Bank of Travancore,
Citi Point Shopping Mall Manjeri.

Name of the Account : Department of English Fund

Branch Code : 71023

Account number : 67267390497

IFS Code : SBTR 0001023

MICRCode : 676009054

Signature :

Date :

Postgraduate Department of English

Korambayil Ahamed Haji Memorial

UNITY WOMEN'S COLLEGE

Manjeri, Malappuram, Kerala.

www.singularities.in



Singularities
a transdisciplinary biannual research journal