

# 1

## *Shakespeare and the Theatre*

Paul Prescott

*R: Do you think that all this and the rest of it can be read in the play?*

*B: Read in it and read into it.*

BERTOLT BRECHT, 'STUDY OF THE FIRST SCENE OF SHAKESPEARE'S *CORIOLANUS*', 1953

*'Why don't you let them see Othello instead?'*

*'I've told you; it's old. Besides, they couldn't understand it.'*

*Yes, that was true. He remembered how Helmholtz had laughed at Romeo and Juliet. 'Well then,' he said, after a pause, 'something new that's like*

*Othello, and that they could understand.'*

*'That's what we've all been wanting to write,' said Helmholtz, breaking a long silence.*

ALDOUS HUXLEY, *BRAVE NEW WORLD*, 1932

Two Shakespearean negotiations of the past and the future: 1950s Soviet Berlin and London in the year AD 2540. The first epigraph offers a documentary insight into the creative process: Bertolt Brecht and a collaborator discussing the Berliner Ensemble's adaptation of *Coriolanus*. Brecht's colleague is vexed about fidelity and, specifically, whether the Ensemble's pro-plebeian version of *Coriolanus* is faithful to Shakespeare's original text. Brecht's response is only partly reassuring. The second, a fictional account of the problems of creative reproduction in the antiseptic future imagined in Huxley's *Brave New World*. Here the taste of the society has changed so much (has indeed been forcibly

changed) that audiences are no longer equipped for, or sympathetic to, the tragic ethos of *Othello*. In both cases, something new is required: Shakespeare's legacy is both an obstacle and an opportunity. A creative solution needs to be grappled from two related problems. How do you make a Shakespeare play do and say what you want it to? How do you make something new, but something new that's *like* a Shakespeare play? These might be viewed as evolutionary problems, relating as they do to the impulse to adapt and make something fit in order for it to survive and the adaptor to prosper. 'Something new that's like *Othello*' – evolution is mutation; adaptation is repetition with a difference.

Over the last four centuries, Shakespeare's works have proved to be extremely 'adaptogenic' (a relatively recent word, but also one that Huxley might have invented) and nowhere have they been so creatively refashioned and reproduced as in their natural habitat, the theatre. Shakespeare's creative legacy to the theatre is to have left it a matchless collection of plays, a stupefyingly generous benefaction to the primary legatees, the theatre artists of the world. According to the *OED*, a legacy can be: 'A sum of money, or a specified article, given to another by will' (II.5a). As a so-called 'public good', Shakespeare's works are characterized by their non-excludability and non-rivalry in consumption. In other words, and unlike the resources bequeathed in most legacies or wills, his works can be consumed by all without being depleted. Perhaps the opposite is true: the more often Shakespeare's plays are used, the more they grow as a resource of creative capital in the world bank of culture.

Shakespeare didn't mention his works in the three pages that constitute his last will and testament. Part of his creative legacy is therefore not to have been explicit on the subject of what his works meant and how they should be performed. It is pleasant to think that, even if Shakespeare had written elaborate staging and set directions and a range of paratextual commentaries, he might nevertheless have taken the liberal and permissive attitude of a modern playwright like, for example, Peter Shaffer. Shaffer wrote in his Introduction to the revised version of *Amadeus* that, in publishing detailed stage directions based on the original production, 'it is no part of my desire to imprison the play in one particular presentation; still less to encourage the automatic borrowing of an original director's ideas by future interpreters. I hope that *Amadeus* will enjoy a vigorous life in many differing productions.'

Whether Shakespeare willed it or not, all of his plays have enjoyed varied and vigorous afterlives on the world's stages. Some of these productions have sought to be faithful to presumed authorial intention or to the original conditions of performance; more often theatre-makers have sought to please themselves and their audiences by fashioning the texts to speak to contemporary tastes and concerns, and by harnessing the latest theatrical technology to convey the story as spectacularly or sensually as possible. Whatever they think they're doing – whether reading *in* or reading *into*, presenting the 'authentic' *Othello* or 'something new that's like *Othello*' – all theatre-makers are engaged in an act of collaborative co-creation with Shakespeare's legacy. All of these acts create new works that are, as Sir Toby Belch might have it, 'consanguineous', blood-related to Shakespeare's texts; the family resemblance will sometimes be clear, sometimes remote.

What follows is a non-exhaustive lexicon of adaptive tactics that practitioners can and have used in response to Shakespeare's dramatic works. Most of these relate to the creative theatrical work of playwrights, actor-managers, dramaturges and directors. The creativity of the actor would require a different lexicon and the creative contributions (often crucial) of choreographers, composers, set and lighting designers, fight directors et al. would require a much more technical vocabulary. Most of the creative artists and works cited here are, for the curious, only a search-engine click away. (And while the presence of individual names might appear to support a romantic or heroic view of creativity, it is worth noting that nearly every individual here has depended on the industry and invention of others to realize their vision.) I have tried wherever possible to present the concept as an activity, process or action – something that people can and have done *to* and *with* Shakespeare's texts, or with the themes and ideas suggested by them. I hope this modest lexicon might even prove useful in inspiring (or purging) the temporarily 'blocked' creative artist faced with the task of making Shakespeare (or something new that's like Shakespeare) 400 years after the playwright's death.

\*\*\*

**Adaptation** – a catch-all word for a piece of theatre modelled on or inspired by a work or works of Shakespeare. Etymologically: to fit to a new context (with

Darwinian under- and overtones). Much ink has been spilled in assessing the finer taxonomical distinctions between what counts as an adaptation, an offshoot, an appropriation, a spin-off, etc. Some argue (plausibly) that every production of a Shakespearean play – no matter how apparently ‘faithful’, straight or neutral – is in fact an adaptation, involving as it (usually) must cutting and other key interpretative choices relating to casting, scenography, direction, costume and the vast array of non-verbal meaning generated by any performance.

**Animalization** – the introduction of live (non-human) animals to charm, thrill, amuse or provoke philosophical reflection. Relatively rare. Shakespeare definitely calls for it once (the dog Crab in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*), and some argue that the Bear that pursued Antigonus to his exit in the first performances of *The Winter's Tale* was a real example of the species. Creative examples in theatre after the early modern period include horses (typically in productions of Roman or English history plays), rabbits (Herbert Beerbohm Tree's 1900 *A Midsummer Night's Dream*), and the occasional non-venomous asp (*Antony and Cleopatra*). Writer and critic Henry Chance Newton (1854–1931) recalled ‘several condensed versions of *Hamlet* in which we used a real dog star to work the *dénouement*’. ‘F. R. Benson's idea of Caliban was to come on stage with a fish [presumably deceased] in his mouth’ complained Edward Gordon Craig. *King Lear With Sheep* – a one-man, nine-ovine affair that handsomely delivers on its title – is playing in London at the time of writing.

**Archaeological** – an approach to staging Shakespeare in which the historical settings of the play's fictional locales are realized with elaborate accuracy. Especially popular in the nineteenth century or during any period undergoing a craze for classicism. Actor-manager Charles Kean (1811–68) was proud to list the affiliation ‘F.S.A’ (Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries) after his name. Often a form of super-sizing in which maximal human and non-human resources are thrown at the production in the hope of overwhelming – or simply outnumbering – the audience. But also a meme in the discourse of creativity; artists and critics alike are fond of metaphors drawn from archaeology and one will often find them mining the text's many layers,

uncovering nuggets of gold or truth, brushing the dust off to reveal the original in all its pristine brilliance, etc.

**Burlesque** – from the Italian (*burla*) for mockery; a skittish, playful entertainment designed solely to amuse by undercutting the solemnity or pathos of the original. Usually though not exclusively based on Shakespeare's tragedies (including tragical histories such as *Richard III*); the gap between noble original and parodic adaptation, between high and low falutin', has historically proved entertaining. 'The sacrilegious hands of the parodist do not appear to have been laid on Shakespeare much before the end of the eighteenth century' noted R. Farquharson Sharp in 1920, before concluding, more in sorrow than in anger: 'the appeal of such things arises from their pandering to the low liking, which persists in human nature, for seeing solemn things made to look absurd'. The nineteenth century was one of the golden ages of Shakespearean burlesque or 'travestie' as it was more commonly known – witness such titles as: *King Lear and his Daughters Queer* (1830), *Macbeth Modernized; A Most Illegitimate Drama* (1838), *Hamlet the Ravin' Prince of Denmark; or, The Baltic Swell and the Diving Belle* (1866). The postmodern period (whenever that started) has also proved congenial to pastiche and parody; the Reduced Shakespeare Company's *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (Abridged)* has played across the globe since 1987. History has so far corroborated George Bernard Shaw's opinion that 'Shakespeare will survive any possible extremity of caricature'.

**Casting** – arguably the most important act of theatre-making, all too often executed without creativity, imagination or risk. The stage must be peopled and what those people look and sound like, where they come from, and what they represent has implications for the audience experience, and for the reputation of Shakespeare within wider culture. In short: the question of who gets to speak Shakespeare is a political issue. Clichéd casting fulfils audience expectations and often results from unexamined conventions – we know from the text of *King Lear* that Cordelia is the youngest of the three daughters, but many productions will cast an actress that is a) blonde and b) apparently half the age of her older (darker haired) sisters, two choices for which there is scant justification in the text but which neatly pander to some regressive

cultural assumptions. A casting equivalent of Mercutio's *punto reverso* can be achieved by presenting the audience with the opposite of what it might have expected or imagined: a geriatric Romeo and Juliet in Ben Power's *q.v.* collage piece *A Tender Thing* (2009); a matriarchal monarch in Ellen Geer's selectively gender-bending *Queen Lear* (2014); a monoglot white American Othello (Bill Pullman) surrounded by bilingual (English and Norwegian) Venetians, as in Stein Winge's 2015 production in Bergen. In the words of Leah Adcock-Starr, the director of an all-female 2015 *Hamlet* in Minneapolis: 'Good Stories belong to everyone. Is Hamlet a woman's story? Yes? No? It's a Good Story [...] Sometimes it may take a [*q.v.*] re-framing (like an all-female cast) to unearth and explore the ways in which stories we think we know and believe might be about or belong to someone else, might in fact, be more ours than we first imagined.'

**Collage** – a term borrowed from the visual arts where it describes the arrangement of various objects in a delimited space. Theatre is a temporal as well as spatial art form, so the analogy isn't exact, but this term generally stands for an adaptation that has cut, rearranged and reassigned lines, as well as disrupted the order of scenes and speeches as found in the original. A quick route to defamiliarization. In relation to Shakespearean creativity, the term is synonymous with Charles Marowitz whose 'Collages' based on *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *Othello* opened the way, as he saw it, for 'zillions of interpretations of the collected works [and] countless new permutations of the plays themselves; configurations never dreamt of in Shakespeare's philosophy, or anyone else's'. See also Djanet Sears's *Harlem Duet* (1997) that creates a collage-like exploration of *Othello*, race and American history by switching between timeframes and between fiction and non-fiction.

**Copyright** – the enemy of creativity (cf. the limpet grip exerted by the Samuel Beckett estate on productions of works by that playwright). Magnificently irrelevant in the case of Shakespeare, where artists and writers are freely able to reproduce with a difference, or copywrong. In the 1980s Prince Philip suggested that American theatre companies should pay a levy every time they performed Shakespeare to help fund the building of Shakespeare's Globe in

London, but the plan came to nought and the public recitation of Shakespeare's words in America, as throughout the world, remains unregulated and untaxed.

**Cutting** – the removal of lines or scenes in the interests of clarity, accessibility, taste or train timetables. Viewed by a puritanical minority as intrinsically suspicious, although the process clearly dates from Shakespeare's own time. And given that 'only a maniac is never bored in the theatre' (Kenneth Tynan) and that 'even the Sermon on the Mount could use some cutting' (Tyrone Guthrie), it follows that only bore-proof fundamentalists truly relish every syllable of an uncut performance. An aversion to cutting can lead to the acquisition of a nickname, as it did in the case of William Bridges-Adams, the director of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre from 1919–34, known to weary punters as 'Unabridged-Adams'. Reviewing productions from which their favourite line has been excised, waggish critics are apt to declare 'this was the unkindest cut of all'.

**Decentring** – the act of refocusing the play away from its customary centre; not necessarily *Hamlet* without the Prince, but certainly *Hamlet* in which the Prince is not the main object of attention. Prime example: Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* (1966), in which the hapless pair take centre stage (and which is also an adaptation of *Waiting for Godot* that somehow evaded *q.v.* copyright fees from the Beckett estate). Decentred adaptations often seek to redress a political imbalance by focusing on underwritten characters, as in the (very different) examples of Paula Vogel's *Desdemona: A Play about a Handkerchief* (1993), Toni Morrison's *Desdemona* (2011) and Howard Barker's *Gertrude – The Cry* (2002). In otherwise 'straight' productions, decentring can sometimes happen by accident: Kenneth Tynan wrote of a 1953 Stratford-upon-Avon production that *Richard III* is 'generally regarded as a one-man show' but that in this rendering 'the man in question was the Duke of Buckingham'; this was presumably not what the director or the actor playing Richard intended.

**Domestication** – also known as indigenization – producing Shakespeare's plays in such a way that they feel, sound or look familiar and recognizable to a specific audience. This might be a case of drawing on indigenous performance

traditions, conventions and styles or of placing the play at a specific moment that resonates with the audience and allows them to make sense of the text in the light of their pre-existing historical knowledge. Yukio Ninagawa's 2015 *Hamlet* (the director's eighth distinct production of the play) featured both modes of domestication: the setting was a poor urban neighbourhood in late-nineteenth-century Japan (the cultural moment when *Hamlet* first played in the country), while the play-within-the-play was presented in a formal manner reminiscent of Kabuki theatre. Domestication often produces or is inspired by topicality: Sulayman Al Bassam's *The Al-Hamlet Summit* (2002) transplanted Shakespeare's play into the contemporary Middle East to create a political tragedy of regime change, petro-dollars and arms deals, while the riotous opening of Nuno Cardoso's 2014 production of *Coriolanus* in Lisbon clearly alluded to recent anti-austerity demonstrations in that city.

**Downsizing** – producing Shakespeare with fewer resources than obtained in original performances and/or are found in standard contemporary mainstream productions. Characterized by inexpensive costuming, minimal sets and scenery, and small casts. Can stem from economic necessity, aesthetic preference or both. Inventive doubling, trebling, quadrupling can draw attention to patterning across the play, creating echoes unimagined by the author, as well as generating audience pleasure at the actor's art and labour. Many directors and creative teams (including e.g. Deborah Warner or Cheek by Jowl) have at least begun their careers touring a small cast in the back of a van around village halls and leisure centres. One of the most enjoyable shows in the history of Shakespeare's Globe to date was Mike Alfred's pared-back and downsized 2001 production of *Cymbeline* presented with six actors in a default outfit of off-white pyjamas.

**Extraction** – creating a new piece of theatre by detaching character(s) or scene(s) from their plays. This might form a monodrama – e.g. Tim Crouch's series of one-man shows: *I, Peaseblossom*; *I, Cinna*; *I, Malvolio*; et al. – or a stand-alone entertainment (e.g. the so-called 'droll' entitled *The Grave-Makers* [c. 1650], based on 5.1 of *Hamlet*, or the Beatles' rendition of *Pyramus and Thisbe* broadcast on UK TV to celebrate Shakespeare's 400th birthday in 1964). As I write, Frank Bramwell's *King Lear (Alone)* is playing at the Buxton

Fringe Festival, a *q.v.* post-scripting concerned with Lear's 'spiritual journey following the news of Cordelia's death'. Bramwell speaks for many fans of extraction when he claims: 'By losing the other twenty-nine characters of the original play, this allows us to get inside the very thought and feelings of King Lear himself.' As here, extractions are often based on the assumption that characters have selves beyond their existence as a series of speech acts in Shakespeare's plays.

**Framing** – situating the performance of a Shakespeare play within a specific historical moment or cultural space so that it becomes, in effect, a play-within-a-play. There is at least half a precedent for this in Shakespeare: *The Taming of the Shrew* begins with a lengthy Induction but the text that survives, for whatever reason, fails to return us to the framing world at the play's conclusion. Framing spaces have included schools (Joe Calarco's *Shakespeare's R+J* [1998]) or prisons (Phyllida Lloyd's female-prison-set *Julius Caesar* [2012] and *Henry IV, 1* [2014] at the Donmar Warehouse). Other notable 'framed' productions include: George Tabori's 1966 *The Merchant of Venice as Performed in Theresienstadt*, in which Jewish prisoners performed the play for Nazi guards, and – more recently and in a different key entirely – Chris Abraham's production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Stratford Festival, Canada, 2014) which opened with a garden party celebrating a same-sex marriage (a nod to the theory that this work was originally intended as a wedding-play) and proceeded, with riotous invention, ostensibly to improvise a performance of the text drawing on the guests attending (and props typically found at) the wedding reception.

**Fumigation** – the process of deodorizing Shakespeare on the grounds of moral and/or aesthetic indecency. Henry Irving (1838–1905), for example, thought that *Troilus and Cressida* could not be put before his audience without extensive fumigation. Neo-Classical Stuarts and Georgians, squeamish Victorians, and proper Edwardians (i.e., most periods in British history) have left us plenty of entertaining examples of queasy bowdlerization. But before we in the present get too swollen with 'the enormous condescension of posterity' (in E. P. Thompson's phrase), it is worth noting that it is common for present-day Anglophone performances silently to fumigate any offhand

reference that might lead to the impression that Shakespeare was a racist or an anti-Semite. It is currently rare to hear any Benedick say of his Beatrice 'If I do not love her, I am a Jew' (*Much Ado About Nothing*, 2.3.252–3), or for Lance to demonstrate his dog's hard-heartedness by comparing it to an almost equally hard-hearted, generic Jew (*The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 2.3.10–1).

A commonly cited landmark in the history of censorship is the unlamented demise of the Lord Chamberlain in 1968, after whose departure actors disrobed en masse in raunchy shows such as John Barton's 1968 RSC *Troilus and Cressida*, a production that prompted at least one spectator (Lieutenant Colonel L. C. Gayer) to write to the *Daily Telegraph* complaining that 'Mr Barton has taken the liberty of introducing a highly sensational drunken homosexual orgy scene with no justification whatever'. It is not at all uncommon for contemporary (especially continental European) productions to treat audiences to what Lt. Col. Gayer and other fumigators would describe as 'four or five minutes of irrelevant unpleasantness'.

**Identification** – every reader or viewer of a play finds their own moments of heightened engagement, empathy and rapport with Shakespeare's works, whether through alignment with specific characters, or ideas, or combinations of words. Identification is at the centre of many actors' creative process (and, in turn, of the audience's response to their performance). Laurence Olivier realized he had to love Richard III in order to play him and audiences loved his Richard accordingly. The approach was formalized by Stanislavski and elaborated by, e.g., Strasberg in the 'Method', but the quest to identify with the character has surely been central to the actor's art since at least Shakespeare's time. The creative act is engaged by the 'Magic If' – an ethical identification that Shakespeare stages in such memorable set-pieces as Sir Thomas More's defence of refugees and Emilia's of wronged wives. It is also the case that adaptors usually feel an elective affinity with the text they are adapting, although this can sometimes be provoked by a kind of negative identification whereby irritation or anger with the Shakespearean text provokes an aggressive rewriting.

**Imitation** – wanting to write like Shakespeare – an understandable wish and the highest form of flattery but not always guaranteed to yield the desired

results. If not careful, can shade into inadvertent *q.v.* burlesque or the merely pedestrian or soporific. As Samuel Johnson pointed out: 'Almost all absurdity of conduct arises from the imitation of those we cannot resemble.' Examples: the unreadable and unstageable slew of pseudo-Shakespearean plays written in the nineteenth century; John Keats's fragment *King Stephen* (1819) is perhaps an honourable exception. More egregiously, imitations have been passed off as originals, as in the remarkable attempted forgery perpetrated on 1790s London by Samuel and William Henry Ireland. See also the fascinating case of the French playwright Jean-François Ducis (1733–1816), whose 'imitations' of Shakespeare spread across Europe in multiple new translations – often the first in that particular language – despite the fact that Ducis had written his 'imitations' without being able to read any English. No one knows quite how he pulled this off, but one sardonic contemporary, noting both Ducis's idolatrous veneration of Shakespeare and his ignorance of the English language, likened him to 'a priest without Latin.' For a successful imitation by an author who *could* read Shakespeare in English, see Pushkin's *Boris Godunov* (1825) with its unmistakable echoes of *Macbeth* and *Richard III*. Pushkin wrote that 'I imitated Shakespeare in his free and broad portrayal of characters, [and] in his careless and simple formation of plots' – imitation as liberation.

**Improvement** – the implicit goal of much creative engagement with Shakespeare. Few confess this for fear of seeming arrogant or hubristic, and tend to smuggle their 'improvements' in, just as John Barton did when he silently inserted hundreds of his own lines into his adaptation of the history plays (*The Wars of the Roses*, RSC, 1963). Others are unabashed. 'Throughout the fabric of his work', wrote the critic Max Beerbohm in 1901, 'you will find much that is tawdry, irrational, otiose – much that is, however shy you may be of admitting that it is, tedious.' The creative artist then has two options: to cut or to improve. George Bernard Shaw, Beerbohm's predecessor as reviewer on *The Saturday Review*, had an entertainingly ambivalent relationship to Shakespeare; on his more rancorous days, Shakespeare's 'legacy' carried for Shaw something of the technical meaning the word currently enjoys among computing experts: 'Designating software or hardware which, although

outdated or limiting, is an integral part of a computer system and difficult to replace.' Shaw did his best, though, not least in his *Cymbeline Refinished* (1936), which attempted to improve the final act of that play by severe cutting and by rationalizing the number of revelations; without such improvements, Shaw felt, the act was merely 'a tedious string of unsurprising *dénouements* sugared with insincere sentimentality after a ludicrous stage battle'. As Shaw pointed out in the same preface, there has also been a long tradition of improving the ends of Shakespeare's plays by 'supplying them with what are called happy endings', a practice that has 'always been accepted without protest by British audiences'.

**Improvisation** – the intentional or accidental use of Shakespeare's words or scenarios as springboards for new flights of fancy and invention. Despite Hamlet's haughty and presumptuous 'advice' to the clowns to speak no more than is set down for them, audiences have enjoyed those moments (precious because usually rare) when actors go off-script; many of the best anecdotes from theatre history consist of a split-second moment of improvisation. More systematically, improvisation is a process that channels the sometimes-aleatoric creativity of the actor in rehearsal and makes it integral to the interpretative process: Herbert Blau and his actors improvised within and around the text of *Hamlet* for a year (1975–6) before presenting the freely adaptive *Elsinore*.

**Interculturalization** – a cumbersome nonce word for an interesting phenomenon: the unleashing or creation of new meanings and dynamics by casting or setting productions in cultural contexts unknown to Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Opinion differs as to the extent of the mono- or multiculturalism of Elizabethan and Jacobean London, but we do know that every member of Shakespeare's acting company was a white, European male, many of whom would have been dependent on costume, appendages and make-up to impersonate men of other cultures and women. While some directors and companies continue to pursue these mono-cultural (and, sometimes, mono-sexual) casting practices, others are more interested in what happens when the stage becomes a meeting-ground for actors and artists from a range of cultural and national backgrounds. The German

director Karen Beier has staged *A Midsummer's Night Dream* (1995) and *The Tempest* (1997) with actors from across Europe and Israel, mostly speaking their native languages. In Beier's *Dream*, rehearsals for *Pyramus and Thisbe* consisted of an informal intercultural acting competition between proponents of different acting styles. At the time of writing, UK director Tim Supple has just embarked on a two-year project that pulls actors from all over the world into a polyglot and experimental *King Lear*, just as his earlier production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2006) featured actors from all over the Indian subcontinent in a multilingual text.

**Mashing up** – The compound word 'mash-up' was rare before the late-twentieth century, since when it has been widely used to describe a piece of music created by merging the elements of two or more existing songs or tracks. But the technique can be seen in early theatre adaptations such as William Davenant's *The Law Against Lovers* (1662), a mash-up of *Much Ado* and *Measure for Measure* and Thomas Otway's *The History and Fall of Caius Marius* (1679), an equally unlikely but intriguing combination of *Coriolanus* and *Romeo and Juliet*. More recently, the mash-up has become a staple technique of 'fan-fiction' and is therefore perhaps more common in novels and short stories than on stage, although a play such as Ann-Marie MacDonald's *Goodnight Desdemona (Good Morning Juliet)* (1988) inserts its modern-day heroine into the fictional worlds of both *Othello* and *Romeo and Juliet*.

**Modernization** – the rational assumption that contemporary audiences might enjoy a rendition of Shakespeare that looks and sounds like the present. A specific form of *q.v.* domestication. Modernization is primarily conveyed visually, and some element of modern-dress costuming has featured in Shakespearean production from Shakespeare's day to the present. It has been increasingly common since early pioneers like Barry Jackson, whose series of three modern-dress productions at Birmingham Rep in the 1920s (*Cymbeline*, 1923; *Hamlet*, 1925; *Macbeth*, 1928) insisted on presenting Shakespeare as his audience's contemporary. The choice of contemporary settings often invites theatre-makers to rethink issues relating to politics and *q.v.* casting. Iqbal Khan's 2015 *Othello* at the RSC not only cast a black actor (Lucian Msamati) as Iago, it also situated the action of the play in a multicultural context that may

have said little about race in Shakespeare's England but made exciting sense of the complex dynamics of modern race and racism in the UK. Modernization is generally easier in non-Anglophone countries where productions will often commission new translations that capture the tang and slang of contemporary speech.

**Musicalization** – the introduction of music where it is not explicitly called for in the text, or the wholesale musicalization of Shakespeare's plays. All art, Walter Pater averred, aspires to the condition of music; many contemporary productions of Shakespeare aspire to the condition of *The Musical*. This is an honourable tradition stretching back to such notable adaptations as Thomas Shadwell's 1674 operatic *Tempest*. Garrick's version of a musical adaptation of *Pyramus and Thisbe* advertised itself: 'Where *Shakespear* has not supplied the Composer with Songs, he has taken from *Milton, Waller, Dryden, Hammond &c.* and it is hoped they will not seem unnaturally introduced', a hope shared by many theatrical producers before and since. For some, Cole Porter's *Kiss Me, Kate* (1948) and Bernstein and Sondheim's *West Side Story* (1957) are, as works of art, distinct *q.v.* improvements on the Shakespearean originals on which they are based.

**Post-scripting** – a creative response to the widespread sense that the conclusions of Shakespeare's plays often feature loose ends and unfinished business, or else fail to satisfy. This process began within Shakespeare's lifetime – John Fletcher's *The Tamer Tam'd* (1611) is a sequel to *The Taming of the Shrew* in which, as Fletcher's title hints, Petruchio gets a dose of his own medicine from the woman he marries after his first wife, Kate, has died. David Greig's *Dunsinane* (2010), in which Lady Macbeth has survived ('the Queen, my lord, is not dead'), and is pursuing her claim to the throne, is a twenty-first-century example.

\*\*\*

**Postscript:** What is clear from this far-from-complete lexicon is that Shakespearean theatrical creativity is by definition collaborative and co-dependent. Isaac Asimov, reflecting on the fact that Alfred Wallace and Charles Darwin had developed their own theories of evolution at the same

time through a similar route, noted that creative thinking often consisted of the ability to make connections: 'what is needed is not only people with a good background in a particular field, but also people capable of making a connection between item 1 and item 2 which might not ordinarily seem connected.' Applied to Shakespeare's creative legacy, item 1 is 'Shakespeare', but item 2 can be *anything*. And however we define 'creativity' – as divergent or flexible thinking, fluid intelligence or conceptual blending – at its best it will involve some kind of combination of item 1 and item 2 into something new that's like Shakespeare.

