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Theatre Reviews


Reviewed by Danielle Nicole Byington*

Denmark relocated to Africa, a vibrantly-colored production design conveying bleak content, “To be [conventional] or not to be?”—Simon Godwin’s _Hamlet_, performed by the Royal Shakespeare Company in Stratford-upon-Avon, premiering in spring of 2016, wedded theatrical tradition with cross-cultural elements, engendering an innovative, artistic space for the production. A play famously concerned with mortality, Godwin’s production does not rely on the multicultural motif to simply make his version unique, but uses its nature as a method for more deeply communicating the difficult theme of death. Rhythmic, ritualistic, and representational, this _Hamlet_ deserves to take its place alongside other innovative versions of Shakespeare’s most performed tragedy.

A brief commencement ceremony, in which Hamlet receives his diploma from Wittenberg with his fellow students, opens the performance, shot with a striking photography-strobe light effect; suddenly, however, a startling tribal drum’s thud stills the celebratory location before reconnecting the play—after a quick blackout—to its modern African setting, as the guards meet for their shift change, ala Marcellus and Barnardo. The Ghost of King Hamlet, portrayed by Ewart James Walter, effectively embodies his role as the “perturbed spirit,” communicating his message to the Prince with an eerie authority. Highlighting the importance of the spiritual realm in this _Hamlet_, a trapdoor was used to create an illusion of boundary between the space of the stage’s world and the intangible site of the mythical underworld. As the Ghost departs into this trapdoor after instructing Hamlet to take revenge, the thunderous rhythm of African percussions halts, forcing the audience back to the reality of Hamlet’s urgent mission.

At this moment in the play, Paapa Essiedu, the real star of this production, begins to dominate the stage. Frequently described in his portrayal

---

* Danielle Nicole Byington is a published poet who recently completed her M.A. at East Tennessee State University focusing on creative writing and Renaissance studies.
of Hamlet as remarkably mature at only twenty-five years old, Essiedu’s skill of delivering the Bard’s verse is sagacious. His performance of the “To be or not to be” soliloquy reveals a genuine reflection on mortality, the internal, ponderous struggle with which Hamlet’s character is often associated. When Ophelia enters, played by Natalie Simpson, the dispute between the assumed former lovers appears particularly physical under Godwin’s direction, Hamlet throwing Ophelia on to a mattress in the nunnery scene’s set. Additional details in the production’s design—by Paul Anderson—further reveal the young Prince’s frustration. Hamlet’s anger and rebellion are demonstrated with boisterous, chaotic graffiti, a meshing of grungy high school sketches composed from a psychedelic-bright palette. This aggression is extended into his wardrobe, a white jacket embellished with similar graphic designs. With an image composed primarily of a skull and crown on his back, it is as if Hamlet’s vandalized fashion echoes the oncoming struggle for his “coat” of arms, or, even more directly, when Essiedu strolls to a portrait of Claudius, calmly defacing the new King’s picture with a steady waving of his can of spray paint.

When the players enter the stage to entertain the royal family with The Murder of Gonzago, the same mattress on which Hamlet had thrown Ophelia is stacked with a board and fluorescent-stained draping, quickly adapted into a makeshift stage for their performance. This directional choice ironically hearkens back to the Ghost’s request to “Let not the royal bed of Denmark be / A couch for luxury and damned incest” (1:5:82-83), as the players carry out their performance, the imitation of King Hamlet’s death and his widow’s hasty marriage. The production design separates their identities as performers performing for other performers with even more blaring colors, neon and mismatched patterns comprising their costumes. It is in scenes such as this that Tanya Moodie and Clarence Smith, Gertrude and Claudius, respectively, demonstrate a natural chemistry as the newly-wedded Queen and King. When Smith’s Claudius reacts to the content of Gonzago, his demeanor suggests a passive but stern politician, rather than a reckless tyrant, a tone that represents his performance throughout the production.

Once Polonius is murdered by Hamlet, Essiedu becomes more erratic, and Godwin puts his original touch on the action succeeding Hamlet’s banishment from the country. A ship’s fog horn bellows at the dock awaiting Hamlet’s boarding for England, followed shortly after by Laertes rappelling from a helicopter to his meeting with Claudius—both somewhat splashy facets in the performance’s stylized modernism. Ophelia’s mad scene, also in Act 4, attempts to recreate the shattered maiden with which audiences have come to expect from the text; however, even though Simpson’s singing haunts the theatrical space, the hysteria she shifts into seemed forced considering her previously too-gentle essence prior to this point. The gravedigger scene again utilizes Walter, now stripped of his restless façade as the Ghost, appearing
instead as the gravedigger who light-heartedly sings a Calypso song into a femur bone as if it were a microphone. As Hamlet sneaks into this setting—his identifying-graffiti garbs swapped for lurking beanie and dark sweater—Essiedu’s Yorick speech is uncanny, as if he expects Yorick to also recall his remembrances as he speaks to the hollow skull. Ophelia’s funeral procession then enters, her body not in a coffin but tightly wrapped in gauze and hauled on the back of a pallbearer. Laertes and Hamlet’s grave squabble culminates in the arrangement of their formal duel back at the palace, this production replacing swords with African stick fighting in the play’s final scene.

Experiencing the play through Godwin’s aesthetic, on a stage’s space within the heart of Shakespeare’s birthplace, offers a collision of cultures and continents for observers to sort out. What audiences of any version of *Hamlet* should expect is the striving of the company and creatives to provide a moment that enters the audience’s mind and collaborates with what they think they know about the play, totally surprising them with something not only unexpected, but an artistic experience which they did not know they were seeking. Godwin has created not only a successful production, but one that, by utilizing the artistic direction of alternate time and place, deserves recognition as an exhilarating and unprecedented take on the traditional plight of the Prince of Denmark.

Reviewed by Xenia Georgopoulou

---

**Cymbeline in the sixties**

Alexandros Cohen’s *Cymbeline*, first presented at the Exarchia Theatre in October 2016, was one of the very few Greek productions of the play. This was not the first time that the director dealt with a Shakespearean play that is rarely performed, even in its country of origin. He did it earlier in 2014, when he directed *Timon of Athens*. However, this does not mean that he is ignorant of risk. Acknowledging not only the problematic nature of *Cymbeline*, due to its length as well as its parallel plots, but also the difficulty of staging the play on the relatively small stage of the Exarchia Theatre, Cohen decided to proceed to an adaptation.²

In his version the director cut about half of the play and eliminated a series of secondary characters. Of Shakespeare’s characters he kept Cymbeline and the Queen, Innogen³ and Cloten, Posthumus and Iachimo, the Roman general Caius Lucius, and the Doctor. Innogen’s confidante (called Helen in the original), who also replaced Pisanio in Cohen’s adaptation, was now called Cornelia (taking the doctor’s original name [Cornelius]).

Another crucial alteration Cohen made to the play was the removal of the subplot that refers to the kidnapping of Cymbeline’s sons. This left a couple of loose ends in the main plot. However, Cohen resolved this problem rather harmlessly; Innogen’s apparent death after drinking the Queen’s potion was not witnessed by anyone, and Cloten’s death supposedly happened during the battle.

Even with the removal of this part of the plot, the play remained complicated. To make things clearer, Cohen adopted some of the suggestions made by George Bernard Shaw for the production of the play starring Helen Terry as Imogen in 1896; he also used his characters as narrators, who occasionally explained to the audience what happened in the play. Such moments were the monologues of the Queen, Cornelia and Posthumus in the beginning of the play (who informed the audience about the characters and their

---

¹ Cohen argues that this is the reason why *Cymbeline* is rarely staged (see the director’s note in the programme of the production [Γουίλιαμ Σαϊξπηρ, Κυμβελίνος, Εταιρεία Θεάτρου Υπερίων, Θέατρο Εξαρχείων, Αθήνα, 2016, p. 6]).

² For a detailed account of the changes see Cohen’s note in the programme (p. 84).

³ Cohen opted for ‘Innogen’, as opposed to ‘Imogen’ (in the First Folio).
stories), the Queen’s report of the war between Britons and Romans, but also the
dialogue between the dead Queen and the King, where she explained to him how
she used him.

Cohen’s *Cymbeline* was set in the 1960s, for two main reasons: firstly,
the main scenery was a bourgeois living-room that could fit in the small stage of
the theatre; and secondly, this time distance (though shorter than that between
Roman Britain and Renaissance England) underlined the tale element that
characterizes *Cymbeline* as a romance. Thus, the sixties played the role of “once
upon a time” for both the younger generations, who were born later, and those
who have lived in the sixties and feel nostalgic about the past.4

Within this atmosphere of the sixties there was also a contemporary
Shakespearean reference: in the beginning of the production Innogen and
Posthumus watch on the television a 1968 movie, namely Franco Zeffirelli’s
adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*. The reference to the most famous
Shakespearean couple is not random, since there are quite a few resemblances
with the young couple of *Cymbeline*. In both plays the love affair between
the young lovers, who get married in secret, is hindered by their parents, the young
woman’s father intends to marry her to somebody else, and the young hero is
exiled. The resemblances between the two plays are underlined by the director:
the scene he chooses to show from Zeffirelli’s movie is the one where Friar
Laurence takes Romeo away from Juliet, and right afterwards Cohen’s Cloten
attempts to separate Posthumus from Innogen. Moreover, in the character of
Innogen’s confidante Cornelia we may see Juliet’s Nurse, especially in a scene
where she takes some time to share the news with Innogen, which reminds us of
*Romeo and Juliet* 2.5.5

*Cymbeline* is a play that deals a lot with shifting or hidden identities;
Innogen dresses as a boy, Cloten wears Posthumus’s clothes, Posthumus changes
clothes shifting from the Roman to the British camp and back again. Cohen
chose to underline these changes by putting them together on the stage at the
same time. Using the furniture of the set he created, one may say, three
individual stages. Posthumus changed clothes on a chair, Innogen on a couch,
and Cloten on the table where the negotiations took place in other scenes. While
this was happening, Cornelia, who had orchestrated their movements, as servants
often do from the very beginning of dramaturgy, unreeled around them a tape
like those used for works in progress, as if to delimit her own space of action,
between the characters of the play. This was probably in line with the director’s

---

4 Cohen also argues that in *Cymbeline* he located elements found in American films of
the 1960s: love, agony, treason, intrigue, adventure (see “Αλέξανδρος Κοέν: 'Στο θέατρο
ούτε τις δικλίδες ασφαλείας τηρώ, ούτε τον ασφαλή δρόμο ακολουθώ', Interview to
5 On the resemblance between the two plays see the director’s note in the programme (p. 6).
choice to present the scenes outside the safety of the young characters’ home as a supernatural, mysterious experience in a world that seems distorted, as opposed to the realistic depiction of the scenes within Cymbeline’s kingdom.6

Cohen’s whole mise-en-scène was firm, since the omission of a large part of the play allowed for a quick succession of the scenes left, whereas the kinesiology, designed by Frosso Korrou, reflected the characters’ personality and mood as well as the relations between them.

The set and costumes, designed by Christina Kostea, reproduced successfully the atmosphere of the sixties. Kostea used swinging panels that enabled quick changes between interior and exterior spaces, depending on the side of the panels that was visible by the audience. On one side the panels were green, and represented the walls of Cymbeline’s living-room or Innogen’s bedroom, whereas on the other side they looked like old mirrors, which mostly suggested an exterior space. The panels were also used sideways, to denote a space between interior and exterior, as in the last scene, located in a liminal place that is not Cymbeline’s living-room but is not outside either.

The light design by Katerina Maragoudaki played an important part in the illustration of both the particular places and the atmosphere of the play. For the outdoor scenes Maragoudaki opted for leaf shadows on the side walls of the stage, whereas in Cymbeline’s living-room there was a shadow that reminded the audience of a barred skylight, creating the impression of a prison.

Apart from illustrating the era chosen by the director, Kostea’s costumes also denoted the characters’ mood. The Queen, who starts losing her mind when she loses her son, is a good example: In the beginning of the production her clothes fitted her tightly, whereas after Cloten’s disappearance her garments were rather airy. The same happened to her hair, which was tightly bound in the beginning, becoming loose later on.

Cohen’s choices regarding music also played an important role in his production, underlining the characters’ changes of mood (through pieces of music from the sixties which followed the lovers’ excitement, the Queen’s melancholy etc.) as well as the heavy atmosphere (through an electronic composition that alluded to the harsh repetitive sounds of a machine).

Despite the fact that Cohen had to work with a heterogeneous group of actors, he managed to produce a tight show. Takis Vouteris as Cymbeline combined the King’s weariness with the firmness he manages to retain. Eleni Krita in the role of the Queen portrayed as successfully both the strength of her character in the beginning of the play and her gradual psychological decline after the loss of her son. Antigone Drakoulaki as Innogen gave in detail all the mood shifts of the heroine, jumping easily from her cheerfulness in the beginning of the play to her despair (deliberately verging on the comical) when she thinks that

---

6 On this choice see the director’s note in the programme (p. 7).
she has just discovered the headless body of her lover. Sarantos Geogleris was very convincing as Cloten, underlining, clearly but without exaggeration, the comical aspect of the role, through his desperate attempts to approach Innogen, antagonize Posthumus, or show that he plays a part in the government of the kingdom. Nektaria Giannoudaki as Cornelia was a firm presence from the beginning to the end of the play, underscoring the manipulating aspect of the character but also underlining the humour of the adapted text. Antonis Fragakis, probably a little milder than what we would have thought of Iachimo, managed nevertheless to illustrate the reversals of his behaviour. Panagiotis Exarcheas enacted with ease Posthumus’s psychological shifts, and Romanos Maroudis kept successfully the functional parts of the Roman general and the Doctor.

Alexandros Cohen, who has already staged three Shakespearean plays (the first one being Much Ado about Nothing in 2011), revealed in a recent interview that the more familiar he becomes with Shakespeare’s texts the more charmed he is by them. 7 Considering his recent work, mostly with Shakespearean plays that are rarely staged, one wonders which one will be next.

7 See Cohen’s interview mentioned in note 4.
A Tribute to Professor Sarbani Chaudhury

On 29th of December, 2016 Sarbani Chaudhury “shuffled off her mortal coil.” A massive heart attack robbed us of a precious life. “But thoughts, the slaves of life […] must have a stop.” “Men must endure/Their going hence even as their coming hither” [KL 5.2.9-10], are the epigraphs more appropriate for the persons who have played their innings, enjoyed the game of life, and have made to their heart’s content, a substantial contribution for the good of society,” A good life, a beautiful heart is always a need of the society, a blessing of mankind. Still, as we come to this earth to play the game of life and to enjoy as well as create the spectacles of beauty and goodness, grandeur and grace, we all have a claim, and equally the society too has a claim on good lives to a certain measure, a reasonable span of our existence. Of course, there is a “divinity that shapes our ends” [H 5.2.10] but it rough hews them as it wills; there may even be “a special providence in the fall of a sparrow” [5.2.212], still at times we feel that the fell Sergeant Death is not only strict in his arrest but also a bit too discretionary and somewhat wayward.

In Greek Mythology there is a mention of three goddesses, also known as Sisters of Fate, who influence human destiny: Clothos, Lachesis and Atropos. Clothos would weave the sken of life, Lachesis would measure it, but Atropos the inexorable, was known to act arbitrarily.

She carried the shears that would cut the thread of life anytime. Once again, Atropos has played her trick and snatched away our Sarbani from us. Shakespeare too was aware of Nature’s waywardness when he observed, “if it be [now]’tis not to come, if it is not to come, it will be now, if it be not now yet it will come” therefore “the readiness is all” [5.213-16]. We have to be in eternal readiness as the fell Sergeant is strict in his arrest, even if he is arbitrary.

Sarbani was living a full life embellished with love, goodness, aesthetic values and cultural graces that emanate from an earnest heart; whatever is earnest is automatically profound too in love of literature and scholarship. Her heart was as much attuned to the love of literature, mainly, of course,
Shakespeare, as her intellect was wedded to scholastic pursuits. For a true scholar hard work, is not a task but a temptation. She was as much a darling of her students as of her friends and colleagues. In fact, she was fortunate in having been nurtured in an atmosphere which was as congenial to the growth of one’s personality and for the enrichment of mind and intellect.

Jadavpur University was, and partially still is, a great centre of learning and for imbibing the values of life. It can rightfully boast of several eminent and legendary names in the field of Shakespeare and Renaissance studies: like. S.C. Sen Gupta, Jagannath Chakraborty, D.C. Biswas, Kitty Dutta, Jasodhara Bagchi, Mihir-da, Visvanath Chatterjee and at present the awesome twosome, Sukanta and Supriya Chaudhuri who keep on excelling each other in quality and calibre. Socrates asserts the supreme value of art and literature in life when he asks, “What would not a man give if he might converse with Orpheus and Musaeus, and Hesiod and Homer?” On a slightly lesser and more mortal level I may say, “what will not a student give to be taught by such enchanting Shakespeareans at Jadavpur University?”

Sarbani was fortunate, perhaps too fortunate, to have passed her B.A. (Hons), M.A., M.Phil & Ph.D. from Jadavpur. Of course, it must needs be mentioned that besides Jadavpur, the entire Calcutta [now Kolkata] was charged with the atmosphere of love for learning—Jadavpur, Calcutta University, the Presidency College, Rabindra Bharati University and numerous local enthusiasts from the city of Shakespeare Sarani, the only city in India where a street is named after Shakespeare, together helped in creating a climate in which any sincere lover of literature and learning could relish the game of life, in its multifold riches. Even today, Shakespeare, along with Tagore, is an integral part of Bengal’s intellectual culture.

Sarbani taught mainly at Kalyani University where she acted as at the Head of the Department for two tenures [27-07-2002 to 26-07-2002 & 01-10-2005 to 30-06-2007]. It is said that love is the only virtue we need; other virtues become necessary, only when we lack love. Sarbani acquired the attitude of going beyond the text, the attitude that becomes instrumental in our understanding everything, including Shakespeare. Instead of adopting a dogmatic attitude towards literary interpretations, she encouraged, even prompted, the students to evolve a healthy independence in their understanding of literature.

The enormous generosity and large-hearted openness that she inherited from her professors at Jadavpur, helped her earn a huge fan-following among her students who learnt as much about life as about literature. She led a wholesome life dedicated to scholarship as well as class room performance. For a good teacher, class room is as sacred as any temple and she lived this dictum from the core of her heart.

No General is worth his post unless he is active as a soldier. Our erudition is only of half use if we do not spread it far and wide. Sarbani was as much
A Tribute to Professor Sarbani Chaudhury

A worker as she was a scholar. As member of the International Committee of Correspondents, for World Shakespeare Bibliography maintained by Shakespeare Quarterly, she played a commendable role. Professor S. Nagarajan was the first to represent India for the WSB. Prof. Rajiva Verma and my humble self were the next. Sarbani carried on her responsibility with a sense of commitment. She was also the Book Review Editor for Multicultural Shakespeare and edited a student friendly edition of The Tempest. Her lectures at Paris University on Kalyani Ishstyle and her talks on “Fun & Frolicking Women and Freewheeling Shakespeare” and on the study of ‘Indian Response to Shakespeare’ at Dhaka University, along with her vibrant campaigning for women’s cause, earned her wide appreciation. No wonder, in 2002 she was nominated ‘Woman of the Year’ by the American Biographical Institute, Board of International Research, North Carolina. From Folger Shakespeare Library to British Council fellowship and other awards and honors, it is a long and interesting story of Sarbani’s achievements, who was also counted among Asian Admirable Achievers in 2006.

I remember my first meeting her at Sarnath, near Varanasi where Buddha delivered his first sermon. Since then whenever she came to attend conferences & seminars, I always felt a redolent calm dwelling around her person, a simple artless affability that she wore as a jewel of her life.

I have a slightly bad reputation of sending too many messages, greetings and affections. But whenever I sent her a message whether official, as Secretary of the Shakespeare Society of India, or any personal message of festival greetings and occasional felicitations, she was always among the firsts to reciprocate. Persons of such sensitivity, feelings and sentiments are always among the firsts to reciprocate. It is a pity, a person of such generosity is now no more with us. One great advantage of studying great literature is the richness of mind and deep inner content and the privilege of coming into contact with some of the noblest souls in the world. Sarbani indeed, was one such soul.

No praise can be too high for Cordelia’s nobility. Still, Lear’s words have become a landmark “Upon such sacrifices my Cordelia/The gods themselves throw incense” [5.3.20-21]. On a more human level we can certainly offer some wreaths and bouquets at the shrine of Sarbani.

Adieu ! Au Revoir ! Sarbani ! The flights of angels sing for thee ...