Glocal Shakespeare in Albania:

Race, Gender, and the Politics of Cultural Identity

by

Marinela Golemi

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2021 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Ayanna Thompson, Co-Chair
Bradley Irish, Co-Chair
Cora Fox

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
May 2021

ABSTRACT

Glocal thinking redistributes Shakespeare's cultural capital and reimagines Shakespeare studies as a multiplex and integrative network without an original, authoritative Shakespeare at its center. Local Shakespeare criticism focuses exclusively on local place and culture, whereas global Shakespeare explores local adaptations with an international scope that risks homogenizing local identities. I challenge the local/global dichotomy and submit that Shakespearean adaptations are never either global or local. Instead, they are always already glocal insofar as they are translated and performed in a culturally and technologically interconnected network of local and global Shakespeare users. I argue that the intercultural processes of adaptation constitute non-Anglophone Shakespeares as culturally, temporally, and spatially glocal. I hope to show that glocal methodologies in marginalized countries like Albania, which historically lack scholarly attention, are necessary to defuse Shakespeare's global authority over localities. To reveal how adaptations are multitemporal, multispatial, and multicultural, I employ Jonathan Gil Harris' palimpsest metaphor which traces both past and present meanings in cultural objects. Specifically, I examine the palimpsestic nature of adaptations through socio-political constructs in translations and performances of *Macbeth, Othello, Hamlet, Julius Caesar,* and *II Henry VI* from pre-communist to post-communist Albania. Shakespeare critics need a glocal methodology that reciprocates the palimpsestic nature of non-Anglophone Shakespeare adaptations in order to better understand the adaptations and value their contributions to the field.

This dissertation is dedicated to my family, near and far.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I must thank my co-chairs, Ayanna Thompson and Bradley Irish, and my committee member, Cora Fox, whose guidance and support helped to complete this project. I'd like to thank them individually for the pivotal roles they played in the making of this work. Ayanna Thompson's intellectual brilliance is infectious. Thank you for challenging me to grow as a thinker and a writer. Brad Irish has been an exceptional mentor who always prioritized my well-being. Thank you for the time and care you dedicated to our independent study sessions and my academic success. And Cora Fox, thank you for welcoming me into your classroom and advising me. I am grateful to all of you for your feedback and encouragement. I would also like to thank the English Department, the Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, and the Graduate and Professional Student Association for providing financial support to share my research in national and international conferences. In addition, I am thankful to the Folger Shakespeare Library for inviting me to examine Fan S. Noli's collection of translations. This experience was invaluable to my research. I also must thank my friends and colleagues who contributed to this project in a number of ways. Celina Osuna, Jack Geist, Warren Glynn, Michael Wood, and Scott Maisano have uplifted my mind and spirits through instrumental feedback, thoughtful conversations, and undying support. I am grateful to you all for your friendship and generosity. I cannot forget Evaggelia Derdemezi, Claudia Mati, and Leonidas Mati whose support, even from afar, was always felt. Thank you for your confidence and positivity. Most of all, I am grateful for my family whose unconditional love and support helped me realize my dreams. Thank you,

Aldi Golemi, Arta Golemi, Llazar Golemi for your sacrifices. You continue to inspire me. I couldn't have finished this project without you. This is for you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION: GLOBAL SHAKESPEARES

Localization and globalization have various definitions across disciplines. Sociologist Victor Roudometof describes localization as the social process of adapting a cultural item to the fabric of a locality and place (2019, 809). For Roudometof "localization refers to the processes through which place-making naturalizes and constructs a locale as a place" (2019, 810). Cultural items are localized "when actors recognize them as part of the local scenery"—take for example the expression "American as apple pie" (Roudometof 2019, 809). Yet, localization produces a nostalgia for cultural authenticity: a desire for an original American pie, in an exponentially interconnected world of pies amplified by globalization—a force described by Roland Robertson as "the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole" (1992, 8). William I. Robinson claims that globalization "is unifying the world into a single mode of production and a single global system and bringing about the organic integration of different countries and regions into a global economy" (2001, 159). Raewyn Connell also forewarns that globalization creates "a persisting polarity between system and singularity" which "constitutes the concept of the local, the singular" which "has no meaning other than being the nonglobal" (375). Local and global are depicted as codependent concepts but following either one always leaves behind something of the other.

Despite the local-global codependency, globalization is held in a higher regard. Globalization suggests that boundaries are breaking down and links are being formed between people across regions, resulting in a "global society" (Connell 371). However, a global society implies a sense of "modernity spreading from its heartland in Europe and

North America to cover the whole world" (Connell 372). The equation of modernity with Northern European thinkers is nothing new. In criticizing Michel Foucault's West and Renaissance centered theory of modernity, Timothy Mitchell argues that modernization is linked to imperialism.[1] Modernity has been inappropriately associated with civilization, as seen through Nobert Elias' *The Civilizing Process* which set a precedent for regarding Northern European societies as civilized by tracing processes of social behavior to Medieval and Renaissance Europe. As a result, sociological theories that conceptualize globalization have emerged distinctly from white male authors (Connell 379). Globalization tries to connect the world, but its white and Western European idea of a global society compares all local cultures to Western European culture. This metropole of global thinking is what Martin Orkin describes as the "Shakespeare metropolis" of Shakespeare studies.

Local and global Shakespeares respectively constitute growing subfields in Shakespeare Studies. Martin Orkin's *Local Shakespeares* (2005) explains that the travels of Shakespeare's plays in European and North American academies share and produce "a common bank of Shakespeare scholarship and knowledge" (1). This "Shakespeare metropolis" which Orkin describes as the "centre of Shakespeare studies" (1) monopolizes the field and becomes a border of legitimacy for those outside of the center seeking passage. The metropolis, Orkin argues, is expanding because texts are travelling to multiple locations where they become "hybridized by those locations and their

[1] Mitchell advocates for "multiple capitalisms" whose local, regional, and global forces shape the particular histories of capitalist modernity and move away from Eurocentrism (xii).

particular knowledges (2). His work brings scholarly attention to local and non-metropolitan locations that shift the Shakespeare metropolis, within but also outside the European and North American Shakespeare metropolitan academy (Orkin 2). Orkin describes local Shakespeare by "what characterizes each reader who comes to the text, in terms of her or his place and time, what is within that place epistemologically current, the particular institutional position or struggles within which she or he is situated or with which she or he is actively engaged or, again, the particular knowledges and ideologies she or he exemplifies or legitimates" (2). That is all to say that reading is always done from somewhere. Orkin advocates for the value of local knowledge and experience in helping Shakespeareans understand the texts and their locations. He professes, "the historically contingent…impact of any critical practice, together with the knowledge-systems that inform it, may in turn be taken as evidence for the relativity of any dominantly exclusionist policy towards particular local knowledges lying outside currently dominant critical terrain" (2). By focusing on South African knowledge to demonstrate the collapse of gender binaries, exploring primarily masculinity in the late plays, Orkin portrays local and metropolitan powers as proximates. Although Orkin's work eventually returns to the center, at least it empowers local Shakespeares without alienating them as Dennis Kennedy's global foreignization approach unintentionally does.

Dennis Kennedy's *Foreign Shakespeare* (1993) initially broaches the local/global debate by introducing a collection of foreign Shakespeares (performances in translation) which seeks to destabilize the idea of a globally universal Shakespeare constructed in the Shakespearean academic center. Kennedy disrupts the global notion of Shakespeare by

stating that there are many localities such as Islamic countries, Southeast Asia, Central and South America, and Africa that do not read, perform, or study Shakespeare "with enthusiasm" (290). Shakespeare's own foreignness, Kennedy implies, made him useful for establishing the national identities of foreign countries (3). This process of foreign adaptation results in foreign performances which "have a more direct access to the power of the plays (Kennedy 5). All foreign adaptations have something to offer to critics and the field. Kennedy specifies that critics have focused too much on the value of Shakespeare's original language and overlooked the importance of non-Anglophone adaptations (2). *Foreign Shakespeare* demonstrates that outside of his English context, Shakespeare requires linguistic and cultural adaptation which then deserves the attention of Anglo-centered critics. His work is a call for Anglo-American scholars to also theorize about the different ways that Shakespeare is localized and how he operates in foreign countries. By "reflecting on performances outside of English," Kennedy suggests that "we can see more clearly how Shakespeare is alien" (17) and how we continue to localize him. Kennedy ultimately realizes that "Shakespeare doesn't belong to any nation or anybody: Shakespeare is foreign to all of us" (16), but his initial foreignization of non-English adaptations inadvertently enforces the idea of a Shakespeare center by way of these foreign others.

Another pivotal contribution to local/global studies is Sonia Massai's *World-Wide Shakespeares* (2006). This book focuses on a variety of geographically diverse appropriations that speak to local traditions.[2] Unlike Kennedy's collection, Massai

[2] Massai's work distinctly focuses on appropriations as opposed to adaptations. In the afterword of this collection, Barbara Hodgdon references the *OED* to clarify that

avoids normalizing Anglo-centered adaptations by foreignizing 'other' Shakespeares, nor does she focus solely on non-Anglophone Shakespeares. In turn, she reframes the Shakespeare metropolis according to Pierre Bourdieu's notion of a cultural field that changes through local contributions. Like Orkin, Massai submits that "the field. determines what is possible to say about or do with Shakespeare at any particular moment in time" (6). Massai continues to investigate the globalization of Shakespeare studies in numerous localities "within which Shakespeare is made to signify anew" (9). Her work demonstrates a dialectic relationship between local and global Shakespeares wherein appropriations are almost always local and thus, the global is seen as "the product of specific, historically and culturally determined localities" (9). Massai argues that local/global appropriations have "originated in areas which cannot be adequately described as post-colonial" therefore, "there is a need for a model of cultural appropriation which can effectively account for the variety of localities from which Shakespeare is being appropriated, for the range of textual strategies employed by its adapters, and for the impact world-wide Shakespeare have on their target audience" (6). As a result, she offers an audience centered model that distinguishes local Shakespeare for local, national, and international audiences in order to diffuse the local/global binary. However, I argue that audiences, like the Shakespeare adaptations themselves, cannot be divided so evenly, and doing so ignores audiences who are glocal. Massai also realizes

---

adaptation is defined as "the process of modifying a thing so as to suit new conditions" whereas appropriation is defined more broadly as the process of "making something private property;" "the assignment of anything to a special place," and a "special attribution or application" (157). My project centers solely on adaptations given the nature of the materials.

that local and global appropriation processes are increasingly intercultural and therefore need to be retheorized.

Despite the intercultural traffic between local and global Shakespeares, the division between them persists. For instance, in her earlier work, *Shakespeare and Appropriation,* Christy Desmet weighs in on the local/global discourse by defining the local as "small-time Shakespeare" with "individual acts of 're-vision' that arise from love or rage, or simply a desire to play with Shakespeare" (1999, 2). She then posits "small-time Shakespeare" against the global "big time Shakespeare" which "serves corporate goals, entrenched power structures, and conservative cultural ideologies" (Desmet 1999, 3). Desmet's edited collection seeks to "challenge the idea that Shakespeare must always already be co-opted by the dominant culture and caution[s] against the easy assumption that Shakespeare can set us free" (1999, 3). Although she is interested in the colonial resistance produced through the exchange of big and small Shakespeare, her definitions cement more binaries between global vs. local, big vs. small, and personal vs. corporate Shakespeares.

More recently, Desmet has proposed that the local/global dichotomy is actually an import/export process of intercultural exchange, so she's redefined global and local Shakespeares. First, she explains that global Shakespeare refers to the "export of the bard to other nations [and] to the import of "foreign Shakespeares" into Western metropolitan centers" (Desmet 17). Then she re-establishes local Shakespeare as a process where "readers/consumers from non-Anglo cultures [sic] reconfigure Shakespeare's play in light of their own, unique local knowledges" (Desmet 18). The global is often described as "the multinational and the corporate, blandly disseminating sameness throughout the

world" whereas the local is thought of as the "heroic small scale attempts to sustain specific difference" (Houlahan 141). While "the local needs the global" to access a global market (Seeff 532), the global market is "dependent upon a simultaneous attention to, and erasure of, the local" (Loomba 125). Desmet's scholarship seems to suggest that theories of local vs. global provide opportunities for remembering and forgetting, which she identifies as necessary aspects of cross-cultural exchange. Despite the import/export traffic, the local/global distinction remains as part of the equation. To break this binary, I turn to glocalization, the assemblage of local and global, as a solution to the exploitation and erasure of the local for the global.

The scholars and critics engaged in local and global Shakespeares focus principally on performance adaptations. Alexa Joubin, for example, describes "global Shakespeare as a performance practice and research field" (2017, 424) where "multiple local perspectives enrich the reception of the play" (2017, 25). For Joubin, global Shakespeare is not limited to "non-Anglo-American performances 'elsewhere,' away from the more familiar metropolitan centres of Shakespeare activities" (2017, 427). Instead, she explains that a Shakespearean performance becomes "global when it goes on an international tour or when it borrows themes or techniques across cultures" (Joubin 2017, 427). In defense of globalization, Joubin expresses that global adaptations allow multiple cultures to meet and local traditions to be reconstructed (2017, 427). But global Shakespeare, Joubin adds, is a circular myth that "is neither possible nor desirable to

debunk" (2018, 6). This myth presents Shakespeare as universal[3] which makes the canon global; then the global field "is seen as evidence of Shakespeare's universality" (Joubin 428). In other words, Shakespeare is a myth with its own circulating and self-regulating global market. Whether it is Shakespeare's universality or his malleability, global Shakespeare risks homogenization and the reproduction of the hegemonic "we." On the other hand, local Shakespeare rejects this homogeneity by introducing a multitude of site and time specific adaptations, appropriations, translations, performances, and criticism. Alexander Huang defines local Shakespeares as "interpretations that are inflected or marked by specificities of a given cultural location or knowledge derived from a specific geocultural region" (2007, 187). Although Joubin and Huang, among others, represent global Shakespeare as a field inclusive of localities, the dichotomy between local and global performance adaptations lingers and prevents an adequate assessment of said adaptations. To be exact, local adaptations are often transformed to fit global (Western) traditions or assessed by them.

This muddy expanse between local and global Shakespeares is one I try to breach here. Dennis Kennedy's *Foreign Shakespeare*, Sonia Massai's *World-Wide Shakespeares,* and Martin Orkin's *Local Shakespeares,* signal the shift from the global to the local in Shakespeare studies. These foundational scholars aspire to expand Shakespearean studies to make it more inclusive by focusing on local cultural identities that shape and are shaped by Shakespeare. My work compliments their efforts to

[3] Dennis Kennedy explains that the universal usually means "his plays transcend time and location because they deal with unchanging aspects of human nature and present characters and plots people everywhere can recognize and understand" (441).

redistribute Shakespeare's economic, political, and socio-cultural capital equitably across world-wide localities. However, as opposed to focusing on a Shakespearean metropolis, center, or field, I imagine a network of glocal Shakespeares. I believe that local and global Shakespeares can be entangled in new and meaningful glocal ways. Glocal Shakespeares[4] is a critical approach for analyzing non-Anglophone Shakespearean translations and performances without resorting to the polarizing spectrum of local and global Shakespeares. My work is situated in between local and global ways of thinking about and with Shakespeare. Shakespearean adaptations are never either global or local. Instead, non-Anglophone Shakespeare adaptations are always already glocal because they are translated and performed in a culturally and technologically interconnected network of local and global Shakespeare users. [5] Shakespeare was never wholly local or global. As Roudometof implies "The local is never quite 'pure' or outside the global" (2016, 392). As such, Kennedy labels Shakespeare as foreign in Early Modern England because his work crossed many imaginary and real borders; therefore, Shakespeare[6] has always been glocal.

Glocalization originates from the Japanese notion of "dochakuka"—a term that describes "the agricultural principle of adapting farming techniques to local conditions"

[4] I use the plural noun Shakespeares to reflect the multiplicity of this concept.

[5] I borrow this term from Valerie Fazel and Louise Geddes to refer to the human and non-human participants who use and engage with Shakespeare. For a more comprehensive discussion on Shakespeare users see chapter 6.

[6] My use of the term Shakespeare throughout this study is purposefully abstract to refer to the multiplicity of meanings tied to the name.

(Roudometof 2016, 2). It has been theorized by sociologists Roland Robertson and George Ritzer. Robertson defines glocalization as "the process in which phenomena are spread, flow, or are diffused from one 'place' to another and are adapted to the new locality where they arrive" (2018, 3). In this manner, glocalization accounts for heterogeneity and homogeneity. For Ritzer, the local and global cannot exist without each other. He defines glocalization as "the interpenetration of the global and the local resulting in unique outcomes in different geographic areas" (Ritzer 192).[7] Ritzer points to McDonaldization as a successful glocal business model whose global success depends on catering to local fast-food tastes. Glocalization is possible because the "global political economy promotes cross-border traffic" (Pieterse 66). Since the 1990s, glocalization has resurfaced as a theory to address the homogenizing social practice of globalization which threatens the erasure of the local. Robertson posits glocalization as a "refinement" of the culturally homogenizing globalization (2003, 191). Whereas globalization is now seen as an ideology that produces world-wide sameness, glocalization instead accounts for local difference and global forces in Shakespeare. In response to glocal movements, Roudometof worries that "either glocalization is subsumed under globalization or globalization is transformed into glocalization" (2016, 391). To prevent this, he approaches glocalization as an analytically autonomous concept understood "as the refraction of globalization through the local" (Roudometof 403). Thus, glocalization

[7] George Ritzer also introduces grobalization as another process of glocalization (192). The grobal (growth + global) is used to describe something that is "global and accessible, but increasingly devoid of content and removed from any concrete or stable cultural, political, or social context" (qtd in Peterson, 111).

functions as a process that "pairs local and global into a new synthesis that transcends the opposition between Western methodological strategies and indigenous research methodologies" (Roudometof 2016, 38). Glocal Shakespeare as an analytically autonomous process of analysis of Shakespeare adaptations first recognizes false European/non-European, West/rest, local/global binaries and then distorts them. I recommend that glocalization can change how scholars interact with non-anglophone adaptations without committing to either Western or indigenous methodologies but combining both.

Glocalization has been mentioned in Shakespeare studies but never fully actualized as a valid method of thinking about Shakespeare adaptations. In *Shakespeare, The Movie II*, Richard Burt introduces the glocal as "the collapse of the local into the global" (15). Also, Alexander Huang suggests that instead of a dichotomy this merger offers "a celebration of the possibility to articulate difference" wherein representations are understood to "signify relationally and contextually" (186). Robertson seconds this idea by claiming that "Within the gaze of glocalization, comparison enables us to consider items to be compared as closely *interrelated*" (7). In this sense, the local and the global are constantly intertwined, producing glocal Shakespeares. Burt asserts that film blurs the distinction between local and global. What I'm suggesting is that performance and translation are equally capable of blurring that same distinction. Shakespeare is always already glocal in adaptations because the process of adapting Shakespeare necessitates that his works travel between cultures, time periods, and borders. Shakespeare cannot "be placed squarely on the side of hegemonic, dominant culture, or counter-hegemonic, resistant subculture" (Burt 16).

Glocalization in glocal Shakespeares is not limited to place; it extends to time and culture. As Ritzer implies, "Little of the local remains that has been untouched by the global. Thus, much of what we often think of as the local is, in reality, the glocal" (31). To that end, I argue that the intercultural processes of adaptation constitute "foreign" Shakespeares as culturally, temporally, and spatially glocal. Thinking glocally in Shakespeare studies enables Shakespeare users, specifically critics and spectators, to see "foreign," world-wide," and "local" adaptations, particularly non-Anglo-American ones, through a new network of signification that appreciates the difference and similarities produced in intercultural[8] exchanges of Shakespeare. Glocal Shakespeare helps critics and scholars to understand and appreciate the multiplicity of non-anglophone adaptations. Ultimately, I view Shakespeare as a multicultural, multilocal, and multitemporal rhizomatic network where adaptations are glocalized to produce new, multiplicitous cultural identities.

Glocal Shakespeare is responding to two major challenges that local/global studies are facing. First, as a concept, global Shakespeare overshadows the multiple localities that contribute and make up Shakespeare. Inevitably, global Shakespeare contributes to a neocolonial hierarchy of local Shakespeares. While theoretically everyone is invited to participate and be a Shakespeare user, realistically, this is not true since hierarchies of economic, geographic, ethnic, religious, and linguistic differences determine access and use in Shakespeare studies. Second, as a methodology, "locality

[8] Desmet supports Im Yeeyon's claim that "interculturalism can easily slide into glocalization" (22). It would be inaccurate to use these terms synonymously since glocalization is both intercultural and cross-cultural.

criticism—that is, analyses that focus on shifting localities that cluster around the artists, their works, and their audiences" (Huang 17)[9]—privileges local histories over the intercultural narratives that inform them. Glocal Shakespeare tries to resolve these conceptual and methodological difficulties by analyzing the historicity, temporality, locality, multiculturalism, theatrical and economic influences of Shakespeare adaptations. My glocal approach views local cultures as distinct yet interconnected through Shakespeare. To show this, glocal readings take into account multiple identities and influences embodied in the adaptations. Because of its multiplicity, glocal analysis is useful for Shakespeare adaptation in places that reflect the interconnectedness of glocalization.

Glocal Shakespeare is both real and conceptual. As a theory, glocal Shakespeare represents the multiplicity of intercultural and multicultural interactions involved in local adaptations. Each Shakespeare adaptation participates in a glocal system of exchange that is determined by the multiculturalism of the users (actors, translators, spectators, directors, readers, theatres, etc.) and the intercultural histories of Shakespeare's works. In practice, glocal readings of Shakespeare adaptations put into conversation local socio-political histories and global socio-political constructs to show how Shakespeare scholars can rethink race, gender, politics, and spectatorship.[10] Both as a speculative and practical

[9] Huang focuses on locality on the basis that "literary interpretation is always done from specific cultural locations" (26).

[10] I define socio-politics through a materialist political philosophy which according to Jonathan Gil Harris sees "any work of literature as riddles with the tensions of its historical moment" given that "culture is shaped by material conditions" (2010, 9). I propose that translations and performances carry out this type of socio-political and archival work that Harris describes.

approach, glocal Shakespeare is useful for critics studying Shakespeare adaptations in localities where identity is always in-between and multiple cultures. Glocal Shakespeares promote a centerless nexus. Glocalization "does not promise a world free from conflict but offers a more historically grounded and pragmatic worldview" (Roudometof 394) that eliminates the standardized Euro-American criteria by which we esteem local Shakespeare adaptations.

The glocalization of Shakespeare adaptations reveals the many histories, cultures, geographical spaces, and timelines that are present in any non-anglophone adaptation. Here, I adapt Jonathan Gil Harris' palimpsestic account of material objects to suggest that adaptations are multitemporal, but also, multispatial, and multicultural. As a result, Shakespeare studies scholars and critics need a glocal methodology that reciprocates the palimpsestic nature of non-Anglophone Shakespeare adaptations to better understand the adaptations and value their contributions to the Shakespeare network. A glocal reading materializes the historical, geographical, socio-political, and temporal configurations of a Shakespearean adaptation to show how these entanglements transform to the cultural identity of that locality or nation. The palimpsestic nature of glocal Shakespeare is ideal for analyzing Shakespeare adaptations in nations like Albania whose polychronic history defines its cultural identity. I apply this glocal methodology to Albania—an isolated post-communist, European, yet not-European, Balkan country that I call home. While Albanian history can be periodized between pre-communist, communist, and post-communist periods;[11] the reality is that these are not separate, but integrated, much like

[11] Sometimes post-communism is also referred to as post-post-communism to describe post-communism in the twenty first century.

global and local are integrated through glocalization. My work traces socio-political constructs in *Macbeth, Othello, Hamlet, Julius Caesar,* and *II Henry VI* in pre-communist, communist and post-communist Albania to show how glocal Shakespeare impacts cultural identity and constructs such as race, gender, and politics. In using this approach, I demonstrate that glocal methodologies in marginalized countries like Albania that historically lack scholarly attention, are necessary to defuse Shakespeare's global and monopolizing authority over localities. Thinking glocally redistributes Shakespeare's cultural capital and reimagines Shakespeare studies as a multifarious and integrative network where there is no original or singular Shakespeare.

Shakespeare's authority emerges from a nostalgia of a common past that never was. In *Performing Nostalgia,* Susan Bennett elucidates that this nostalgia becomes obvious in the performance of the present and its confrontational relationship to the writing of the past (2). To escape the present, humanists turn to writings and performances of the past. This obsessive idea that the past is preserved in text is indicative of a desire to prove either a progression or decline in the present world. Nostalgia, according to Bennett, promotes a "collective community" that is strictly Western European, and Shakespeare serves as its poster-boy. Because Shakespeare's homogenizing authority is maintained through the text, adaptation is then projected as a transgression of not only the text but of the past. W.B. Worthen picks up this point in *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance* where he explains that texts "are construed as vessels of authority, of canonical value, of hegemonic consensus" (6). Therefore, the nostalgia which prompts a call to textual fidelity limits the authority of performance and stabilizes a hegemonic original Shakespeare. However, non-anglophone

adaptations naturally contradict textual or performative authority by assembling intercultural texts and performances that ultimately distort any singular idea of origin. Although many local cultures adopt Shakespeare to appeal to his authority, the very process of adopting and adapting negates that authority because fidelity to Shakespeare cannot remain pure outside of his socio-historical and geographical context. Therefore, Shakespeare is glocalized and his authority is shaken.

A glocal methodology is integrative in nature. In this study, I apply glocal analyses to Shakespeare performances and translations. This is done to ascribe to Albania's unique relationship to Shakespeare, where performances are based on Fan Noli's translations. Although it is not my intention to privilege text over performance, or vice versa, I should note that in most Albanianized Shakespeare performances, the translation is prioritized. To clarify, this is not the process of glocalization, but it is the case for Albanian adaptations. While the singular editions[12] of Noli's translations produce new meaning in performance, they are not the sole signifiers. A performance is not simply a reproduction of the text. Rather, translation and performance are in dialogue and continually inform one another under different socio-political and cultural circumstances.

In glocal Shakespeare, I treat translation and performance as equal forms of adaptation. Tom Hoenselaars states that "The borderline between translation and adaptation is extremely difficult to draw, certainly since, in recent years, translation itself has come to be looked upon as a form of adapting or rewriting" (15). For instance, Susan Bassnett argues that translation is "an act of both inter-cultural and inter-temporal

[12] While Noli's translations have been reprinted by different publishers, the content remains the same.

communication" (9). If translation then is already a form of intercultural adaptation, by putting translation and performance in dialogue, I approach both as means of comparative adaptations rather than texts. Margaret J. Kidnie's definition of "the dramatic work, whether encountered as text and performance, [as] a dynamic process" (32) is useful for thinking about adaptations as evolving processes. Kidnie rejects the idea of the text as the original and the performance as a second-order adaptation, to argue rather that "performance and text are both, in their different ways, instances of the work" (28). Thereby, adaptation is "an evolving category" (6). In Albanian theatre these meaning-riddled adaptations assemble and form new multilayered interpretations for critics and spectators.

Translations and performances are individually mnemonic artefacts whose content stretch across time, places, and cultures. A glocal reading treats adaptations as "polytemporal" (3), in the words of Jonathan Gil Harris. A translation already embodies many temporalities, histories, cultures, and languages. Once it is placed in performance, together they synthesize new glocal identities with multiple histories and cultural significations embedded in them. Adaptations, defined as both translations and performances, form "temporal pleats" (Harris 5) wherein past and present are experienced together through palimpsestic memory.

Harris introduces the concept of the palimpsest as a mode of thinking about objects and their relation to history. Palimpsesting refers to a medieval process of "scraping and washing the pages of an old manuscript so that they may be written on anew (Harris 15). The manuscript always retains shadows of its own past in tandem with its present context to create a third temporality. Harris gives a great example of this

palimpsestic process by analyzing what the smells of gunpowder would have meant for audiences of *Macbeth*: the smell of the squib evoked the Gunpowder plot, the firework-throwing stage tradition, and the old Catholic ritual that related foul and fair smells to satanic and divine presence (22). Just like sight and sound, smell can trigger theatregoers' memories of their past as a means of fracturing their present. Harris calls this "the temporality of explosion: the apparition of the 'old' text shatters the integrity of the 'new' by introducing into it a radical alterity that punctures the illusion of its wholeness or finality" (15). Such is the analytical process of glocal Shakespeare.

I use Jonathan Gil Harris' palimpsestic approach to argue that as objects of material culture, adaptations are also saturated with "faint imprints of many times" (Harris 7). Adaptations move through places, times, and cultures, and to understand the value and potential of any adaptation, as Shakespeare scholars, we must account for their palimpsestic nature. Linda Hutcheon avers that to think of adaptations as palimpsestuous is to view them as "haunted at all times by their adapted texts" (6) because they carry an aura with them (4). Hutcheon defines adaptation as a product and process. As a process, she asserts that "For the reader, spectator, or listener, adaptation as *adaptation* is unavoidably a kind of intertextuality if the receiver is acquainted with the adapted text" (21, original emphasis). Adaptations therefore ought to be regarded as palimpsests. But by accepting adaptations as palimpsests, I'm not suggesting that they are, as Gérard Genette declares, texts in the "second degree" because of their relation to a prior text. Rather, palimpestuous adaptations produce new intermediate meanings that supersede any textual and cultural binaries. I invite Shakespeareans to reconsider adaptations, especially non-anglophone ones, as palimpsests that produce meaning temporally,

spatially, and historically. In doing so, adaptations become glocal by embodying both local and global places, temporalities, and histories to accentuate cultural multiplicity. By tracing pasts and histories of objects, as Harris directs, one is also tracing a variety of places and cultures-in-the-making. To perform a glocal reading is to account for all these complexities that make up the adaptation's palimpsestic nature.

Glocal Shakespeares are especially relevant for postcolonial nations or cultures who encompass palimpsestic identities and require reciprocal methodologies to be adequately understood. Albania's identity as a country that faced severe isolation from the rest of the world during a forty year-long (1944-1990) communist regime serves as a strong example of a nation whose past persists in the present. In Albanian adaptations of Shakespeare, significations from pre-communist, communist, and post-communist socio-political temporalities are layered to produce glocal interpretations. In turn, those glocal interpretations shake the assumingly stable English identity of Shakespeare and hopefully release Albanian and other local cultures from their bonds to dominant Western European culture.

This process is possible because translations and performances are co-dependent. As Harris advises, "In order to read the significance of any object, then, it becomes necessary to trace its 'cultural biography' as it 'moves through different hands, contexts, and uses' (9). Palimpsesting as a practice of analysis (reading, writing, listening, and spectating) helps Shakespeare users understand adaptations as complex signifying networks which are transformed by their users, but can also transform them. The temporality of material objects is also "generated by the work we do with that object, and how we read and rework its polychronic marks of different times" (Harris 16). In turn,

then, glocal Shakespeare also transforms Shakespeare users by disrupting that nostalgia which preserves Shakespeare's authority and upholds the Shakespeare metropolis.

Despite the abundance of scholarship on local and global Shakespeare adaptations, glocal Shakespeare has yet to be established as a critical methodology. I wish to promote glocal Shakespeare as a progressive mode of thinking through and with Shakespeare, especially in non-anglophone adaptations and locations. Glocal Shakespeare as methodology is inspired by Alexa Huang's "Global Shakespeares as Methodology." Huang argues that global Shakespeares as a methodology "situates us in a postnational space" characterized by cultural fluidity as opposed to nation-states (273). Huang does not share the negative perception of globalization as the homogenizing Westernization of local cultures through Shakespeare. She believes that global Shakespeares retain a sense of the local as they travel (Huang 279). Huang describes the relationship between the local and the global as a transmission of control and balance: the local confronts "global clout" and the global "reduces the authority of the local" (28). What global Shakespeares needs, Huang asserts, is a "a mental map of the world that is based on transnational cultural flows rather than nation-states" (282). Alexa A. Joubin and Aneta Mancewicz also hint that the decline of globalization is evoking "rising myths of national independence" (9). Joubin and Mancewicz assert that "the local is not always the antithesis to the global or an antidote to the hegemonic domination that has been stereotypically associated with the West" (2018, 8). However, criticism that fears national and favors postnational Shakespeare ultimately glosses over the cultural and historical values being exchanged in transnational adaptations. The goal is not to create through Shakespeare "a cultural location that is neither here nor there" (Huang 283), but to

celebrate the cultural location that is *both* here *and* there. In proposing the glocalization of Shakespeare studies, I reject the methodological nationalism enforced by local Shakespeares and the overgeneralizing fluidity of global Shakespeares. In glocal Shakespeares, postnational and national identities can coexist because this is the current political and postcolonial reality of the world.

Glocal Shakespeare as a methodology is deeply influenced by postcolonial theory. Ania Loomba suggests that postcolonialism does not just refer to the independence of countries from colonial power. Rather, it is better thought of as "the contestation of colonial domination and the legacies of colonialism" (Loomba 2015, 32). Jyotsna G. Singh offers a more expansive definition of postcolonial theory as "an academic study of the cultural legacy of European colonialism, showing how the literature of former colonial powers represented and often distorted colonial history and the experiences of the native subjects and, how, in turn, colonized peoples articulated and reclaimed their identity and history by interrogating European culture and history" (3). Because glocal Shakespeares are invested in destroying Western globalization, they are rooted in postcolonial theory that empowers marginalized voices to combat and/or mimic colonial forces like Shakespeare as a means of subversion.

Postcolonial Shakespeares, Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin argue, challenge meta-narratives that "had excluded and marginalized the experience and cultures of the underprivileged—the lower classes and castes, women, colonized people, homosexuals and others" (2). They do this through a historical approach to the cultures of both colonized and colonial subjects. Loomba and Orkin state that "Shakespeare is the site for colonial and post-colonial encounters, but these encounters cannot be understood without

reference to specific social, political and institutional histories" (17). Thus, postcolonial Shakespeares are invested in the multiplicity of histories.

Postcolonialism is crucial to local and global studies because it refutes generalizing differences like those between Global North or Global South that arise from global metropolises like Europe or the United States. In fact, postcolonial theory anticipates the downfall of globalization as a homogenizing and inequitable hierarchizing theory. As Victor Li puts it, "Like Orientalism, theories of globalization do the representing for those who cannot represent themselves" (10). It is naïve to think that in globalization cultural traditions and identities remain unscathed. Ania Loomba argues that globalization studies must incorporate the historical awareness of postcolonial studies in order to trace global inequities (16). Glocal Shakespeare is bound by a similar stance against the totalizing power of globalization in Shakespeare studies.

Glocal Shakespeare is better understood by its proximity to hybridity. Homi Bhabha's concept of hybridity in *The Location of Culture* (1994) refers to the "liminal space in-between the designations of identity" that allows for "symbolic interaction" between polar identities, between self and other (5). Cultural hybridity, in other words, is a mixture that denies hierarchy to either identity. Bhabha was inspired by Edward Said's foundational work, *Orientalism* (1978) which exposed the cultural and political imbalance between the West and the East. Said unfolds that "the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience" (1-2). Hybridity and glocalization are responses to the imaginative and extremely real consequences of Orientalism. While Bhabha's theory of hybridity is limited to nineteenth century politics, glocalization is diachronic and multitemporal. Multiplicity in

postcolonial criticism is not singular; postcolonial Shakespeares show that there are many ways of being hybrid (Loomba and Orkin 147). Hybridity in post-colonial terms is usually seen as a mixture of colonial and postcolonial subjects; "hybrid" subjects are colonized peoples answering back in Shakespearean accents (Loomba and Orkin 7). For Frantz Fanon, "the colonial subject is hybridized most powerfully in his attempt to mimic dominant culture…and fashion a European self" (qtd in Loomba and Orkin 144). This mimicry of the hybrid subject has also been viewed as an act of subversion.

Roudometof suggests that glocalization is related to hybridity and creolization, but it is not another replacement word (2016, 3).[13] "Not all hybridity is necessarily glocal – only those hybrid forms that include a local element" (Roudometof 808). Therefore, glocalization is better understood as a form of hybridity. As such, I find particularly topical Cláudia Madeira's view of "Structural hybridism" which she defines as "a process that mixes different temporal (past, present and future) and spatial contexts" to produce "spatiotemporal configurations" (87). Glocal Shakespeare also takes into account the various temporal, spatial, and historical configurations of its subject, but with emphasis on local culture. Ideally, Ania Loomba submits, we need to attend to the nuances of each culture that makes up the hybrid form (149). In glocalizing Shakespeare in Albania, I reveal new hybridities made possible by the palimpsestic reading of Shakespeare's works.

[13] Victor Roudometof explains that hybridity and glocality are not the same given that "glocality necessitates the presence of two streams, one of which needs to be local," whereas hybridity makes no specific distinction between them (2016, 14).

My glocal analysis of Albanian adaptations prescribes to a postcolonial practice which Cecile Sandten calls the "individual rewrite"—a process that "adapts or produces a Shakespearean play in the specific national, regional, local or indigenous adaptation and translation," allowing the text "to reflect a particular socio-political, cultural and historical matrix" (5). This form of rewriting in an intercultural or transcultural lens is not concerned about writing back to the colonial power, instead it uses "the Empire's colonial material to the advantage of the writer's own literary/dramatic tradition" (Sandten 5). This is especially true for Albanian theatre which evolved from folk theatre through foreign influences such as Shakespeare. In part, the purpose for such a theatrical integration was to offset the literary isolation induced by the Ottoman colonization and Enver Hoxha's communist regime which led the nation to an identity crisis.

Although Albania is part of Southern Europe, it is often not identified as European due to its history of political corruption. It is in Europe, yet not European, nor Anglocentric.[14] As a result, the name by which one calls Albania implores a different history. For instance, when identified as part of the Balkans, Albania becomes a geopolitical location, a post-war site. Due to its war-torn history and political turmoil, Albania has failed to acquire a much-desired spot in the European Union. That is why Shakespeare served as a cultural mitigator. Aleksandar Dundjerovic reveals that "Nations recently liberated from the Ottoman empire appropriated Shakespeare as a way of

[14] Like other Balkan nations, Albania cannot adequately be identified as postcolonial insofar as colonialism refers to the West, and Albania was colonized by the East.

connecting themselves with the wider framework of European culture" (161).[15] Shakespeare was used to shape Albania's national identity, particularly during Hoxha's dictatorship, and Shakespeare in modern Albania continues to allude to the past as a means of addressing the present. This proximation equates Shakespeare's Englishness to a European essence that does not exist, thus reproducing a singular identity of English Europe which is fundamentally flawed.

Shakespeare was Fan S. Noli's bridge to the rest of the world. Despite Albania's global marginalization, liberals like Noli, the first Albanian translator of Shakespeare, advocated for Albania's political and cultural advancement through literature and theatre. Noli's Shakespearean translation movement began with the political impetus of using Shakespeare as a symbol for freedom. Soon, the name Shakespeare in Albania became synonymous with Fan Noli who translated *Othello, Hamlet, Macbeth,* and *Julius Caesar* for the Albanian people in a plight to globalize Albania.

Noli described Shakespeare as the "greatest dramatist in the world after Christ," and he wished to grant his people access to great literature in their own language—the language of Illyrians (1916, 5). Noli's translations were initially reminiscent of a pre-communist Albania grappling with war, invasions, and strict customary laws. But during communism the translations and translation-based performances served as socio-political propaganda. From the pre-communist translations to the communist reprints and performances, and the recent post-communists performances, Shakespeare has

[15] Shakespeare served as a foundation in the creation of many European nations. As Dundjerovic explains, in Balkan translation, Shakespeare's iambic pentameter mirrors the dominant oral tradition of heroic poetry which further localizes Shakespeare in national cultures (161).

simultaneously captured and influenced socio-political milestones—all of which inform Albania's collective national identity. While Albanians did not lay as strong a claim on Shakespeare as their own, they nonetheless adapted him through translation and performance for the purpose of promoting Albanianness and Europeanness.

Painting Shakespeare Red, *European Shakespeares*, and *Shakespeare and Eastern Europe*, to name a few, show how Shakespeare appropriations were usurped by communist ideology and how they were used as a voice of liberation in Europe. However, even in the globalization of European Shakespeares, the influence of Shakespeare adaptations in Albania's cultural identity is understudied and poorly archived. The history of Shakespeare in Albania is not linear, and the archives are limited and restricted. Nonetheless, I find this archival peculiarity to be an asset in tracing the palimpsestic nature of non-Anglophone Shakespeare adaptations. That is why I rely on material leftovers such as interviews, promos, reviews, photographs, and mediatized recordings, to account for both archival silence and temporal difference in local Albanian Shakespeares. The goal of this project is to glocalize Shakespeare in Albania. Glocal readings of Shakespearean adaptations in Albania celebrate the borderline identity of the nation for being in fact unstable and always in-between. My palimpsestic method incorporates close readings of translations and performances together to reflect Albania's cultural identity.

Early twentieth century pre-communist Albania is chosen as the starting point of this project since Shakespearean translations were first produced and published during this period. But I trace some of these translations in communist and post-communist Albania when they are transformed into performances. The combination of translations

and performances from past and present historical moments results in an assemblage of historical identities which I argue, contributes to a collective cultural identity for Albania. This project follows Margaret J. Kidnie's argument that adaptations are processes that evolve over time and space, as opposed to being fixed objects (5). It is this evolution of meaning-making between text and performance which proves fruitful to the identity of Albania but also the field of Shakespearean adaptation which relies on such processes.

By way of example, the second chapter of this project, "Glocal Shakespeare in Praxis: A Glocal Reading of *Macbeth* in Albania," uses *Macbeth* adaptations to demonstrate to scholars and informed spectators how to perform a glocal analysis. *Macbeth* was translated in Albania in 1926 by Fan Noli and staged for the first time in the National Theatre of Albania in 2018 by Kled Kapexhiu. By tracing the historical and political context of the themes of tyranny and witchcraft which are embodied in the *Macbeth* translation and performance throughout pre-communist, communist, and post-communist Albania, I show how glocal Shakespeare can be used in practice. The palimpsestic method traces of a Scottish imagined community, English history, and the Albanian pasts and present that form a new glocal identity which more accurately represents the nature of adaptation and simultaneously transforms Albanian's folk theatre. This glocal perspective dispels the colonial idea of a united Europe or European identity by foregrounding the marginalized and palimpsestic cultural identity of Albania. Shakespeare users employing this method of reading Shakespearean adaptations are in effect challenging standards of access to Shakespeare's capital value.

Chapter 3, "Glocalizing *Othello:* Performing Race Rhetoric on the Albanian Stage" examines the racialized rhetoric in Fan Noli's 1916 *Othello* translation and the racialized performance techniques employed in A. J. Ricko's 1953 production. Hoping to combat racial discrimination in Albania, Noli's *Othello* renders the Moor an exceptional Turk whose alienation in Venice was designed to mirror the Albanophobic experiences of Albanian immigrants. Both Noli and Ricko believed there was an anti-racist power inherent within this play. In the end, however, the race-based rhetoric in the Albanian language, the use of blackface make-up in performance, and the logic and rhetoric of Shakespeare's play itself challenged these lofty goals for race-healing. For this reason, I submit that racialized performances of *Othello* stem from the text's inherent racial values which are carried unto translations, and those values are further highlighted by Albania's culturally racialized rhetoric.

Glocal readings demonstrate the palimpsestic process of embodying history and race in nation states as it is remembered through Shakespearean translations and performances. I perform a glocal reading of *Othello* adaptations from pre-communist and communist Albania to reveal that racial identity in Balkan nations is multiplex; thus, Othello is simultaneously understood as a Turkish other, a black foreigner, and a Muslim man. Although these significations evolve and differ outside of Albania, the glocal process of adaptation which produces multiplicity remains intact. Therefore, a glocal reading of the Albanian *Othello* can also address ethno-racial tensions between Albanians and Turks, Northern and Southern Albanians, and Albanians of color and white Albanians. By glocalizing *Othello*, I argue that race-based epistemologies in Shakespeare can benefit and expand from considering race/racial identities as glocally multifarious.

Race is a glocal concept; treating it as such yields productive political discussions and further deconstructs group-specific significations by showing how malleable this identity construct is.

Chapter 4, "Cross-Dressing and Gender-Crossing: Hamlet as an Albanian Sworn Virgin" explores gender issues through Noli's 1926 translation and Enke Fezollari's 2015 Albanian production of *Hamlet*. *Hamlet*'s misogynistic rhetoric aptly reflects Albania's patrilineal culture which before and during communism was ruled by the social customs of the *Kanun*—a strict conduct book. The Albanian *Hamlet* palimpsestically embodies the evolution of gender socio-politics in Albania, and these histories are further conflated in the modern performance which includes a cross-gendered and cross-dressing Hamlet. Specifically, the production features actress and former MP for Albania's socialist party, Luiza Xhuvani, as the first female Hamlet in an Albanian production of the play. I suggest that Xhuvani's performance complicates the actor/character divide as she simultaneously embodies both Hamlet's male and global identity and her own local, feminine, and political identity.

The gendered rhetoric of the Albanian text, stemming from the *Kanun,* makes visible the gender difference between Xhuvani and Hamlet, thereby inviting an interpretation of the actor/character as an Albanian sworn virgin—a traditional practice of female transvestites assuming the role of a man in their patrilineal families. As a result of the *Kanun's* patriarchal laws, in the absence of a male figure, Northern Albanian women became sworn virgins, known as *Burrnesha*. They took an oath of celibacy in front of their village elders, and thereafter, dressed as men and assumed the patriarchal role of their household. A reading of Hamlet as a sworn virgin is triggered through the

references to the *Kanun's* gender norms which inspired this subversive tradition. This chapter offers a glocal reading of *Hamlet's* gender politics from pre-communist, communist, and post-communist adaptations to show that gender is always socio-politically contingent and should be read as such. Ultimately, I argue that a glocal reading crosses English and Albanian borders, time periods, and histories to entangle *Hamlet's* gender politics with Albania's customary gender laws as a means of imagining gender as a multivalent construct instead of a divisive binary that upholds patriarchal politics.

Chapter 5, "Political Adaptations and Glocal Politics in *Julius Caesar*," focuses on the political milieus of twentieth and twenty first century Albania as represented through Noli's 1926 translation and Ivica Buljan's 2019 production of *Jul Cezari*. I glocalize *Julius Caesar* through communist and post-communist adaptations to show that Albania's political identity as expressed through Shakespeare is interpreted through body politics. By tracing the glocal body politics of the adaptations, I argue that non-anglophone adaptations of *Julius Caesar* are glocal and therefore produce multiple Caesars. In light of the multiplicity of Caesars (tyrants), the spect-actors are encouraged to contribute to political change by taking physical action. The Albanian production emphasizes this idea by staging the play in four distinct historical and political locations which require the audience to physically enact change.

The glocal reading reveals how local politics shape and are shaped by Shakespeare in historically contingent adaptations. By acknowledging the glocal nature of Shakespearean politics through adaptations like *Jul Cezari*, scholars and critics have a chance to distort the inequitable distribution of power which gives rise to politically superior nations like the UK. As a politically influential force, Shakespeare can promote

a supranational constellation wherein local politics are always in conversation and in flux. Thinking of local and global adaptations as culturally, temporally, and geopolitically evolutionary works helps Shakespeare users disrupt the global domination of Western politics which advances neocolonialism.

The final chapter, "Global Users and Mediatized Adaptations: *II Henry VI* as a Case Study," investigates the influential role of glocal Shakespeare users through Adonis Filipi's Albanian production of *II Henry VI* staged at the 2012 international Globe to Globe festival. Shakespeare users are always already glocal because they engage with Shakespeare through global technology. In addition, I argue that the local identities of Shakespeare users impact how they use and interact with Shakespeare adaptations through global media technologies. However, glocal Shakespeare users from localities like Albania are marginalized and their contributions do not merit as much influence in Shakespeare studies because they are evaluated by Western neoliberal standards. I analyze spectator responses to the *II Henry VI* production to demonstrate the hierarchy of users that prompts dissension between Albanian and English Shakespeare spectators and users. To address these issues, I recommend that Shakespeare critics engage in glocal readings of non-anglophone adaptations in order to understand the production and its reception and eliminate user hierarchies.

Although I introduce glocal Shakespeare through Albanian adaptations, my hope is that Shakespeare scholars and critics will employ this analytical method to various locations that stem from equally complex cultural and socio-historical identities. For instance, one might read Shakespeare adaptations in El Paso, Texas, or similar borderlands, glocally to understand how hybrid and multitemporal cultural identities are

negotiated through Shakespeare. In turn, these glocal Shakespeares help Shakespeare studies evolve into a multifarious and integrative network where there is no original or singular authority monopolizing localities. I am imagining a Shakespearean rhizome filled with glocal assemblages. By glocalizing Shakespeare in Albania, I have placed the first piece of the puzzle. Now, I invite Shakespearean scholars to read non-anglophone Shakespearean adaptations palimpsestically and illuminate this infinite glocal network. Nostalgia for an authentic Shakespeare and an original world cannot exist in such a glocal community. Thus, Shakespeare will always be multiple, in-between, and shared.

Global thinking is a byproduct of my own lived experience and identity as an American-Albanian Shakespeare scholar. James Bulman reminds us that the "archival work of performance critics is itself a form of performance" (4). With this in mind, I wish to acknowledge my own locality as a critic, an on-looker of a culture and place that is both my own and not. I am native Albanian scholar, born in post-communist Albania, but having moved and lived in Greece, and now in the U.S., I find that my own identity is distorted. While I foreground my cultural ties to Albania, I must also acknowledge that now my critical perspective is attuned to Western criticism and scholarship. I am reading and writing about Albania, but I am not in Albania. This makes a world of difference as my stance is somewhat glocal too.

CHAPTER 2: GLOCAL SHAKESPEARE IN PRAXIS: A GLOCAL READING OF *MACBETH* IN ALBANIA

Fan S. Noli translated *Macbeth* in Albanian in 1926 and it was staged for the first time in the National Theatre of Albania in 2018 by Kled Kapexhiu. The 1926 and 2018 *Macbeth* adaptations have been studied and reviewed individually,[16] but the serious time gap between them has prevented further inquiry of their relationship to each other, Shakespeare's work, and Albania's cultural identity. I venture that the local status of these Albanian adaptations of *Macbeth*, determined by linguistic barriers and the mise-en-scène, has sheltered them from reaching global recognition. In addition, Albania's exclusion from literary and economic global markets, as well as Albania's peripheral inclusion in Shakespeare's industry, has limited the celebrity of Albanian adaptations and stalled their potential in Shakespearean criticism. Nonetheless, these gaps are useful for understanding how Shakespeare is adapted across historical periods and localities (spatial and cultural), and how Shakespeare scholars and critics can better analyze the peculiarities of Albanian adaptations by glocal, and not only Western European, standards.

How Shakespeareans choose to interpret adaptations determines their relationship to the work and the evolution of Shakespeare. Glocal Shakespeare challenges Shakespeare's dominance by encouraging a multiplicity of pasts, instead of a singular, English past. Susan Bennett argues that Shakespeare's cultural dominance is a result of a modern nostalgia for the past— "a nostalgia for that authenticity which is not retrievable"

[16] I refer to translations and performances as adaptations while noting that translation-based performances dictate their own genre of adaptation.

(5). Shakespeare users seek in Shakespeare stability as a refuge from their present instability. Nostalgia, Bennet t explains, "is constituted as a longing for certain qualities and attributes in lived experience that we have apparently lost, at the same time as it indicates our inability to produce parallel qualities and attributes which would satisfy the particularities of lived experience in the present" (5). In other words, nostalgia for Shakespeare is a desire for "an imagined and imaginary past" (Bennett 5). This desire for an original Shakespeare, as a means of cultural dominance, leads to the othering of non-English and non-European Shakespeares.

By using highbrow Shakespeare, Western Europe has defined its identity by othering the pasts of other European nations like Albania whose alterity is reproduced via geographical, political, social, and racial othering. I explore the socio-political othering between Europe and Albania through a glocal reading that disrupts and replaces this binary relationship with a culturally, temporally, and historically palimpsestic one. Through the *Macbeth* adaptations, I show that Albania is not Europe's uncivilized and politically corrupt other.[17] Instead, all European nations share social, cultural, and political characteristics in their interconnected pasts and presents. The palimpsestic nature of glocal Shakespeare distorts how one perceives time, therefore disallowing for the linear division of past and present that induces nostalgia. Because of its anti-hegemonic properties, the palimpsestic method is adopted frequently, but no matter how "forcefully" Shakespeare users read and write on the palimpsest, its nature cannot be

[17] Similar to Edward Said's Orientalism theory, this foreignization of Balkan nations is referred to as Balkanization.

concealed (Huang 24, 32). I capitalize on the palimpsest's ability to transform both its object (Shakespeare) and subjects (Shakespeareans).

The palimpsest is not new to Shakespeare. Alexander Huang argues that Shakespeare is a palimpsest that is constantly re-written and erased (24). Similarly, Jonathan Gil Harris views material and immaterial objects such as *Macbeth's* gunpowder smell and *Othello's* handkerchief to be palimpsestic because they trigger many temporal realities in the present moment, thereby changing it. And more recently, Karoline Johanna Baumann uses the palimpsest metaphor to show how stage characters in *Troilus and Cressida* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, that derive from ancient sources and are repeatedly re-written, challenge historical periodization (13). Baumann argues that "multiple pasts (as well as futures) are contained in the present" and these "distinct, disparate moments of time are anachronistically conjoined, 'compressed' in a palimpsest-like manner" (9). In this process, there is no "linear or hierarchical relationship" between the palimpsestic inscriptions (Baumann 9). Due its equitable features, the palimpsest is the foundation of my glocal Shakespeare methodology. But whereas Harris applies the palimpsest to objects, and Baumann to characters, I attribute the palimpsest to non-anglophone adaptations. However, my employment of palimpsestic reading of Shakespeare adaptations differs from theirs in that it doesn't only extend temporally, but also, culturally and spatially. The palimpsest-like nature of glocal Shakespeare implies that historical, geographical, and cultural pasts are interwoven between local identities.

The glocal in this case becomes a means of seeing Shakespeare as simultaneously local and global via multiple histories, borders, and cultures. Traces of glocal assemblages are embedded in Shakespearean motifs such as tyranny and witchcraft. To

examine the temporally, spatially, and culturally glocal exchanges present in Albanian adaptations, I analyze tyranny and witchcraft in *Macbeth.* By tracing these historically and politically contingent themes embodied in *Macbeth* throughout pre-communist, communist, and post-communist Albania, I will show how to apply a glocal interpretation of Shakespeare. By way of the palimpsestic method, glocalizing *Macbeth* in Albania summons forth a Scottish imagined community, an English history, and several Albanian pasts—all of which, in the present, form a new glocal identity that extends beyond the nation. In response to Ton Hoenselaars' call for European Shakespeare to address how Shakespeare might reach a supranational idea with a common denominator (11), I contend that glocal Shakespeares as a methodology compliments a supranational Shakespeare culture without erasing local histories and identities. Eventually, this glocal perspective destabilizes the very idea of European Shakespeare and questions the nature of Shakespearean research.

In "the spirit of glocalization" (Joubin & Mancewicz 14), I perform a glocal reading of *Macbeth* by palimpsesting the Albanian translation and performance. When translation and performance are used and studied together as a means of "intersemiotic translation (or translation between sign systems)" (Hoenselaars 43), they become glocal by weaving local and global and past and present memories into a new cultural identity. Of course, translation and performance adaptations in non-anglophone settings are already glocal, but together, the localized translation and the globalized performance procure a glocal *Macbeth*, thereby doubly emphasizing the glocal effect. I explore *Macbeth*'s tyranny and witchcraft as examples of glocalized ideologies in Albanian theatre and culture. Noli's translation localized *Macbeth* in Albania through his political

commentary, while Kapexhiu's production incorporated intercultural design aesthetics which instead globalized the performance. While the tyrannical rhetoric of the translation alludes to Albanian politics, the translation-based performance, or tradaptation,[18] expands beyond national politics to the global politics of performance and theatre. The production transforms characters into larger-than-life shadows and marionettes whose choreographed mechanical movements and skeletal makeup are reminiscent of Platonic theatre assisted by technology. The performance becomes visually global as the weïrd sisters are beautified to resemble Kabuki figures. The glocal reading of the adaptation which already exhibits glocal features, ultimately distorts local and global theatrical identities through Shakespeare in order to establish the glocal cultural identity of Albania as a nation in-between.

Glocalizing *Makbeth* in Translation

Shakespeare's tyrannical plays have been used to maintain and subvert governments. Shakespeare, as Keith Gregor states, provides examples of good and bad tyrants (8). As one of Shakespeare's plays with the most references to tyrants and tyranny, *Macbeth* is acknowledged as a universal, cautionary tale about power. In *Political Shakespeare*, Jonathan Dollimore argues that tragedy as a genre is "the most capable of transcending the historical moment of inception and of representing universal truths" (9). In addition, Stephen Greenblatt implies that tyranny isn't only universal; it is

[18] I am adapting Michel Garneau's term which refers to "the flexile midway stage between translation and adaptation" to explain translation-based performance adaptations instead of the intended focus on textual translations (Hoenselaars16).

also infinite because it "attempts to poison not merely the present but generations to come, to extend itself forever" (106). *Macbeth's* universality has steered it far away from its Jacobean home to many global appropriations where tyranny gains a new name and history. Outside of the historical context that ties *Macbeth* to James I of England, I argue that the play adapts to different histories, but not uniformly. The cultural translation of Shakespeare is apparent in the retention of Shakespeare's name and status on Noli's translations—reminding readers that Shakespeare is never wholly Albanian nor English.

In short, "the subject of *Macbeth* is tyranny" (Cantor 667). Tyranny is a globally understood concept that gets adapted locally. Because of its tyrranical subject, Paul A. Cantor argues that "*Macbeth* can at any time embody the fears and hopes of a subjugated people" (669). Consequently, *Macbeth* cannot be analyzed globally since its local impact fluctuates. Cantor exclaims that *Macbeth* "makes you want to take Shakespeare away from the English and give him to someone who will really know what to do with him" (667). For this reason, it has served as a medium by which many Eastern European and Balkan nations, like Albania, have critiqued, embodied, and reflected upon their respective histories with tyranny.

Fan S. Noli introduced *Makbeth*[19] to Albania in the early 1900s. *Makbeth* was Noli's last Shakespearean translation in his tetralogy of tragedies. As part of the expatriate movement, Noli translated *Makbeth* with the agenda of attacking his political rival, the self-proclaimed King Ahmet Zog by comparing him to the usurper Macbeth. *Makbeth* then became a source of criticism for Albanian tyrants to come. For example,

[19] I use *Makbeth* to reference the translation, and *Macbeth* to reference the work as a whole.

Nexhmije Hoxha, the wife of communist dictator Enver Hoxha, was recently named "Lady Macbeth of Albania." Zog and the Hoxhas are viewed as Albania's tyrants because they wounded their country with oppressive regimes. As the translation was read through Albania's transition from monarchy to communism, it embodied both of these historical and political moments.

The conceptualization of *Makbeth* began in Vienna where Noli was living in exile. Both Fan Noli and Ahmet Zog were politicians, but Zog rose to power and made many enemies (Tomes). In June of 1924, a peasant-centered revolt, led by Noli, dislodged Zog from his position and named Noli the Prime Minister of Albania instead. Zog feared for his life and fled to Yugoslavia. Meanwhile Noli tried to lead a democratic state. His experiences and education abroad, especially his studies at Harvard, had oriented him with Western ideologies based on which he developed a twenty-point program to democratize the country through agrarian reform. Noli's plan to eradicate feudalism failed. He explained that his system failed because "By insisting on the agrarian reforms [he] aroused the wrath of the landed aristocracy; by failing to carry them out [he] lost the support of the peasant masses" (qtd. in Elsie, 106). After six months, Zog backed by Yugoslav forces, returned, and overthrew Noli. By 1925, Zog was elected president, but he ruled Albania as a military dictatorship, stripping civilians of liberties, murdering opponents, and censoring freedom of speech. On September 1st, 1928 Zogu declared himself king. Noli protested Zog's inauguration as king of Albania by stating that "This farce was prepared in Rome and played at Tirana. It is an odious crime against the Albanian people and the Balkanic people in general" (qtd. in *NYT*). At this point, Noli had to flee, and he sought refuge in Western countries where he translated and published

Shakespeare.[20] All this historical context informed interpretations of the translation in pre-communist Albania. The mention of tyrants in Noli's introduction and his translation led his readers to interpret Macbeth as a Scottish, a Jacobean, and an Albanian tyrant.

Although Noli does not openly compare Macbeth to Ahmet Zog, his introduction to the translation sets up the play as a point of political reflection and a cautionary tale. Noli localizes *Macbeth* for Albania by conflating the global theme of tyranny with terrorism. Noli sees *Macbeth* as a "criticism of the government's terrorist system" (vi). His analysis transforms *Makbeth's* tyrants to terrorists. Consequently, when Angus comments, "Those he commands move only in command, / Nothing in love" (5.2.22-23), Noli writes that "Ushtarët nuk i binden veç nga frika, / Po jo nga dashuria" (Soldiers obey only out of fear, and not from love) (126)[21] in order to compare Macbeth's poor leadership to Zog's forceful and fearful militant control. Noli builds the idea of Macbeth as an Albanian tyrant by suggesting that the scared Albanian population is like a rotten piece of wood that breaks under the tyrant's feet (vi). Noli faults Macbeth's "criminal ambition" (vi) because it is similar to the monarchical ambition of Ahmet Zog. Through indirect metaphors and analogies, Noli compares Macbeth's monarchy to Zog's kingship which for readers blends Macbeth's identity as Scottish, British, and Albanian.

Noli situates *Macbeth* as a mirror of England's relationship to Scotland, and he does not change the setting from Scotland to Albania; therefore, Albanian readers

[20] His later translations were completed in Belgium. Noli returned to the United States in 1930 where he continued to advocate for Albanian diplomacy through his literary prowess.

[21] Noli's *Othello* translation uses page instead of line numbers. All English translations from Albanian are mine.

conflate these histories, time periods, and locations as they think about tyranny. This palimpsestic process makes the non-Anglophone Shakespeare adaptation glocal. The glocal nature of Noli's *Makbeth* is also indicative of "a desire to 'be simultaneously different and the same—different within the ingroup but the same to 'outsiders'" (Robertson 6). In other words, Albania's history with tyranny, as related through *Macbeth*, belongs to a common thread of tyrannical European rulers. Hence, Noli claims that *Macbeth's* plot is universal because it "has been repeated a hundred times with some variations, in the history of the world" (vii). Yet, Albania's connection to tyranny is also a unique variation because Albania's tyrant, King Zog, is qualified as a terrorist and not just a tyrannical monarch. Such variations make the work glocal. Ultimately, Noli's desire to glocalize Albania through Shakespeare proves that "each nation strove to demonstrate its cultural maturity by having its own version of Shakespeare and thus sharing in the status of the plays as international possessions" (Stillars 5). Albanian Shakespeare is glocal because it is always torn in-between global ambition and local identity.

When Noli localizes *Macbeth* in Albania he is in fact glocalizing Shakespeare. He begins with an intercultural comparison of Scotland's history of "bloody terrorisms and a foreign army invasion" (vi) and Albania's history of invasions. Specifically, Noli judges Malcolm for relying on foreign aid to take back his country. He says, "The tragic irony… is that Malcolm, who occupies Scotland's throne with an English army is saluted by the parish and the people as a liberator" (vi). Noli sympathizes with the Scottish population which was so desperate for change that they chose a faulty leader. He writes, "A nation, which is widely disgruntled at that point by the terrorism of the national government,

would prefer a foreign invasion and call it the only salvation, is fatally doomed to lose political independence" (Noli vi). This is a clear allusion to Zog's re-occupation of his political position with the help of Yugoslav aid. The Albanian people falsely chose, or better yet, allowed Zog instead of Noli to lead them. The *Makbeth* introduction directly connects pre-communist Albanian and Early Modern Scottish history.

The translation continues to glocalize *Macbeth* in Albania via the concept of tyrannical leadership. For example, Macbeth says that Banquo is essentially freed in death because "Treason done his worst: nor steel, nor poison, / Malice domestic, foreign envy, nothing, / Can touch him further" (3.2.25-27). However, Noli plainly translates the malady of foreign envy into one of invasion: "S'e nget dot më as hekuri, as helmi / As kryengritja, as invazj'e huaj" (Not iron, nor poison hurts him, neither rebellion or foreign invasion) (68). This translation choice emphasizes Albania's personal history with invasion. But this historical reference travels beyond 1928 Albania, to the colonization of Albania by the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the themes of tyranny and invasion are glocalized as *Makbeth* joins Scotland's past with Albania history of tyranny across historical and political time periods. The condemnation of invasion in *Makbeth* can be interpreted as nationalism. However, as a well-travelled scholar, Noli is not against foreign influence. In fact, he has vehemently advocated for the recognition of his country by European nations and the United States. Instead, Noli uses *Makbeth* to caution against foreign military presence given Albania's long history with invasions. Naturally, Noli's contemporary and modern readers would interpret these translated references based on their personal knowledge of history. Thus, glocalization demands an informed audience so as to not misjudge local Shakespeare adaptations as nationalistic.

Noli reflects on *Macbeth* as a play that "shows that he who begins his governance with bloodshed and terrorism is bound fatally to continue as he began, he can't turn back anymore, he enters deeper and deeper and is doomed to drown in the pool of blood he himself created" (vi). Because Noli couldn't specifically name Zog or Albania in the translation, the political message of his translation transcends its pre-communist localization. Afterall, his translation found more readers during the communist period. Elsa Demo reveals that Shakespeare is read more than he is seen in performance by the Albanian public. By reading this glocal translation in pre-communist Albania, readers would reflect on their contemporary moment with Zog as well as previous historical moments. Likewise, communist readers related Macbeth to Hoxha without necessarily forgetting their historical-political past. And presently, post-communist readers might discuss *Makbeth* with politician Edi Rama in mind while still remembering Hoxha. In all reception processes, the historical context of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* is added to Noli's *Makbeth* in print, calling on its global capital within Albania. This is how *Makbeth* becomes glocal. By forgetting and remembering, history and time become fragmentary and a new glocal identity is formed.

Glocalization takes on a literal form in translation through palimpsestuous lexicons. To examine this further, Ornela Çoku argues that Fan Noli mixes the old Albanian lexicon with the new to create a superior form of narration. The "historicized lexicon" in *Macbeth*, she suggests, is a way for the translator to deliberately emphasize that "this was a foreign world, which describes a distant period of time" (24). If Noli calls forth the past, whose past is it that emerges? The language of the past that Noli resurrects through the translation carries many possibilities of cultural memories. Stuart Stillars

implies that "The force of the tyrant offers a dominant note that is applicable to any time, any regime, either through its instant presence or through collective memory" (4). Glocal translations call upon cultural memory to produce glocalized meaning. Noli's diction then brought to pre-communist Albania cultural memories of Shakespeare's and Albania's tyrants. When *Makbeth* was reread during Hoxhaism, these remainders of the past would be remembered as fragments to a collective cultural memory without any semblance of a linear narrative. The cultural memories in the translation continuously adapt to places and times, thus the translation performs memory as a process of distortion. By the time the translation reaches the stage, its multiple significations are both lost and reformed anew. The past then always reemerges in the present for the sake of establishing a historically embedded national identity. However, this palimpsestic process actually produces a glocal rather than national identity.

The past is remembered and recreated in the present through language and more broadly through themes that simultaneously carry local and global meaning. Tyranny is the first glocal motif, and witchcraft is the second most prevalent, glocal theme in *Makbeth*. In a local setting where superstition reins high, the supernatural elements of *Macbeth*, especially the witches and ghosts, are also localized. These beliefs were particularly dominant in pre-communist and post-communist Albania because occult practices remerge in periods of economic transition and uncertainty. Noli's endeavor to move away from feudalism became a reality in post-communist Albania, but the transition also resulted in increased anxieties about property and wealth. These anxieties

manifested through folk ideals and superstitious practices. [22] A good example of such practice is the use of a dordolec (scarecrow) outside homes for protection against the *evil eye*—"a look of envy that is believed to cause real and sudden damage to valued possessions, including the home, livestock, and even children" (Putzi 9). According to Kristin Peterson-Bidoshi, "The presence of belief in the evil eye is found in communities who understand the idea of limited good to mean that there are fixed amounts of resources at their disposal" (339). Consequently, the fear of witchcraft was reintroduced at the wake of communism, or what Bidoshi aptly calls "post-post-communism."

The supernatural, for Albanian readers of *Makbeth,* was not simply myth. Tales of ghosts and witches when embodied in Albanian culture risk a literal interpretation because Albanian folklore blurs the line between mythical and real. For instance, Albanian witches are known to "perform their malicious sorceries in the dark, and collect herbs of baleful influence, with the help of which they paralyze their enemies and cattle with disease" (Putzi 9). In *Makbeth,* Noli names the witches as magjistrice, a derivative of the word "magjia" which refers to "an evil woman or an old hag who can do people harm by wishing them bad luck (Elsie 2001, 164). However, the witches of *Macbeth* are called by several names: witches, prophets, hags. The variant translations of these words signify new mythological meanings in Albanian culture because of the inherent and inherited variety of witches. When Banquo confesses his dream "of the three weïrd sisters" (2.1.20), in translation they're described as "Të tria motrat magjistrica" (the three

[22] As a young girl in Albania, I remember the great discomfort of having garlic cloves stashed in my stockings to ward off the evil eye. This is a common example of a superstitious tradition.

sister witches) (Noli 37). However, whenever the witches are being criticized, they are referred to as "shtrigë" (Noli 11). Similarly, when Macbeth calls them "filthy hags" (4.1.114), Noli instead calls them "Shtriga" (95). A shtrigë in Albanian folklore and mythology describes a specific vampiric witch that preys on infant blood during the night.[23] This cross-cultural figure of "the *shtriga* is usually conceived of as an older woman with remarkable supernatural powers and a penchant for cannibalism" (Heller 27). Robert Elsie explains that "Though any woman, young or old, can be found to be a shtriga, they are usually ugly old hags who live in hidden places in the forest and have supernatural powers" (2001, 236). The multiplicity of names and histories recalled in *Macbeth* suggests that the witches carry an ambivalent role in the play. There is no single historical or present definition for their being because they are glocalized. They blur myth and reality just as a glocal translation blurs past and present, local and global cultures.

Glocalizing *Macbeth* in Performance

From translation to performance, we transition from a political to a cultural agenda. Whereas Noli glocalizes *Makbeth* by drawing political connections, Kled Kapexhiu diverts from the politics of the country to the politics of theatre. His *Macbeth*[24] production is glocal because it layers the local associations of witchcraft and tyranny, noted in the translation, with global theatre aesthetics. For example, the production

[23] This term is now used as a common insult.

[24] Kapexhiu names his production after Shakespeare's *Macbeth* rather than Noli's *Makbeth*, even though he uses this translation.

transforms the witches into three beautiful women with short, embroidered dresses and Kabuki face makeup; their mannerisms become mechanical and doll-like, and their chants are mostly sung to create an operatic effect. Visually the performance borrows from global theatre aesthetics, but the translation's rhetoric continues to signify the witches as evil, ugly shtriga, therefore combining contradictory images at once. The witches' conflicting nature is also illustrated when they show their bloody hands while maintaining their pristine and cheerful composure. Although the visualization of these characters is global and beautiful, the language of the translation reminds audiences' the vile historical representations of the witches in Albania and England. In other words, the local language from Noli's *Makbeth* collides with Kapexhiu's transcultural performance techniques, resulting in a glocalized adaptation. Precisely, I categorize Kapexhiu's production of *Macbeth* as a glocal tradaptation because it makes spectators conscious of its palimpsestic features, and it capitalizes on Shakespeare's global market without compromising its local language.

Kapexhiu's production is a great example of glocal Shakespeare because it visually represents and embodies the sameness and difference that is produced when local and global theatre strategies enfold. Primarily, the performance demonstrates that Macbeth's tyranny is not an old and buried tale, but one that lives on in our immediate environments, albeit through different forms and images. For instance, Indrit Cobani as Macbeth appears in a crimson red business suit and black shirt that alludes to the Albanian flag and also indicates that Albanian tyrants now come in new shapes and forms. The attire reminds audiences that tyrants are businessmen and politicians, while Noli's language recalls images of Zog, Hoxha, and James I. While the audience is not

likely to recall Noli's commentary or the historical context of *Makbeth*, I argue they are able to recognize and expect the theme of tyranny in performance, especially as Macbeth appears before them as a blood-thirsty, red devil whose only affiliation is to his wife. This glocal adaptation is both familiar and unfamiliar.

Glocal Shakespeares rely on palimpsestic memory to make meaning. Max Silverman explains that "The relationship between present and past therefore takes the form of a superimposition and interaction of different temporal traces to constitute a sort of composite structure, like a palimpsest, so that one layer of traces can be seen through, and is transformed by, another" (3). Non-anglophone performances of Shakespeare that rely on translation are always already glocal because they engage with past and present, and local and global tensions at once to produce a new assemblage of meaning(s). The world of fashion offers a fitting analogy to the way that vintage and global styles are presently restored to create a new multicultural, multilocal, multitemporal, and essentially glocal identity that is consumed locally. Similarly, the translation-based performance evokes performative language through which "by saying or in saying something we are *doing* something" (Plate and Smelik 8, my emphasis). In this sense, translation in performance is given the political agency to reproduce multiple pasts in the present, resulting in a new glocal cultural identity. Thus, the translated language of *Macbeth does* the past anew. A glocal adaptation of *Macbeth* shows how this composite act of remembering a national identity can be altered through the glocalization of theatrical aesthetics and practices. If remembering is a form of creation, then through a repetition of historical memories (pre, mid, post, and post-post-communist) in Albanian adaptations of Shakespeare, a new plural identity is formed.

When Kapexhiu's *Macbeth* takes the stage, it transforms characters into larger-than-life shadows, literally and metaphorically. On a physical level, the borrowed makeup and costumes glocalize the performers' bodies. Specifically, the Kabuki style makeup and masks translate the Albanian bodies of the actors as simultaneously Japanese, English, and Scottish bodies because visual and linguistic significations are not separate from each other. Likewise, the dramatic and skeletal ancient Greek-theatre inspired makeup highlights the nonhuman difference between immaterial objects and the material bodies beneath. The use of global and ancient facial prosthetics symbolizes the art of drama and its theatrical practices across cultures, "producing a chain of signification which draws together disparate spaces and times" (Silverman 3). This is also reflected through costuming. Apart from the female actors, the rest of the actors are dressed in suits—visibly cuing the modernity of the adaptation. Cobani as Macbeth is the most physically localized personality because the local Albanian colors of Cobani's costume, which are not replicated unto the rest, are interpreted together with the global makeup techniques and the local language. Consequently, the performers embody glocal characters which in turn glocalize *Macbeth*. In embodying the glocal, the performance relays the difference between the conceptual relationship of character/actor/spectator across cultures. Thus, the performers embody embodiment.

The puppeteered, doll-like behavior of the actors and the manipulation of stage shadows are reminiscent of traditional folk theatre, whereas the costumes and facial prosthetics typify modern global theatre. The assemblage of these elements glocalizes the production so that all identities are renegotiated in light of the present performance. To achieve this, Kapexhiu borrows from Petr Matásek's puppet theatre style which combines

"text, action, movement, and kinetics" and treats "puppets, objects, actors, costumes, light, and scenography [sic] as equal elements in the presentation" (Unruh 62). Light, movement and language become equal, simultaneous modes of storytelling in Kapexhiu's adaptation. Light creates the performers' shadows; the performers then become puppets with stiff and robotic movements; and the language of the translation supports those shadows and movements. All these elements in equal measure translate the importance of sight in glocal adaptations. Shakespearean performances are traditionally rooted in auditory practices; however, postmodern productions centralize sight and spectatorship in performance because it allows spectators to see the glocalization of the characters.

Stagecraft makes glocalization visible. Stage lighting technology fabricates real and surreal shadows of the characters/performers. These simulated shadows are reflections of the faceless, immaterial in-betweenness of characters and performers. For instance, by seeing the shadows of the character/actor projected on the bare, white background of the stage, spectators are able "to perceive [Macbeth and Cobani] as separate entities, existing on different perceptual planes, but also to construct a third identity, the "blended" [Macbeth/Cobani], who occupies both planes at once" (Purcell 23). What Purcell describes here as "conceptual blending" I avow is part of the process of glocalization. Taking Purcell's argument that metatheatricality "emerges when an element of the 'Then and There' starts to interact with the 'Now and Here' in a way that it previously had not" (33), I argue that glocal metatheatricality follows the same process of exchange wherein both audience and performer experience intercultural exchange and are aware of it. The shadows prove that spectators can see how the actor embodies the multiplicity of the character but cannot separate them. That multiplicity is realized

through the palimpsestic blending of sight and sound. The language from Noli's *Makbeth* and the visual aesthetics of Kapexhiu's globally-inspired production assemble to give meaning to the shadows.

Although Kapexhiu tries to distance the production from Noli's politically motivated translation, the two are bound by language: specifically, language of shadows. The translation makes several references to shadows, and even conflates them with ghosts. For example, Macduff exclaims that he "S'fle dot nga hij'e gruas dhe e bijve" (cannot sleep because of the shadows of his wife and children) (138). Noli's textual references to shadows are enhanced in performance as Kapexhiu employs shadow play. This is especially true in the final scene where *Macbeth* delivers his infamous speech: "Kjo jetë s'është veçse hije ecëse, / Aktor I humbur, që bërtet e shkundet / Pas rolit tij mbi skenën për pak kohë. Dhe s'ndihet më;" (This life is but a walking shadow, / The lost actor, who yells and shakes / after his role on stage for a brief time. And is heard no more) (Noli 134). The actors embody walking shadows or ghosts of past, multitemporal, and multicultural Macbeths, and when the spectators simultaneously see performers and shadows, they become aware of the theatrical technology enabling this sight. The presence of technology, particularly the manipulation of stage lighting and audio, is consciously emphasized so that spectators focus on the mise-en-scène in tandem with the narrative. The stagecraft permits spectators to experience the palimpsestuous process of glocal adaptations.

These shadows can be read as an allusion to Greek shadow theatre or an allegory to Plato's Cave. The bare stage walls allegorize theatre as a space of entrapment, where both the spectators and the performers are the prisoners facing the shadows. Thus, the

production teaches viewers a new way of seeing performance—a glocal way that incorporates many histories, times, and cultures, all connected by human and non-human agents. The result is an untraditional image of the play which forces the spectator to realize that they are watching a performance that is between past and present, local and global, real and mythical.

Kapexhiu's aesthetic and directorial choices are indebted to Avant Garde theatre. In fact, because the production assembles local and global theatrical and cultural elements it resonates with the Avant Garde theatre's orientation toward socio-politically innovative performances. Kapexhiu approaches the Avant Garde through Brecht's Alienation-Affect wherein "The audience can no longer have the illusion of being the unseen spectator at an event which is really taking place" (Brecht 92). This is what Erin Sullivan describes in the theatre as "concentrated co-presence, both in time and place, which has the power to move, overwhelm, and transform" (59). When the performance shows us "performing," it is demonstrating what Richard Schechner calls "restored behavior" (28-29). Consequently, Plate and Smelik argue that "The notion of performance, then, can be understood as embodied behaviour that privileges body over speech, presence over absence and praxis over product" (9). Because such a performance relies heavily on seeing as part of the performative experience, critics like Elsa Demo fault the *Macbeth* production for not allowing you to "work with your ears" (Demo). But that's just the point—a distinctly glocal performance embraces the multiplicity of the work and asks the spectator to do the same. As prescribed by avant-gardism, the point of such performance is to provoke social awareness and action in the real world outside the

theatre. Kapexhiu's *Macbeth* encourages and undertakes social intervention by altering its familiar form. But its success requires the audience to also think glocally.

Albanian spectators embody their own cultural memories, therefore, the theatre becomes a place where body-to-body cultural transmission is reconciled and/or resistance is produced. As the *Macbeth* adaptation emphasizes its glocal nature, it also challenges the normative structures of reception that dominate Albanian theatre and Shakespeare Performance studies. The mixed receptions about the production capture both the resistance and celebration of glocalization's authoritative defiance. The resistance of the performing bodies against hegemonic theatre practices is met first with resistance from spectators and critics. For instance, critic Elsa Demo writes:

> "Their text is shortened…while creating empty spaces of silence and tension which the director might have thought of as another language in itself that needs to be understood between the lines. The omissions by the author and these kinds of additions from the director, have damaged the climate that Shakespeare creates…Thus the spectator is placed under the power of what is expected to happen. The wait becomes exhausting, it is the burden of Macbeth which exhausts the public, a burden that the director has sacrificed to honor the extremism of the external form, in a way that form and content stick to each other like oil in water. The impossible intimate rapport is due to the demonstration of musical background, mechanical sensations, slow robotic movements, hand gestures, masks. They all dominate Shakespeare and play with him" (Demo).

In her review, Demo questions the unfamiliar style of Kapehiu's production. She criticizes his privilege of movement and choreography over language, but that is to be

expected from an Avant-Garde performance. The production draws attention to its own form, not allowing the spectators to be fully immersed in the narrative. This is distressing to those who expect Shakespeare to be, for a lack of a better term, "Shakespeare." The ways in which Kapexhiu "plays" and "dominates" Shakespeare, however, is part of the work. According to Courtney Lehmann, "what is 'not-Shakespear' is, quite precisely, what Shakespeare is" (46). Lehmann calls this the *counter-Shakespearean* adaptation "that houses the "not-Shakespeare" within their own narrative structure" (46). This novel *Macbeth* is redefining Shakespeare adaptations by multiplicity not originality.

Contrary to Demo's views, critics like Josif Papagjoni have praised Kapexhiu for bringing something new to the theatre—"a different image and form to the work, his own vision" (2018). Papagjoni argues that Kapexhiu "has avoided mimesis, and speaks to a model of postmodernism." Alas, he finds all aspects of the mise-en-scenè which Demo rejects to be purposeful and effective. Papagjoni also claims that what matters most about the production is its ability to put "psychological pressure on the spectator in order to discover the horror that the work contains." This imaginative reading engages with the authority of the past by explicating it as a tale that was, is, and continues to be transformed. Nonetheless, Demo articulates in her criticism that her resistance to what I have analyzed to be a glocal adaptation, emerges because the production "confuses the perceptions of a public unfamiliar with Shakespeare." But I would attest that those experiencing Shakespeare for the first time through a glocal production like *Macbeth* are fortunate to know him as an evolving site of performative possibility.

Glocal Shakespeare attempts to destroy this nostalgia for an organic 'Shakespeare' because it ultimately others non-anglophone adaptations as less than. On

the other hand, by acknowledging Shakespeare's glocal essence, binaries between local and global forces, and hierarchies of value between local adaptations would no longer determine what Shakespeare is and to whom he belongs. I believe that Demo's skepticism is the result of a desire to prove Albanian theatre's worth by doing Shakespeare straight. But because non-Western adaptations are judged by Western standards, these attempts for 'authentic' and text-based adaptations would also fail. This is why glocal adaptations and glocal criticisms are necessary to combat such power imbalances between transnational theatres.

Theatres are themselves glocal. Part of the Albanian localization of *Macbeth*, despite its global diaspora, resolves from the location of the play in the National Theatre of Albania—a building with its own flesh memory. Irwin et al. express that peoples with strong basis in oral tradition enact their cultural memories "along a continuum of belonging to the land, honoring the land, and inheriting a place" (200). Although *Macbeth* was never staged there before, the stage is a place that embodies residues of performances from traditional Albanian theatre and Albanian Shakespeare. As Plate and Smelik declare, "performances of memory take place in space and thus are mediated by it, they are also productive of space and mediate our experience of it" (16). Subsequently, the Albanian theatre is complicit in the glocalization of Albania's cultural memory because it collects and exudes cultural memories. The authority that resides in the theatre can be also understood by comparison to the prestige, history, and capital value of The Globe—an English monument and an international site. The theatre is a place that resides between sameness and difference.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have tried to show how a Shakespeare critic might analyze a non-anglophone adaptation glocally in order to reflect the adaptation's form and the culture's *in media res* identity. By recognizing *Macbeth* as glocal, I attempt to redistribute, that which is impossible to destroy, Shakespeare's global cultural and economic authority. To begin, I embrace Shakespeare's multiplicity. As Ayanna Thompson argues, Shakespeare is "never coherent, stable, fixed, and defined. Instead, he was/ is always defined through the recreation of his identity, image, texts, and performances" (2011, 17). In addition to what Thompson suggests, I propose that glocal Shakespeares are always culturally, geographically and temporally fluid. As a result, they are able to destabilize structures of conventional practices of adaptation and analysis in Shakespeare studies.

As Shakespeare is glocalized, he can no longer function as a measurement of authenticity because to be glocal is to forsake nostalgic ties to the "original" and to embody temporal, cultural, and spatial multiplicity. Glocal Shakespeares as a concept and a methodology accounts for the personal (including local, regional, national) relationships of all Shakespeare users with the global Shakespeare industry. The inclusive glocalization of such consumer-product relations creates a new set of advantages and challenges for Shakespeare Studies. As the world grows glocal, Shakespeareans are called upon to glocalize their methods of research in order to address systemic privileges in access, archives, and education of Shakespeare users outside of British and American literature.

CHAPTER 3: GLOCALIZING *OTHELLO*: PERFORMING RACE RHETORIC ON THE ALBANIAN STAGE

Othello was the first play performed and translated in Albania.[25] The play was initially staged in 1890 in Korça as an amateur school performance in a church hall. An Albanian translation did not exist at the time, so the performers relied on Italian translations and their own oral performance traditions. *Othello* officially reappeared on the Albanian stage in 1953, as a politically-motivated performance based on Bishop Fan S. Noli's 1916 translation.[26] Noli translated *Othello* while he was living in the United States, studying at Harvard University.[27] His choice was primarily "induced by his status as an 'other', an 'alien' in culture, origin, complexion, like other emigrants" from Europe (Kadija 37). During his stay in Boston, Noli was inspired to translate *Othello* after observing the struggles of the African American community. It appears as if Noli was thinking glocally when he translated *Othello* in Albanian. He found the realities of immigration, alienation, and racism reflected not only in Shakespeare's play, but also in the connection between black Americans and Albanian immigrants. As a result, *Othello* was translated and performed with the political agenda "to attack 'racial' discrimination" in Albania (Kadija 37). Hence, Noli's translation emphasizes that Othello is a type of

[25] Albania is thought to be the remainder of Illyria. Fan Noli's preface to *Othello* notes that he is translating the play for the Albanian people in their own language—"the ancient language of the Illyrians."

[26] Noli is one of Albania's most revered political and literary figures.

[27] The finished translation was published by Vatra, the pan-Albanian Federation of America which Noli and Faik Konica co-founded. The translation's success inspired Noli to also translate *Hamlet, Macbeth,* and *Julius Caesar* in 1926.

"exceptional Turk," whose status in Venice was intended to be relatable to the Albanophobic[28] experiences of Albanian immigrants in Europe.

Despite the fact that A.J. Ricko's 1953 text-based production belongs to the communist era in Albania's history, Noli's translation is still reproduced faithfully today, thereby carrying old business in with the new. While both Noli and Ricko believed that Shakespeare's *Othello* was the right vehicle both to explore and heal Albania's racial tensions, I submit that some of the challenges faced by Noli and Ricko actually stem from the race-based logic of Shakespeare's *Othello*. Noli's original translation and Ricko's 1953 production of *Othello* continue to inform Albania's engagement with race in modern entertainment outlets, including the problematic employment of blackface. To date, critics have neglected to comment on the racial politics of Shakespearean translations and performances in Albania, but there is a rich and complicated history that deserves to be unearthed and analyzed. This chapter will glocally trace the history of race in Albania, Noli's employment of racialized Albanian rhetoric in his translation, and Ricko's use of blackface in his wildly popular communist-era production. The palimpsestic interpretation of the Albanian *Othello* weaves together histories of race from medieval and early modern England and pre-communist and communist Albania to reveal the glocal nature of race-thinking.

[28] Russell King and Nicola Mai define Albanophobia as "an all-encompassing and irrational fear of all things Albanian" (123). King and Mai explain that Albanian immigrants are one of the most assimilated and paradoxically the most nationally "rejected and stigmatized" non-EU groups (117).

The sentiments and prejudices Albanians shared against Turks, following centuries of Ottoman colonization, seemed to Noli to resonate in Shakespeare's *Othello*.[29] *Othello*, Kadija notes, "was the first Shakespearean play to be staged and performed by the Albanian National Theatre" to combat racial discrimination by emphasizing "the theme of the 'other', alienation, loneliness, the life of a soldier, the discrimination of a coloured man"—all of which would hold special resonance for Albanian audiences (37).[30] Regardless of the play's negative images of Turks, Othello's perceived foreignness in Venice and Cyprus was relatable to many Albanians who faced similar discrimination when migrating from the Balkans. This palimpsestic way of thinking about Albanian and English past and present blurs the historical periodization of racial bias. Here, I perform a glocal reading of *Othello* adaptations from pre-communist and communist Albania to reveal that racial identity in Balkan nations is multiplex. In Albanian theatre, Othello's racial overtones are performed as being ethnically, geographically, and religiously based, therefore, Othello is simultaneously understood as a Turkish other, a black foreigner, and a Muslim man. Realizing the multiplicity of the

[29] After centuries of Ottoman control, Albania's nationalist movement emerged, and it further fueled their ethnic pride. Albania futilely battled against their massive forces, and as a result, many had to flee to surrounding countries while approximately two thirds of the population had to convert to Islam.

[30] Othello's jealous nature also contributed to play's popularity among stereotypically jealous Albanian men. Albanian culture is heteronormative and still upholds patriarchal values; thereby, cuckoldry and betrayal are relatable causes for masculine anxiety. As Kadija asserts, "the betrayal of fathers holds particular weight in patriarchal Albanian families" since they maintain a strong patriarchal system (38). Desdemona's betrayal of her father would have struck a chord for Albanian fathers.

Albanian Othello helps critics better understand the local impact of the adaptation as well as the global consequences of the abundance of race.

The glocalization of any non-anglophone Shakespeare adaptation fosters a palimpsestic and multicultural identity whose very presence promotes a more equitable and polyvocal future for how adaptations might confront race issues in and through Shakespeare. For instance, a glocal reading of the Albanian Othello initially addresses ethno-racial tensions between Albanians, Turks, Northern and Southern Albanians. However, its multitemporal nature also accounts for the present conflicts between Albanians of color and white Albanians. Although Noli's and Ricko's adaptations do not immediately assume any links between Othello's struggles with the experiences of marginalized Albanians of color (Afro-Albanians, Romani, Egyptians, and Northern Albanians), a local Shakespearean who thinks glocally can create those links. With each creation of these links, glocal Shakespeares reveal that race as a social construct evolves just as Shakespeare adaptations do.

In their book *Racecraft*, Karen E. Fields and Barbara J. Fields define race as "the doctrine that nature produced human kind in distinct groups, each defined by inborn traits that its members share and that differentiate them from the members of other distinct groups" (16). Race is indeed a social construct, but racism is not. Racist concepts affect real political and economic life, but they do so because of their "intimate roots in other phases of life" (Fields and Fields 11). Racism is "a social practice, which means it is an action and a rationale for action, or both at once" (Fields and Fields 17). In other words, racism is the practice of redefining race subjectively. The misconstruction of race and racism informs what Fields and Fields call racecraft. Moreover, Fields and Fields

describe racecraft as "the ability of pre- or non-scientific modes of thought to hijack the minds of the scientifically literate" (5-6). Fields and Fields turn to bio-racism to show that racecraft as a social practice does not need genetic differences between racial groups to exist in order for the socio-political effects of racisms to be exercised and felt. Racism is present in Shakespeare and Shakespeare has historically contributed to racecraft.[31]

By glocalizing *Othello*, I argue that race-based epistemologies in Shakespeare can benefit and expand from considering race/racial identities as glocally multifarious. For example, Othello's racial identity is glocal because he embodies multiple racially marginalized identities from various cultures and temporalities. Glocal analyses of race in *Othello* and Othello's race show Shakespeare scholars how malleable this identity construct is. This argument, I hope, will demonstrate that treating race as a glocal concept exposes its mythical nature and the painfully real socio-political, cultural, and economic consequences racism has on groups of people. This conceptual dissension about race and racism is necessary for change in Shakespeare and beyond. Glocal Shakespeares distort the idea of racial purity just as they discredit Shakespeare's authentically white and Western locus.

Race in Albania

Race takes on a specific meaning in Albania. As one of the oldest ethnic groups of Southern Europe, race for Albanians is a delicate subject matter that is intimately woven

[31] Ayanna Thompson proposes that the name Shakespeare employs many "meanings, references, and ambiguities" and it is important to "capitalize on these multiplicities" (2006, 4). My use of the name Shakespeare in this project references this multiplicity.

with ethnicity. Consequently, one cannot review racial discrimination in Albania without recognizing that race and ethnicity are conflated concepts, although they are not necessarily interchangeable. The various definitions of the Albanian term rracë/rraca (race) include "origin, descent, blood, nation, phenotype, colour, body build and shape, geography, and kin" (Ohueri 39). However, ethnicity is determined by many of the same internal and external categorizations, thereby creating a gray area that has immobilized the discursive progress of race studies in Albania. Because "boundaries between race and nation are slippery" (Lemon 60), certain ethnicities are racialized phenotypically.[32] This means that the idea of ethnic pride or ethnic nationalism could conceivably be a racialized epistemology. Due to their war-bound history, Albanians embrace their ethnicity with a sense of national pride which has inadvertently led to a rise of ethno-racial division within and without the country's borders.

The ideological value that Europeans have placed on colorblindness has rendered race invisible in Albania. Race is not given the necessary political and cultural gravitas it warrants, and racism is often not regarded as a real issue. During her field work in Tirana, anthropologist Chelsi West Ohueri recounts testimonials from Albanian natives who reveal their naive attitudes about racism in their country.[33] Beyond direct denials of racism or reiterations of the claim that "there is racism everywhere" (qtd. in Ohueri 19),

[32] Alaina Lemon describes the slipperiness between race and nation through the Romani people whose blackness became a signifier of being a "true Gypsy" (60).

[33] I follow Gilroy's definition of naivety which suggests that "any aspiration to live outside of racialized bonds, codes and structures is naïve, misplaced, foolish, or devious" (xvi).

Albanians offered justifications for the lack of racial diversity by explaining that their xenophobia is a result of their isolation (Ohueri 6). As one of the "last European socialist countries to break with communism" (Waal 5), Albania's self-imposed isolation, following centuries of colonial rule from the Ottoman Empire, has divided Albania from the rest of the world for at least fifty years, geographically, culturally, and politically.[34]

In her research on race in Albania, Ohueri also records responses from residents who view themselves as victims of racism from the English, Italians, Germans, and especially, the Greeks. Despite Albania being a predominantly white country, many Albanians have experienced racism in their own migratory relations with Greece, thus placing their whiteness in question. For this reason, Albanians claim that race is understood primarily through ethnic differences rather than skin color. But to complicate matters, an interlocutor categorizes Albanians as "the n*****s of Europe" (84).[35] Misguided as it may be, this respondent's analogy between the racial discrimination perpetuated against blacks in the U.S. and the discrimination faced by Albanians in Europe is symptomatic of a lack of a coherent Albanian discourse for racism and the unequal distribution of power, rights, and goods based on constructions of race.

Moreover, many Americans and Europeans retain an outdated and stereotypical image of Albanians as violent and blood-thirsty from 19th and 20th century travel writing.

---

[34] Robert Austin explains that under communist rule, Albanians were forbidden to watch foreign television and there was an absence of foreign literature (174). Even at the collapse of communism "Albania had adopted a form of self-reliance" which made them "the most isolated people in the world" (Austin 175).

[35] Lemon interviews a Romani man who complains: "we are negry; we are treated like second class here, like your blacks in America" (60).

Albania has been noted as the "ideal Balkan type—violent, independent, and at times untrustworthy," for it "both touched Lord Byron's creative fantasies and haunts Robert Kaplan's recent travels" (Blumi 528). In letters he wrote to his mother, Lord Byron famously romanticized his time in Albania by describing "Albanians in their white, gold and crimson dresses (the most magnificent in the world)" (Bhattacharji 40). In 1813, he even commissioned a self-portrait in rich Albanian garbs. Byron's exoticization of Albania as a strange and savage land was repeated by the British travel writer Edith Durham, who expressed a sympathetic attitude toward these "unfortunate and childlike nations," while she romanticized their "ancient customs of archaic Balkan violence" (Schwandner 122). Likewise, the German writer, Karl May projected an image of Albanians as the world's real "noble savages"—not only courageous and brave, but also "corrupt, violent, dirty, [and] poor" (Schwandner 121). This stereotypical image of the Balkans, Maria Todorova avers, was set, and consistently reproduced during World War I (184). In its wake, the imagery and rhetoric of the noble but backwards Balkan personality has been perpetuated for decades in the media around the world. Albanians have internalized these ethnic stereotypes as is evidenced by their recorded responses to racism.

Albania is seen as a place of destitution, turmoil, and political chaos, not because it is, but because it is continuously viewed as such. And consequently, Albanians are othered in Europe because their ethnicity is constantly criminalized, resulting in Albanophobia across European countries. This is the process of racecraft: a mental ploy that turns racism into race (Fields and Fields 27). Although racecraft "exists in human action and imagination" (Fields and Fields 18), its lived consequences result in socio-

political violence, lack of access to resources, and the unequal distribution of material goods. The making of the other, as Edward Said has famously noted, is a way for enforcing the idea of the ideal West. Whereas Western Europe is whole, Balkan nations, including Albania, fall prey to the negative connotation of "Balkanization" which breaks up a geographic area into small and often hostile units (Todorova 33). Racisms, whether geographic, political, social, economic, and educational, are oppressively embodied the point of creating other forms of racism that surpass colorism.

Albania's ethno-racial politics are transcribed spatially and are fostered through imaginary racial-spatial boundaries. Primarily, there is a racial division between Northern and Southern Albania, or as an Albanian interviewee suggests, "the real racism comes from political parties […] they perpetuate racial divisions between city and mountain folk" (Ohueri 97). The glorified violent practices of the *Kanun*[36] are assigned to the Northern Albanians from the mountains, who are derogatively called "malok," meaning highlander (Schwandner 119), because they border with surrounding Balkan nations. [37] While Northern Albanians are not people of color, they do face racial exclusion if one acknowledges that racism is a system built on sustaining inequalities of power. Race, Ayanna Thompson argues, does not have a stable of fixed meaning, and it can be "signified by something that is unseen, hidden, and/or invisible" (2008, 19). Some

[36] The *Kanun* is a set of customary Albanian laws, much like a strict conduct book.

[37] The divide between North and South Albania is also distinguished by language and dialects.

Albanians insist that racial divisions are not determined by blackness or whiteness, but rather by geography and ethnicity.

However, the urban/rural divide fails to account for phenotype-based racial discrimination which directly affects those classified as *dorë e zezë (black)* from the *dorë e bardhë (white)*.[38] Blackness and whiteness in Albania are characteristics for differentiating white Albanians from black Romani and Egyptians. Gypsiness is discussed in ethnic rather than racial terms (Mudure 277), despite the fact that some of these "Gypsy" communities identify as Albanians. Roma and Gypsy-Travelers "play the part of 'the Stranger', the internal outsider'" (Mudure 149). Although Alma Hoti insists that it is difficult to measure racial discrimination because race is a changing concept (72), the marginalization of Roma people in Europe is widely documented in data that shows the violence perpetrated against these groups, as well as the income disparities—due to lack of labor integration and shelter—that are allowed to flourish. In Albania specifically, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination reported that "Roma and Egyptians were among the poorest, most marginalized and socially excluded groups."[39] Racial discrimination of Gypsy or Tsigani people follows a long history of targeted abuse as indicated by the history of medieval Gypsy slavery in Europe (Heng 440). Romani history, says Geraldine Heng, proves that race is not a modern concept at all, but one that can be traced in medieval Europe (Heng 449). The white-supremist

[38] Dorë e zezë literally translates as "black hand," referring to the blackness of Roma and Egyptians in contrast to the whiteness of dorë e bardhë (white hand) Albanians.

[39] Hoti reveals that "Egyptian and Rom communities are recognized as linguistic minorities, not as national minorities" (70) in Albania.

influence of Western European culture, one that is resolutely endorsed through Shakespeare, becomes visible when unpacking the racial conflicts between Gypsies and Albanians. The racial themes in *Othello* allow for the reflection of the ethno-racial tensions between white Albanians and Afro-Albanians,[40] a term I borrow from Mustafa Canka to refer to African Albanians of color, who are also affected by the racial representation of *Othello* in theatre.

Race Rhetoric in Translation

Shakespeare is a global phenomenon valorized for his cultural fluidity, but if that fluidity is oblivious to the inherently racialized ideologies of Shakespearean plays, then cultures risk reproducing imperialist credos through their faithful translations. Fan Noli's attempt to bring Shakespeare to Albania as a means of bringing Albania to the world serves as a prime example of this colonial cycle. Noli "Albanianized" *Othello* to share with Albanians Shakespeare's social capital and assimilate them to the 'rest of the world' which was really only Western Europe and North America.

Shakespeare entered Albania at a time of war. In her reception study of Shakespeare in Albania, Enkelena Qafleshi explains that Shakespeare flourished in Albania because Noli's commentary framed his work as being in concert with the historical moment of the country (44). Albanians "were fighting for freedom, independence, integrity of the country, dissemination of Albanian language, [and]

[40] Canka discloses that during the Mediterranean wars of the 19th century, many countries resorted to slavery to fill their fleets. Ulcincj, Montenegro, now located above Albania, kept slaves as prisoners for labor or for ransom. The "Afro-Albanian" slaves became free working citizens as they integrated into their communities (*LeftEast*).

preservation of Albanian culture," and Shakespeare grew popular amongst them because his works were used as propaganda to address such concerns (Qafleshi 45). As a liberal politician, Noli had his own political agenda for translating Shakespeare's tragedies. In fact, Kadija claims that "there was a political motivation behind every Shakespearean play either staged or translated" (38). Noli favored Shakespearean tragedies for their relatability to the stories of his war-torn country, but he deliberately translated *Othello* first because he imagined the play would relate and reflect the racialized experiences of Albanian immigrants.

Yet, *Othello* is a race play and its racialized language and themes easily transfer in translations. For this reason, the play forbids audiences from forgetting Othello's blackness by invoking imagery of "an old black ram" topping a "white ewe!" (1.1.97-88), or by describing Othello as "a Barbary horse" (1.1.110), and by repeatedly referring to him as black and/or Moor rather than Othello.[41] Such racialized rhetoric is reflected in the Albanian translation, despite Noli's reassurance that "Othello had a black face, but was great, kindhearted and beautiful in spirit and in heart" (7). Noli admires Othello for being a self-made warrior, who is "brave, loyal, just, and naïve," and yet, who must remain in Venice "a stranger and black" (6). Alfred Uçi, one of the premier Albanian Shakespeare critics influenced by Noli, refers to Othello as a "white-hearted" person whereas "Iago is white-skinned but his soul is black" (123). This is presented as a moral lesson, not a racial one. Blackness is confined to a symbolic role of sin that is manifested outwardly and assigned indiscriminately to the Moor. Although it is Iago, not Othello whom Noli

[41] References to *Othello* are to the Arden Shakespeare, edited by E.A.J. Honigmann, with a new introduction by Ayanna Thompson (2016).

labels as a “black demon” (166), the stigma of blackness is not overturned by Noli’s interjection since it remains woven in language.

In Albanian culture, blackness is a sign of malady, of being accursed. For instance, when Brabantio exclaims, “With the Moor, say’st thou? –Who would be a father?” (1.1.163), Noli translates it as: “Me cilin, me Arapin, the? – Oh, un’i ziu!” (With whom, the Moor, you said? Oh, I am black!) (22). Brabantio’s blackness here is not literal, it is symbolic. Because Brabantio considers fatherhood a burden, Noli uses the common expression “I am black” to indicate his fatherly misfortune. Similarly, Desdemona’s line “It is my wretched fortune” (4.2.129) is translated as “Ashtu ka qenë fati im i zi” (thus has been my black fortune) (Noli 139). This also serves as a pun that ties her “black” wretched fortune to her “black” wretched husband. Desdemona becomes “rhetorically black” (Hall 22) since her social and marital value has been blackened by her proximity to the Moor. It is precisely this “insistent association of black as a negative signifier of different cultural and religious practices with physiognomy and skin color,” Hall argues, that “pushes this language into the realm of racial discourse” (6). Both Brabantio and Desdemona’s translated exasperations describe a racialized understanding of their misfortunes. This racial emphasis is possible because the medieval associations of blackness with sin still thrive in the Albanian language and culture.

Noli does not provide footnotes for these references to race, ethnicity, or religion, nor does he justify his explicitly racializing translation choices. For example, the rhetoric in Desdemona’s “Willow” song is racialized by blackening the willow.

“E varfëra rrëze një mani po rri,

Qaj, shelg, o shelg i zi;[42]

Me kokën mbi gjunjë, me duar në gji,

Qaj, shelg, o shelg i zi;

Dhe lumi buçiste me këng' e me vaj,

Qaj, shelg, o shelg, o qaj." (Noli 146)

The poor root in sitting in a craze,

Cry, willow, o black willow;

With its head on knees, with hands on its breast,

Cry, willow, o black willow;

And the river roared with song and cries,

Cry, willow, o willow, cry. (Noli 146)

These lyrics rely on the same cultural signification of blackness as ill-fated to indicate Desdemona's misery as the one's cited above. Thus, the willow is transformed into a symbol of racialized grief. While a "green willow" symbolizes the natural green color of a tree as well as jealousy "the green-eyed monster" (3.3.168), a "black willow" symbolizes an unnatural grief that stems from Othello's blackness. Race is obviously not limited to a binary of black and white, but in this Albanian context Othello's otherness is nonetheless colored by the glocal history of race politics.

Othello's intrinsic racial themes are furthermore reinforced through the fundamentally racialized rhetoric of the Albanian language. For example, the line "The

[42] The word "cry" replaces "sing" because Albanian folk music is notably a form of "mountain crying." Vaj also refers to this this crying-singing as a form of mourning.

Moor is of a free and open nature" (1.3.398) becomes "Arapi eshte prej natyre zemerbardhe" (The Moor is by nature white-hearted) (Noli 44). The kindness and naivety of Othello's nature in Albanian is understood through racial descriptors of whiteness. Such associations of whiteness with purity, beauty, and civility can be traced to Early Modern literature and language where it was used to mark interior and exterior beauty with whiteness. These significations are culturally translated unto Noli's Othello which continues to perpetuate a binary thinking of race as black and white. Whiteness, of course, is not singular; it embodies various significations that stretch physically, culturally, ethnically, geographically, religiously, and so forth.[43] Fransesca T. Royster, for example, has illustrated the spectrum of whiteness in Shakespeare plays like *Titus Andronicus* where Tamora's "hyperwhiteness" is othered and potentially threatening. A glocal reading here is imperative to help critics see how race rhetoric travels and evolves across borders, cultures, and timelines, which then enables critics to shake race epistemologies on account of their temporal, geographical, and historical instability.

The glocal nature of the translation is especially evident in intercultural multiplicity of its race-based language. Take for example, the slipperiness of the term Moor in the translation. Arap (moor) in Albanian is used as a "chromodermal signifier" (Smith 35) to derogatorily refer to Turks, Africans, and Gypsies—basically anyone who is non-white. There is of course the unmistakable proximity between Arap and Arab which invites the common, but misguided, conflation of Arab and Muslim. For instance,

[43] This discussion of early modern whiteness being glocalized through language is enhanced by material culture. Josie Schoel, for example, proves that "cosmeticized whiteness" was in fact transcultural (1).

when Noli describes Othello as the black Arap (7), he is simultaneously emphasizing his blackness while also assimilating an ethnic and a religious identity into one. Likewise, when Iago exclaims that "She shall undo her credit with the Moor" (2.3.354), Noli writes instead that "Arap' i zi do ta pandehë të pabesë" (The black Moor will consider her treacherous) (79). The word Moor here is to be taken religiously since it's already accompanied by a chromodermal adjective. Thus, the Albanian Othello rhetorically embodies the racialized identity of a Turkish other, a black foreigner, and a Muslim man. All these associations are burdened unto one word which is then burdened unto a body. The palimpsestic reading of blackness in the *Othello* translation reveals a network of multicultural and multitemporal histories of racisms. In other words, glocal Shakespeare as a methodology seeks to expose the plural racial identities signified in the adaptation and in doing so, it uses that plurality to transform how users think about race via Shakespeare.

Race Rhetoric in Performance

In 1953, Noli's translation of *Othello* reached the Albanian stage under the direction of A. J. Ricko. It was "staged 40 times for a number of 23,747 spectators until 1964" at the National Albanian Theatre (Qafleshi, 110).[44] It was incredibly popular and helped to establish the centrality of the theatre in the Stalinist-leaning Albanian government. While the production was poorly documented, Q.M.K.SH has released an

[44] The text was later transformed by directors L. R Kiçko, B. Levonja, and A. Pano whose "scissor approach" omitted several characters and cut off the second scene of act two (Qafleshi 51).

image from the production featuring the actor Loro Kovaçi who appears to be performing as Othello in blackface makeup.[45] In this Albanian performance of *Othello*, "race is colored," to borrow a phrase from Thompson (2008, 51), and in doing so, the performance represents blackness as performative. Because "the trope of blackness is applied to groups that need to be marked as other" (Hall 7), Othello's cosmetic blackness corporeally signifies physical, geographical, and religious difference. "The black African on the stage," Smith claims, "is visibly fixed in an intractable series of 'devil' stereotypes that require no further knowledge beyond the skin" (35). This line of thinking suggests that racism is glocal insofar as racecraft is informed by local racisms that belong to a global and white Euromerican system of racial othering.

Ricko's 1953 production of *Othello* attempted to address race in Albania, but it did so with the wrong tools. Rather than promoting racial unity, the use of racial prosthetics in his Albanian performance failed to distort the racial politics of *Othello* because blackface practices sustain stereotypes about the performativity of blackness. Thus, Othello's racial difference was highlighted, not erased. In his production, Othello is treated as the exceptional Turk, "a central black figure who appears to supersede the prevailing black stereotype" (qtd. in Smith 35), in order to show Albanians that regardless of his hue, the character is essentially Albanian and white. This notion is complicated given that in performance "Othello was a white man" (Callaghan 76). Any

[45] Qendra Mbarëkombëtare e Koleksionistëve Shqiptarë (International Center of Albanian Collectors): https://www.qmksh.al/21-mars-1953-premiere-e-otellos-ne-teatrin-popullor/. The collection includes a black and white image and one in color. It is unclear whether they are from the same production. The use of blackface is especially apparent in the color image. More photographic documentation of the blackface performance can be found on the National Theatre's social media account.

anxieties the audience might have had about the "black Turk" could be nullified simply by the removal of the black makeup. For this reason, Ian Smith argues that "the prosthetic black body" on stage only validates the "native whiteness" underneath (36). Relying on Othello's static whiteness beneath the surface as a means of promoting racial unity between Albanians of color and white Albanians is a colorblind approach that enforces whiteness as the norm. Thus, the privileged union of a predominantly white audience enables the production of the "white/right gaze" (Thompson 2018, 20) under which racialized bodies become constructed spectacles on the stage.

When it comes to theatrical spectacles, Dympna Callaghan distinguishes between two modes of racial representation: exhibition which is the "display of black people," and mimesis which refers to "the simulation of negritude" (77). In the Albanian production of *Othello*, the racial prosthetics functioned as an exhibition of a Turkish identity that was nonetheless mimetic because it reproduced blackness as performative. Even by portraying Iago as internally black, Noli's translation and Ricko's production comply with and reinforce stereotypes of blackness. Although Noli's sympathy for Othello intended to elicit a similar affinity from the audience as a means of mending a bridge between white and non-white Albanians, that sympathy did not translate onto the stage. Despite the spectacle of "the amiable Othello" (qtd. in *Othello* 56), Ricko's blackface production rendered him a spectacle. Noli's political agenda to combat racial discrimination through the theatre was distorted by Ricko's decision to employ blackface. Moreover, the choice to use a *race play* that disparages people of color to combat racial

discrimination and promote racial unity seems contradictory at best. *Othello's* inherent toxicity is particularly traceable and unavoidable in a homogeneous nation like Albania.[46]

Ricko's 1953 production was vastly successful, and the actors were highly praised for their performances. However, based on the lingering stereotypes about Turks and the existing racial division between Albanians of color and white Albanians, it is evident that *Othello* did not achieve its initial purpose on the Albanian stage. The print translations accompanied by Noli's introduction were also unsuccessful since they emphasized racial differences rhetorically, despite Noli's insistence of Othello's exceptional blackness. Ultimately, the translation failed to carry this message since Noli's commentary which glorified Othello was erased from the later 1977 reprints (Belluscio & Koleci 237). Despite Ricko's production with an exceptional Othello who is black yet "white-hearted in nature" (Noli 44), there is no way to control or predict an audience's reaction to his racialized body because "power resides almost entirely with the [white Albanian] spectator" (Callaghan 77). To that end, the use of racial prosthetics is not in concert with a colorblind ideology; rather, their use exposes the lack of racial diversity among the cast and the audience. Unfortunately, this contributes to the continuous use of outmoded blackface practices in Albanian theatre and television.[47] Noli and Ricko have left their blackface mark on Albanian performance history.

[46] While I don't believe it is yet possible to do *Othello* "right" in Albania, its complexities create a necessary space for a discourse on race.

[47] Ohueri points to an example in the television comedy show *Portokali*, wherein a white Albanian actor impersonates an African football player using blackface and accented speech (5).

The use of blackface makeup in Ricko's 1953 *Othello* production alerts spectators to multiple histories of racialized performances which are not local. Typically, blackface performances date to Early Modern England and nineteenth century America, but despite Albania's severe isolation from non-local influences, this abominable tradition seeped its way into Albanian theatre. It is uncertain whether Albanian spectators were aware of the transcultural nature of blackface theatre practices, or whether this too was a means of assimilating to Europe's global culture. Nonetheless, the blackface performance accompanied by the racial rhetoric of Noli's invites Shakespeare users to read Othello's race and race in *Othello* palimpsestically. This means that 1) medieval and early modern prejudices about blackness and evil, 2) English and Albanian pre-communist antipathy toward Turks, 3) communist bias toward Gypsies, and 4) trauma from ethnic racism, would all coexist in the *Othello* tradaptation. In this glocal reading, Othello's blackness is simultaneously physical, mythical, ethnic, religious, historical, and temporal.

The existence of negative significations of blackness in Albanian language further complicates a blackened-up performance because blackface performances of *Othello* do not and cannot so easily subvert the medieval correlation of black and evil like Noli intended. As Paul Gilroy's states, "Any fool knows that real, grown-up governments cannot legislate the emotions of their populations" (xvi). A more desirable outcome is to invite a discourse that deliberates on the significance of race in performance for both actors and audiences rather than hoping to train audiences to not see race (Thompson 2006, 12). Reception theory can further demonstrate this point. For instance, Anat Gesser Edelburg evaluated "the effects of political performances on the opinions of their audiences" with a race-based questionnaire that they answered prior and after the show

(Sauter 255). Willmar Sauter performs the same experiment as a means of testing the anti-Semitic effects of *The Merchant of Venice* on audiences. The results revealed that the play did in fact enhance and confirm stereotypes about Jews (257). I imagine that an extension of this chapter would benefit from a similar form of reception research that investigates the reception of *Othello* adaptations in Albania. Looking beyond *Othello,* I propose instead that a bilingual and intracultural production of *Romeo and Juliet* performed by Northern and Southern Albanians, or white and Roma Albanians would render the stage a neutral space for reconciliation, and therefore combat racism by Albaniazing Shakespeare in a way that *Othello* cannot.[48]

Conclusion

In adopting Western literature, specifically Shakespeare's canon, countries of non-European status like Albania, risk the appropriation of the racial ontologies that are engulfed within that imperial culture. Racism cannot be easily erased from Western history because it "is built into Britishness, and Britishness is built on racism" (qtd. in Bancroft 39). Once that Western ideology of racial difference has infiltrated the non-European or Balkan nations, then "Western European nations use evidence of racism in Central and Eastern Europe to 'orientalize' racism" (Bancroft 3). Racialized borders, Agnes Czajka notes, also separate Western from Eastern Europe by linking slavery with East Europeans (Slavs) (210). Thus, the West others racism: taking on a centralized

[48] Miki Manojlović's 2015 bilingual and intracultural production of *Romeo and Juliet* successfully confronted the ethnic conflict between Kosovo and Serbia as Kosovan Montagues and Serbian Capulets performed together on an x-shaped stage, making the performance itself an act of reconciliation.

identity of racelessness in which "racial thinking and its effects are made invisible—an assumption that race exists anywhere but Europe (El-Tayeb xvii). Nonetheless, Albanians have aspired to the status of "European" and for inclusion in the European Union because of the enduring myth of the West.

The West, Fatos Lubonja explains, was idealized in communist Albania, first as the "Promised Land," a utopia of sorts, and second, as the "Saviour," a singular source of benevolence and justice (131). This myth has been diluted but not destroyed. Consequently, Albanians' attitude toward racelessness seems derivative of the ideological value Europeans place on colorblindness—unable "to pinpoint a stable signification for race," Albanians "replicate the anxieties [their] society has about defining race" through colorblind practices (Thompson 2006, 8). Europe's colorblind approach to race oppresses legitimate racialized discourses and therefore stunts potential resolutions. Goldberg astutely comments: "Nonracialism squeez[es] out any possibility of anti-racism" (349). Albania's ethno-racial politics are situated within a larger European notion of racelessness that rationalizes racist practices like blackface, and Shakespeare can be found at center of it all.

Glocal Shakespeares can change how Shakespeare users understand and engage with race. As I have demonstrated in this chapter, non-anglophone Shakespeare adaptations are instinctively glocal because they embody multiple historically, spatially, temporally intercultural interactions. Consequently, race-based adaptations, like the Albanianized *Othello*, construe racial identities and epistemologies as glocal. This process eliminates binary race thinking by accepting racial identities as multivalent, which in return shows how adaptable of a construct race is. Racecraft is consecutively

illuminated by local and global race epistemologies that emerge from world-wide Shakespeares. Glocal Shakespeare is necessary to understand how language and performance weave those race epistemologies together, and how scholars might take advantage of such assemblages in order to think about race glocally. This shift in perspective seeks to highlight how different local cultures produce racism, and how those variations of racism interact and inform a global culture of difference.

CHAPTER 4: CROSS-DRESSING AND GENDER CROSSING: HAMLET AS AN ALBANIAN SWORN VIRGIN

Hamlet's popularity in Albania began with Noli's Romantic interpretation of the character as the "Renaissance man" (45). Noli extended Hamlet's global reputation as the ideal humanist tragic figure to Albania by describing *Hamlet* in his introduction as "piktura më e pasur dhe më e thellë që ka dale nga pena e Shekspirit" (the richest and deepest picture to emerge from Shakespeare's pen) (xi). Noli translated *Hamlet* with the political motive to comment on the endurance of the population in the face of Albania's pre-communist, totalitarian state. His translation was equally effective and important during communism when V.V.Batko premiered *Hamlet* (1960) at the National Theatre of Albania. In 1979, Pasko Gjeçi attempted his own translation of *Hamlet* but did not publish it. And more recently, Enke Fezollari brought *Hamlet* (2015) back to the Albanian stage as a way of looking—backward and forward, south and north—at the state of Albanian cultural politics.

Albanian translations and performances of *Hamlet* have been employed to fit the country's political values. Ismail Kadare, one of Albania's most acclaimed authors, in his book chapter titled "Hamlet, the Difficult Prince," argues that "Hamlet was a synecdoche for the theatrics of the Balkan conflict" (159), to suggest that the land dispute between Norway and Denmark reflects that of the Balkan Wars. When Noli was translating *Hamlet*, Albania was experiencing its own tragic downfall at the hands of King Ahmet Zog and warding off invasions from neighboring countries. Therefore, *Hamlet's* prestige in Albania is built upon similarities between Hamlet's tragic emotional state and the felt

experiences of Albanians under communist tyrants.[49] For this reason, Noli introduces Hamlet, not as a weak and indecisive prince, but rather, as an intelligent, practical, and dutiful son—the inspirational hero Albanians needed. With this agenda in mind, the 1960 communist premiere omits the ending so that the outsider Fortinbras would not triumph in the end over the national hero, Hamlet (Qafleshi 52). Ergo, the Albanian Hamlet, Fatmira Nikolli claims, does not die physically, he dies spiritually, and the applause of the audience revives him (*Balkan*).

Hamlet served as a voice for Albanians, especially Northern Albanians. Kadare claims that "in the Albanian mountains, Hamlet really was among his own people" because they also "took orders from a code more ruthless than the ghost, and carried out instructions that invariably led to their own deaths" (159). In other terms, *Hamlet's* English history coincides with Albania's patrilineal culture which during and before the communist era was ruled by the social customs of the *Kanun*—a code of conduct which dictated strict patriarchal, religious, and social rules of behavior for Albanian citizens. With a shared commitment to revenge culture, the articulation of Hamlet's revenge story as one of a higher purpose has excused his attitude, decisions, and crimes, among Albanian readers of Shakespeare. Thus, *Hamlet's* popularity flourished among Albanians. Yet, the scholarship on *Hamlet* in Albania has been finite and locally limited. As a result, this chapter explores *Hamlet's* contribution to Albania's socio-political identity with the

[49] In *Shakespeare in the Albanian World*, Alfred Uçi explains that at the time when *Hamlet* was performed in Tirana, many Albanian students were asked to return from their Eastern European universities but were not allowed to go back on the pretext that they'd be corrupted by revisionism (49). Hamlet, as a student who returns to find his state in turmoil and an extreme state of transition, "awoke in them a longing for freedom" (50).

narrow focus of gender politics through pre-communist, communist, post-communist Albanian and Early Modern histories. The Albanian *Hamlet* glocally encompasses multiple temporal, historical, and geographical elements that make gender politics between Albania and England interchangeable.

When glocalizing *Hamlet*, the palimpsest grows. Consequently, this chapter glocalizes *Hamlet* by analyzing palimpsestically the gender politics of Noli's 1926 translation[50] and V.V.Batko's 1960 and Enke Fezollari's 2015 productions. A glocal reading accounts for the gender politics of all pre-communist, communist, and post-communist adaptations, in addition to the gendered rhetoric and performance practices inherited from *Hamlet's* English and patriarchal background. In sum, glocal *Hamlet* in Albania is understood through Albanian and English borders, temporalities, and histories. Granted, *Hamlet* was initially translated and performed to connect Albania to Europe through a hero who is both Albanian and global.[51] However, I find that the use of cross-gender casting and cross-dressing in Fezollaris' 2015 production renders a glocal reading of *Hamlet* in Albania as a vehicle for understanding Albania's cultural identity through gender. Specifically, the Albanian *Hamlet* palimpsestically embodies the multi-temporal evolution of gender socio-politics in Albania. These histories of gender are further conflated in the modern performance which features actress and former MP for Albania's socialist party, Luiza Xhuvani, as the first female Hamlet in an Albanian production of the play.

---

[50] Noli translated and published *Hamlet* in 1926, in Belgium.

[51] As I mention in the introduction, Noli's slippery slope conflates England with Europe and Europe with the world.

To glocalize *Hamlet* in Albania through gender politics is to reinterpret Hamlet, the national hero, as an Albanian sworn virgin—a traditional practice of women transvestites assuming the role of a man in their patrilineal families. As James W. Stone explains, "transvestism implies that gender is an assumed role which metamorphoses whatever may claim itself to be an underlying, essential sexuality into manipulable and disposable surfaces" (4). Then, Hamlet as an Albanian sworn virgin reveals that gender can be simultaneously masculine and feminine, and that gender performativity, a term popularized by Judith Butler, is adjacent to sexuality, in this case, asexuality. Thus, glocalizing *Hamlet* complicates the gender and sexuality codes of the work. In such a glocal interpretation, the palimpsestic tracings of the Albanian Hamlet situate an English female performance history in conversation with Albanian women's political struggles from pre- to post-communism to reveal gender as what Marjorie Garber calls a "category crisis," that is, "a failure of definitional distinction, a borderline that becomes permeable" (16). As such, I argue that a glocal reading crosses English and Albanian borders, time periods, and histories to entangle *Hamlet's* gender politics with Albania's customary gender laws as a means of imagining gender as a multivalent construct instead of a heteronormative and divisive binary.

Scholarship on cross-dressing centers extensively on Early Modern performance history and especially, the transvestism of male actors. For instance, in *Impersonations*, Stephen Orgel examines the transvestite actor as reflection of cultural anxieties about empowered "unruly" women."[52] Orgel proves that women were not as absent from the

[52] Valerie Traub's work confirms these suspicions as she investigates an early modern history of lesbianism.

Early Modern English stage as one might think, although their participation was limited by class (4). Despite female presence, Orgel implies that most anxieties originated from male-to-female (MTF) cross-dressing. Specifically, it was argued that male spectators would be "seduced by the impersonation" and become effeminate, and thereafter, desire the boy playing the woman in the drama (Orgel 27). Terri Power describes this as "the fear of the feminine" (3). On the other hand, female-to-male (FTM) cross-dressing is registered as a survival and/or subversive act. While investigating these gender relations, Orgel questions how gender was constructed in Early Modern culture and how/why it is constructed as such by our own culture (3). Taking "our" to mean any, not just English culture, I submit that scholars reconstruct gender identity according to the glocal elements of the theatrical and socio-economic 'real' world. By rewriting Early Modern gender, one can see more identities represented in history, which may subsequently disrupt tradition and affect modern gender politics.

This endeavor is inspired by Simone Chess's pivotal book, *Male-to-Female Cross-Dressing in Early Modern English Literature*, wherein she encourages scholars to rethink about Early Modern cross-dressers using trans* studies to study the genders of crossdressers "individually and in relation to other characters and readers/audiences" (14). Because trans* studies are inclined to make visible and disrupt normative gender narratives, Chess posits that they help us understand the range of genders in Early Modern literature, as well as "early modern models of trans* or genderqueer presentations" (15). Chess focuses primarily on MTF cross-dressing in literature, while I explore FTM and cross-gendered casting in local Shakespeare performances. My intention is not to prove or disprove, via Shakespeare, any Albanian or English gender

narratives, nor to replicate ideas of FTM crossdressing as liberating.[53] Rather, I aim to represent cross-dressing and gender-crossing adaptations as challenges to Shakespearean authority and English and Albanian national identities. Instead of then vs. now, here vs. there, us vs. them, I glocalize Shakespeare through gender and gender through Shakespeare by accepting gender relations as then and now, here and there, us and them. This is one of many ways that glocalization allows us to undertake a grand shift in our perspective of gender relations: not just as a superficial understanding of the conflict, but an understanding that it is not a conflict.

Reading glocally is, among other practices, a feminist undertaking. In *Rethinking Feminism in Early Modern Studies: Gender, Race, and Sexuality,* Ania Loomba and Melissa Sanchez consider feminism an "unfinished project" (230) which requires further methodological inquiry (1). To be more specific, Loomba and Sanchez view categories of "woman" and "gender" as contentious and evolving through intersectionalities of race, sexuality, transnationalism, and more (6). As such, they encourage Early Modern studies to engage with non-Western feminist scholarship in order to think about gender anew (9). In an effort to answer Loomba's and Sanchez's question as to how and why we study categories of gender, race, and sexuality in the past (20), I propose a glocal method for engaging with non-Anglophone Shakespeare adaptations whose palimpsestic nature places these categories of identity in oscillation, and sometimes in dissension. The goal is to not to erase gender/sex, but to multiply it, to make visible its abundance, and therefore,

[53] I borrow Terri Power's definition of cross-gender performance as an "umbrella term to indicate any performance of gender that crosses from one 'normative' gender performance to another" (7-8).

negate its assumed essence. Loomba and Sanchez echo that "'identity's inherent multiplicity' becomes particularly striking when gendered, racial, and sexual categories are situated in a temporal frame that precedes modernity" (19). Ultimately, the glocalization of Albania's *Hamlet* parallels the multiplicity of gender with Shakespearean culture to show that both are unstable and in constant flux.

Glocalization is an act of destabilizing Shakespeare's global authority on gender politics. As Sue Ellen Case explains, "feminist activism 'might negotiate [a] way out of the bipolarity of definitions—the Aristotelian taxonomies of hierarchical difference'" (qtd in Miller 13). By showing gender to be multiplicitous, I contend that gender norms are not natural and can be challenged and altered. This argument aligns with Judith Butler's theory of "gender performativity" which constitutes gender as a social role that one performs—the repetition of such a performance creates the gender which it performs. More specifically, Butler argues that "the various acts of gender create the idea of gender, and without those acts, there would be no gender at all. Gender is, thus, a construction that regularly conceals its genesis" (190). I believe that glocal Shakespeares reject the essence of gender and Shakespeare himself. Simply put, this project is trying to cause "gender trouble" through glocalization.

Hamlet in Translation

The conflicting reception of gender relations in *Hamlet* coincide with shifting ideologies of gender in Albania. At the time of *Hamlet's* translation, Albania was still shrouded in the aftereffects of the *Kanun* as well as colonial patriarchy. After Albania's independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1912, the family structure remained strictly

nuclear, and patrilineal. This meant that women were subordinate to men and usually objectified in their domestic roles. Gender studies data is incredibly rare in Albania. In fact, Albert Doja suggests that "there was no equivalent to social anthropology before or during the socialist period, and that is still the case" (155). Therefore, researchers rely on socio-demographic data on familial and social structures in order to understand gender relations of that time. For example, Siegfried Gruber uses the Austro-Hungarian census of 1918 as a marker of household customs in Albania. The census revealed that in larger cities like Tirana "more than 10 percent of households were headed by women" in comparison to rural areas where "only 5.4 percent of the households had a female head" most of which were widowed (Gruber 29). This is not surprising given that traditions as noted in the *Kanun* account for austere patriarchal societal structures. The World Trade Press also confirms that "The cultural traditions of the country have impeded the implementation of these [political, social, economic] legal rights" for women (1). Even with the digression from the customary codes of behavior, Gentiana Kera argues that despite new legislation and modernization, "traditional values of marriage and family continued to persist in Tirana" (35). Dowry and arranged marriage practices continued to be the norm, as well as "religious or ethnic endogamy" (Kera 49). In 1930, Kera adds, women's literacy was at an astounding 10.6 percent in comparison to 44.1 percent for males (39). Progress was being made at the hands of industrialization, but Albania was far from the emancipation of women.

During Zogu's reign, Hazifullah Emadi describes Albania through "Tribal rivalry, religious confrontations, family feuds, and vendettas prevailed" by which "women were suppressed and kept in ignorance and in total confinement" (999). However, during

Hoxha's decades-long dictatorship, Albanian women were considered equal to men in the workforce. The World State Press states, the communist government granted women equal pay and equal access to job opportunities, as well as equal political and social rights (1). Nonetheless women were still required to fulfill their domestic roles as wives and mothers as dictated by a long-standing tradition rooted in customary code of conduct. Therefore, the oppressive attitude that the men express toward Ophelia is in Albania indicative of patriarchal oppression as it had been in Shakespeare's England. This is primarily seen in the rhetoric used by Polonius and Laertes to administer control over the female body and sexuality. For instance, when Polonius plans to "loose" his daughter to Hamlet (2.2.159), in translation he says to the King "Ahere ia lëshojmë Ofelinë" (Then we'll release to him Ophelia) (72). Pre-communist and communist readers would have understood such rhetoric literally because of women's domestic confinements. Not to mention that the familial control men have over women like Ophelia is reminiscent of social gender dynamics and norms for both Early Modern England and pre-communist Albania.

The policing of women and female sexuality and bodies is present throughout *Hamlet*. Polonius, Laertes, Claudius, Hamlet, and the gravediggers all affect her body either rhetorically or physically, or both. For instance, Polonius "charges" (1.3.134) Ophelia to not believe or accept Hamlet's advances, and in translation he directly says "t'urdhëroj" (I order you), to which instead of "I shall obey" (1.3.135), Ophelia replies "Si urdhëron" (as you order) (37), thus making her 'I'dentity rhetorically invisible. In addition, as Laertes is lecturing her about Hamlet, he tells her that "si vajz'e urtë" (as a quiet girl) (32) she mustn't believe Hamlet's words. The Albanian translation is loaded

with many such local gendered expressions that culturally translate the work according to Albanian gender relationships while also abiding by Early Modern English gender politics. For instance, Polonius complains to Ophelia that Hamlet "Given private time to you, and you yourself / Have of your audience been most free and bounteous." (1.3.91-2). But Noli translates this as "Të paska dhënë pjekje të veçanta, / Dhe ti e paske pritur dorëhapur" (He has given you special bakes, And you have received with them open hands) (35). While "pjekje" literally refers to baking, it is often a metaphor for maturity or wisdom. By metaphorically describing their exchange of "matured" words of love as a literal exchange of goods, the translation marks the relationship by Albanian standards wherein courting must include material exchange. Nonetheless, the idea that she cannot accept advances without paternal consent resonates in both cultures. This is why Noli found *Hamlet* so relatable. The glocal reading of *Hamlet* in Albania demonstrates that early English patriarchy influences and supports the gendered traditions of Albanian society through Shakespeare.

The societal similarities between Shakespeare's England and Noli's Albania, Xhafer Martini has argued, allow for an investigation of the "interior cultural developments which are characterized from their contact with other cultures" (12). Although Martini's argument points to a colonial tendency to understand one's own culture through global literature like Shakespeare's canon, it also speaks to a larger network of cultural exchanges. Martini begins this cross-cultural examination by exploring instances where the word "kanun" appears in the play with "the same meaning as it holds in Albanian, that is as a collection of laws and regulations" which determine right behaviors and actions (31). The first example he uses is when the King tells

Rosencrantz, “Yet must not we put the strong law on him” (4.3.3) which Noli translates as “Po s’i zbatojmë dot kanun të rreptë” (but we cannot enforce the strict law on him) (154). In another example, when the gravedigger explains that a man who drowns inadvertently is not guilty of suicide, the term “kanuni” (Noli 189) motions to “Denmark’s” Christian law which forbids suicide just as the *Kanun* does. In these instances, “kanun” is translated as “law” which simultaneously refers to legal, religious, and moral laws. However, Noli also references the *Kanun* to explain Ophelia’s funeral rites whereas the text does not. The priest states that “her obsequies have been as far enlarged / As we have warranty” (5.1.215-16), which Noli explains as “Shërbesën ia zgjeruam pas kanunit / Sa mundëm” (We stretched our services according to the kanun as much as we could) (202). The priest speaks of the authority granted by the church and the crown, but Noli’s translation textually localizes that authority to the *Kanun* which happens to share a similar authority over its people. Martini cautions not to oversimplify the analysis of what Shakespeare borrows from the *Kanun* and what the *Kanun* borrows from Shakespeare (12), but rather, to focus on the cultural revelations that are made by such historical and intercultural exchanges.

A glocal reading demonstrates that pre-communist and communist Albanian readers interpret gender as a heteronormative binarism that emanates from the *Kanun.* And that perception is heightened by Denmark’s fictional and England’s historical treatments of women, as remembered through *Hamlet*. The cross-examination of *Hamlet* and the Albanian *Kanun* specifically exposes a shared thread of patriarchal oppression against women through the rites of marriage. According to the *Kanun*, a widow can marry the brother of her late husband. She was given two options: to remain “honorably”

widowed or to remarry one of her husband's brothers or cousins. Martini describes this false ultimatum as a situation where the woman gains "special status" (41) because she can choose, while completely disregarding the false dichotomy of choice that stems from such a patrilocal obligation. This seems to also be the case in *Hamlet*.

What upsets Hamlet the most is not that Gertrude remarries his uncle, for that was a common practice, but that she does so too soon, with "wicked speed!" (1.2.156). Similarly, the *Kanun* demands that a widow who plans to remarry must wear black for a year (Martini 43). The same idea is repeated by Hamlet who claims that his "cold mother" does not keep with the "customary suits of solemn black" (1.2.78) and "within a month" (1.2.145) she is remarried. Both the *Kanun* and *Hamlet* exemplify the customary restrictions and expectations of male and female relationships whether they be marital or familial. Furthermore, Hamlet is not allowed to harm his mother as the ghost of his father instructs him to "Taint not thy mind nor let thy soul contrive / Against thy mother aught; leave her to heaven" (1.5.85-86). This notion is strongly highlighted in the *Kanun* which does not allow one to "stain your hands with your mother's blood. Whatever ill the mother does, the son has no right to kill her, to stain his hands with her blood" (Martini 55). For this reason, when localizing *Hamlet* in Albania, Noli writes "Mos e nxi shpirtin e mos bëj asgjë / Kundër sat ëme" (48), meaning "do not blacken your soul and don't do anything against your mother." The palimpsestic nature of glocalization emulates the evolution of Albania's gender politics from strict social and bodily control during pre-communism, to the corporeal protection of women during communism, when women's political rights weren't reciprocated socially.

Scholarly criticism of Noli's *Hamlet* in Albania presents a traditionally gendered dichotomy of Hamlet versus Ophelia. For instance, Martini states that Ophelia's "sweet and quiet nature cannot bear the spiritual transformation" whereas Hamlet is of a "stronger and decisive nature" so he carries his plan to the end until he achieves his goal (63). A character analysis which doesn't allow for the possibility of a female hero is influenced by heteronormative patriarchal histories imported and exported between Albania and England through Shakespeare. As a translation, *Hamlet* did little to correct or undermine conventional gender roles in pre-communist and communist Albania. Consequently, Hamlet is a thoroughly analyzed character, Ophelia is reduced to a symbol only serving our reading of Hamlet. For example, after describing the good qualities of Hamlet's character, Martini notes that "Ophelia is a symbol of purity and human kindness" (24). Thus, Ophelia is objectified and Hamlet valorized. She is used as a symbol to help readers better understand Hamlet and the obstacles he faces. Martini's reading of Ophelia is inspired by Noli, who establishes this perception of "Hamlet's girl" as "kindhearted," and "angelic" (vi). Scholar Alfred Uçi also seconds Ophelia's secondary status in the play by suggesting that "maybe the only place where she could save her soul and body" (53) was the nunnery. These gendered reviews show that Albanian readers still interpret the play glocally by interlocking Albania's local gender relations, as understood through the *Kanun* before and during communism, with England's gender norms as dictated by Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The desire to assimilate Albania with Western European culture through Shakespeare, unfortunately, thwarts Albania's gender culture and politics by replicating heteronormative gender binaries.

The glocalization of *Hamlet*, as it has crossed national borders, time periods, and political histories, shows that Shakespeare has been used by non-Western countries like Albania to reaffirm patriarchal structures by mirroring Early Modern English gender politics. As a result, Hamlet's misogynism is misinterpreted as masculine pragmatism, where Ophelia and Gertrude become subjects of femininity. The patriarchal structure of Albanian society arises primarily from the *Kanun* which dictates that families remain patrilineal and patrilocal. As a result, the oppression of women, their bodies, and sexualities is a result of the *Kanun's* constitutional effect on social and political structure. A direct consequence of this patriarchal structure is a subversive practice among families that lacked a male lineage or heir. Women and girls of Northern Albania, out of necessity or sometimes by choice, become sworn virgins, meaning that they take an oath of celibacy in front of their village elders, and thereafter assume the male role of their household as *Burrnesha*,[54] by dressing as men and enjoying the privileges of their newly assumed sex.[55] Like Thomas Middleton's and Thomas Dekker's Moll Cutpurse in *The Roaring Girl*, Albania's sworn virgins broke the rules, but did not stop playing the game.

Although the glocal reading thus far was used to analyze the palimpsestic way that Albanians form and understand gender politics, now I will transition to using the glocal Shakespeare methodology to remedy this and create a possibility for change. Taking a turn from the glocalization of the feminine gender identity in Albania's European/non-European identity politics, I focus on masculine and feminine identities as

[54] The term is derivative of "burra" which means men in Albanian. But the "esha" ending is feminine.

[55] This tradition is unique to the Balkans.

multiplicitous rather than polars. This is possible by reading palimpsestically the Burnessha history which developed out of the *Kanun*. That's to say that the translation's Kanunized gender politics also offer an opportunity to remember in *Hamlet* counter-Kanun gender practices like sworn virginity. The glocalization of *Hamlet* allows for time to be disjointed, where past, present, and future form a multitemporal network rather than a linear progression. Therefore, Hamlet in pre-communist, communist, and post-communist Albania and Early Modern England can indeed be a sworn virgin. Such an interpretation would alter *Hamlet's* gender politics in present Albania and England and beyond. To accomplish this performative glocalization, I turn to Enke Fezollari's 2015 *Hamlet* production whose cross-gender casting and cross-dressing features enhance a glocal reading of Hamlet as an Albanian sworn virgin.

Hamlet in Performance

Hamlet premiered on the Albanian stage in 1960 until 1961, and again in 1962 to 1965, for an approximate total of 70 times for 40,144 spectators (Qafleshi 52). The production was directed by Vladimir Vladimirovich Bortko, with assistance from Andrea Malo and Nina Çefranova, and the "People's Artist of Albania," Naim Frashëri took the lead as Hamlet. Hamlet's identity is venerated because of Frashëri who for the Albanian people was as esteemed as Ian McKellen.[56] Even the promotional flyer includes a simple

[56] Naim Frashëri's son revealed in a recent interview that his father's death was in part due to the poor conditions of the theatre. Frashëri would complain that the stage was humid, cold, and rotten which lead to his pneumonia. His son also observes that "during the interpretation of Hamlet his knees were wounded from the nails and gills of the stage, because Hamlet would often fall to his knees during the performances." Full interview can be found at Dosja.al, "Shembja e Teatrit Kombëtar, flet djali i 'Hamletit shqiptar'

sketch of his face along with Shakespeare's name and the title—reminding locals that this is their Albanian Hamlet. The adaptation was rather classical in its casting, costumes, staging, and performances. But despite its fidelity to classical English theatre, which was an obvious means of cultural appropriation, Bortko's production is by its non-anglophone nature already an adaptation. This is especially true since there is no real *Hamlet* by which to measure the adaptation (Kidnie 11). As Kidnie avers, adaptation is an evolving category that modifies over time and space (9), and so, the Albanian *Hamlet* produced during this communist performance is not fixed, but it adapts with its users and continuous use, thus, inviting a glocal reading to analyze its variegated identity.

To read this performance glocally is to acknowledge that the characters are gendered from the *Kanun*, communist gender policies, Albanian theatre practices, and Early Modern English performance histories. These significations are primarily evoked through Noli's translation which was used for the productions. Pulling from Albanian political and theatrical histories, the production portrays Hamlet as a physically strong, masculine, and patriarchal figure. In two separate short videos of the production,[57] Frashëri is seen reprimanding Ophelia and Gertrude with a similar authoritative voice and gaze. In both occasions, he is grabbing their wrists while he looks down on them, reasserting his male gaze to show the audience that he is in control. On the other hand,

---

Naim Frashëri: Unë isha pro! Edhe babai donte një teatër të ri, se iu bënë gjunjët 'copë' nga gozhdët e skenës. U shtrua në Sanatorium nga ftohja," May 21, 2020, https://dosja.al/intervista-shembja-e-teatrit-kombetar-flet-djali-i-hamletit-shqiptar-naim-frasheri-une-isha-pro-edhe-babai-donte-nje-teater-te-ri-se-iu-bene-gjunjet-cope-nga-g/

[57] The black and white archived recordings reflect the theatre technologies of the time.

Ophelia, as performed by Margarita Xhepa, is seen as a stereotypically feminine, soft spoken, and timid woman. These representations coincide with Albanian gender norms and theatrical practices which were still in formation, therefore derivative of Western European and particularly Italian, performance styles.[58]

During the communist period when *Hamlet* first premiered on the Albanian stage, women experienced rocky waves of liberation and imprisonment. Enriketa Pandelejmoni marks the transition of the state and the economy during communism which unfortunately "was accompanied by a re-traditionalization of gender relations" (19), until 1965, when Enver Hoxha spoke on the need to improve women's lives (20). At this time, Albania was influenced by Marxist-Leninist ideology which stated that women should contribute to the production process and escape their domestically confined roles. Sadini Kushi explains that women "continued to experience a monopoly on the burdens of unpaid labor and childcare" whereas men's cultural roles did not change (2015). Therefore, this political change, Emadi suggests, "did not end the oppression of women" (999). Alison Smale while quoting Dritero Agolli also reveals that this change meant "cosmetics were banned and haircuts prescribed" and "the odor of sweat was glorified" (1991). Smale adds that "widespread poverty and poor fabrics" allowed little opportunity for displaying femininity. And while femininity might have been restricted, womanhood was not. Klejd Këlliçi and Ermira Danaj discuss how communist iconography was centered around the concept of "mother Albania," a rather colonial version of *our* women versus *their* women (55). After communism fell, during another transition period,

[58] Early Albanian theatre was influenced linguistically, politically, and theatrically by Italian theatre.

women's involvement in politics and public life declined, since "gender equality in the socialist period was discredited" (Pandelejmoni 22). Despite the waves of feminist movements in Albania, women's rights have resulted in excessive expectations for women to be both advanced providers and traditional caregivers.

The emancipation of women's rights in Albania, and specifically the gender relations of communism would have been present in *Hamlet's* Nolian language and Xhepa's performance. For instance, Hamlet overuses the term "nënë" (mother) when addressing Gertrude, especially during Polonius' murder scene. And unlike Frasheri's performance, Xhepa's timid and trembling voice epitomizes the role of femininity. As Frashëri looks down on her, his hands clasping her wrists, his speech warning her that she can't escape slander, the crowd applauds while the camera zooms in on her distressed eyes first, and then on Hamlet's stern eyes.[59] Both in translation and performance, Ophelia's gender identity is determined by Hamlet's male gaze and the audiences' projections, thus illuminating the heteronormative patriarchy from which their gender performances emerge. When also considering the influence Early Modern English performance history in a palimpsestic relationship to pre-communist and communist Albanian gender politics in Brotko's production, it becomes clear that multi-temporally, geographically, and historically, "there were no women on Shakespeare's stage" (7), as Dymphna Callaghan argues. Instead, what was present was female impersonation and the symbol of woman. Meaning that Ophelia and Gertrude's portrayals were derivative of

[59] Facebook, "Naimi Frasheri tek Hamleti," Klubi i Aktorit Tone te Madh Naim Frasheri, 2010, https://www.facebook.com/120211058008986/videos/131360710212257/?__so__=watchlist&__rv__=video_home_www_playlist_video_list

Albanian and English archetypes of women. Callaghan states that "presence cannot be equated with representation any more than representation can be equated with inclusion" (9); therefore, she views access to dramatic representation as male (14). This is why Early Modern performance history and scholarship is much more concerned with men cross-dressing as women. Even though female actresses are on the stage, unlike in Shakespeare's time, the patriarchal Albanian and English construction of gender, as either stereotypically feminine or masculine, resulted in gendered performances. As such, Stone critiques the misogynistic responsibility which falls unto woman to embody difference (1). That is, the woman onstage is the object of gaze.

This objectivity is traced in Enke Fezollari's 2015 production of *Hamlet.* The production was received quite well by local Albanian spectators, but there are few critics like Alimemaj who point to the performance's shortcomings. For instance, she judges Ina Gjoni's performance as Gertrude to be "anemic" and Ermira Hysaj's performance as Ophelia to be weak due to her unfit "older voice" and the "same behavior" she directs toward both her brother and her lover.[60] The demand for stronger female characters and performances is an understandable response especially since the cross-dressing effect of Xhuvani's Hamlet awakes a discourse on gender. However, Xhuvani's performance sadly coincides with Frashëri's in the treatment of Ophelia. The scene is almost replicated: Ermira Hysaj is kneeling while Xhuvani maintains a strong grip on her wrist while looking down on her and yelling in disdain. Xhuvani even manipulates Ophelia's face in

[60] Samuel Goff in "Albania's First Hamlet Goes Onstage in Tirana," *The Calvert Journal* (2015), https://www.calvertjournal.com/articles/show/4856/albanias-first-female-hamlet-goes-onstage-in-tirana makes a similar critique of Gertrude and Claudius' portrayals.

front of the audience, so when the line "God hath given you one face and you make yourselves / another" (3.1.142-3) is delivered, the audience can see and judge Ophelia's womanhood directly. Although cross-gender casting and cross-dressing are subversive feminist acts, they are undermined if they exist in isolation.

Peggy Phelan argues that performance only lives in the present moment; it cannot be saved or traced (146). However, the glocalization of Albanian *Hamlets* demonstrates that multiple tracings are possible and desirable because they highlight difference and similarity between past and present cultures. Jennifer Drouin furthers this point by arguing that "No matter what the intentions of the actors and directors may be, cross-gendered casting and onstage cross-dressing is forcibly an archaeological practice because the early modern theatrical norms to which it writes back are historically fixed and therefore inescapable," unless it is not Shakespeare or if it's an adaptation (26). Drouin is referring to the absence and representation or mimetic presence of women on the Early Modern stage which is also palimpsestically embodied in performance. I argue that those archaeological practices resurface anyway in adaptations, especially in glocal Shakespeares, but they do so in conversation with local gender politics, thereby changing the very memories and futures of said past practices. The palimpsestic way of glocal Shakespeare reveals that performative leftovers exist by means of technology and memory and can be used to trace new performative possibilities for gender.

To complicate the binarism of gender on the Albanian stage, I add Enke Fezollari to this glocal palimpsest of Albanian adaptations. Fezollari's production attempts to

change both the work and character to a modern Albanian Hamlet.[61] Just as previous performances were filtered through communist ideologies, Fezollari's contemporary production is guided by the gender politics of the 21st century. This production was deemed revolutionary for Albanian theatre because a female Hamlet "graced the Albanian stage for the first time with the power of a man and the force of a woman" (Nikolli). Veteran actress and former MP for Albania's socialist party, Luiza Xhuvani, was cast as Hamlet. Fezollari did not wish the casting choice to draw attention to gender or femininity, but the reception of the production has been dominated by the phenomenon of a female Hamlet in Albania. In an interview, the director was asked "How risky was the idea of this transformation" given "her [recognizable] femininity" from previous projects, and his response averted to Xhuvani's previous roles as well as photographs of Syrian people which have no gender because "they are simply people fighting for their lives" (*Dita*). That is to say that Hamlet's human condition extends beyond the social constructs of gender. But, of course, cross-gendered casting does draw attention to the actor's gender, deeming it "recognizable", especially when it's the first Albanian *Hamlet* adaptation to do so. Had Xhuvani not been the first female Hamlet, then perhaps the spectators would have been more able and willing to separate gender from the role.

James Bulman explains that a common form of criticism declares that "if the acting is good enough, the actor's body disappears into the character and the gender difference that ideological criticism would foreground is instead rendered invisible" (14).

---

[61] Unlike the Brotko's production, this *Hamlet* was staged in Tirana's National Experimental Theatre "Kujtim Spahivogli" (*Teatrin Kombëtar Eksperimental "Kujtim Spahivogli")* located right next to the National Theatre.

However, in patriarchal countries like Albania, gender is always visible. Accordingly, Xhuvani was soon labeled as the "transgender Hamlet" (Alimemaj).[62] This response is expected for critics who encounter transvestites, says Marjorie Garber, because they are inclined to appropriate the cross-dresser to one of the two traditional genders (9). But Garber asserts that cross-dressing "offers a challenge to easy notions of binarity, putting into question the categories of "female" and "male," whether they are considered essential or constructed, biological or cultural" (10). This breach of gender binarism and gender codes is one that becomes apparent when reading the Albanian *Hamlets* palimpsestically. Specifically, I argue that the palimpsestic process of glocal Shakespeares is particularly useful here because it permits us to read Xhuvani's cross-dressed Hamlet as a communist-born Albanian sworn virgin. This is possible of course because Fezollari still relies on Noli's translation which is traced with allusions to the *Kanun's* gender codes.

Reading Xhuvani's Hamlet as a *Burrnesha* allows us to reassess and alter Hamlet's pre-communist, communist, and early modern gender significations. Contrary to Julia Vrapi's protestation that Xhuvani's Hamlet is "an other without gender. Neither man, nor woman" (*SOT*), I accept Hamlet's abundance of gender. According to Ognjen Obradović, cross-gender casting produces a cross-gender effect where "The new amalgam-body is best described as queer because it is simultaneously perceived as both male and female" (n.p.). By presenting Hamlet as both man and woman, male and female, feminine and masculine, and as queer, the glocal adaptation refashions gender as

[62] Alimemaj criticizes the production's lack of weaponry (replaced by a fist) during Polonius' death and the missing glasses in Act 5.

a temporally, historically, and spatially fluid construct. In addition, as a sworn virgin Hamlet becomes asexual because given *Burrnesha's* vow of celibacy. This gives much more weighted meaning to the phrase "Man delights not me – nor women neither" (2.2.275). Lastly, thinking about gender glocally through *Hamlet* offers possibilities for new intersections of gender, sexuality, and race.

A glocal reading of *Hamlet* in Albania weaves the theatrical implications of staging gender to the reality of gender performance which extends beyond its contemporary place and time. In *Shakespeare Re-Dressed*, James Bulman asserts that "Transvestism in the theatre, therefore, serves to mirror the cultural constructedness of gender identity and thereby to reveal to spectators the instability of what they may have taken for granted, a revelation which can breed discomfort and opposition" (12). Bulman urges scholars to focus on cross-dressing in modern performances in lieu of early modern because the reception of gender and sexuality has changed as our beliefs about gender changed (12). I agree that modern twenty first century interpretations and criticism about gender in *Hamlet*, and Shakespeare performance, more broadly, accommodates the evolution of the work and of gender politics as dictated through Shakespeare's works. But I wish to add that multitemporal and multicultural scholarship is equally powerful in transforming gender discourses and the cultures which use Shakespeare to subvert gender politics. Again, thinking glocally about gender performance in and through Shakespeare can have real social and political consequences for the bodies most affected by conventional gender binarism.

Here Jennifer Drouin's definition and distinction between three forms of gender performance (cross-dressing, drag, and passing) will be useful for understanding the

implications of glocalizing gender within and without the theatre. First, cross-dressing she says, “is a theatrical convention of which we are always aware… a form of ‘‘writing back’’ to the Shakespearean canon and the early modern practice of employing boy actors to play the woman’s part” (Drouin 23). Secondly, drag is a parody of heteronormativity; it is comedic and draws attention to its “not-quite-rightness” (Drouin 23). And passing is a “subversive infiltration of normativity in which the performance of gender itself is disguised.” (Drouin 23-24). That is all to say that cross-dressing is often theatrical (it imitates the real) whereas drag and passing are real life practices (Drouin 24). But glocalization blurs these lines. For instance, sworn virgins participate in passing as a gender performance insofar as “Passing…works to conceal the ‘‘not quite’’ in order for the subject to signify ‘‘just enough the same’’ to avoid detection of the performance” (Drouin 31). However, by reading the cross-gender cast and cross-dressed Hamlet as a sworn virgin, the theatrical seeps into the real and the real into the theatrical. This exchange between cross-dressing and passing parallels the effects of gender as both a mythical construct and a felt socio-political force. Therefore, to pass, not simply between genders, but between any identities is a means of survival and subversion because the act of passing creates new ontological narratives. As Gemma Miller contends, “When used strategically, female-male cross-dressing can challenge not only what gendered bodies should look like, but what the world in general should look like” (13).

In a discussion between the slippage of real and theatrical, I note that gender is not separate from race, class and sexuality. I will briefly discuss how the production entangles these ideas. To start, the 2015 production imagines a transvestite Hamlet whose ability to pass stems from their white, upper-class status of both actor and character.

Class is signaled by the use of topcoats, leather pantsuits and boots, in contrast to the cotton shirts and pants of the minor characters. Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass argue that clothes are animated for they "mold and shape [their subjects] both physically and socially…through their power as material memories" (2). Clothes they add, "leave a 'print or character' upon observer and wearer alike" as they turn "the strong into the weak, the male into the female" (3). Garber also points to the agency of clothing's shapes and colors to transform gender (1). Thus, Xhuvani's quality and style of clothes signify both class and gender. Specifically, her masculine attire in contrast to Ophelia and Gertrude's dresses and makeup (symbols of femininity), reminds spectators that this Hamlet is the same but different. Moreover, Xhuvani's mnemonically embodied Albanian ethnicity confirm her ability to pass.[63] She is recognizably white and Albanian to the Albanian spectators. In addition, Xhuvani's political identity is also present in Hamlet. As the reviews reveal, her acting and political careers are entangled on stage.[64] Lastly, although Hamlet's sexuality as a transvestite can still be interpreted as heterosexual, especially when conflated with Xhuvani's sexuality. However, under the argument that Hamlet is a sworn virgin, then I am inclined to read the character as asexual. According to Albania's norms, asexuality is accepted more readily than homosexuality. That is all to say that while the production offers social and political opportunities for breaking gender barriers, it also enforces white heteronormativity.

[63] While the country is rather homogeneous and its theatre lacks multicultural casting, I imagine that casting an Albanian of color in the lead role would yield a different gendered and racialized response.

[64] This further implicates that the idea that women can occupy political roles but only if they are white Albanians.

The production is politically bound because its obvious cross-gender casting signals a political statement about Albania's gender politics. Although Fezollari shifts the play's time and location to present day Tirana, the fact remains that the protagonist is a former politician whose identity draws gendered and political attention to the role. According to Anne Russell, in nineteenth century cross-gendered casting productions actresses were also criticized by their personal lives, specifically how they deviated from their domestic roles (151). Her presence made the performance noteworthy, just as the presence of Dame Judi Dench in Doran's *All's Well* dominated the spotlight and defined the production (Kidnie 50). Audience members are unable to distinguish the actor from the role, therefore the role of a female politician as Hamlet is transformed into a political statement on Albania's gender relations. The gendered performance then reminds audiences, and particularly women that "neither a communist nor democratic revolution has been able to rid Albanian women of their double burdens and limitations in society" (Kushi). Gender inequality persists and the one way to subvert the norm is to cross dress. As the director states, "This Hamlet doesn't want to change for the world but wants the world to change for him" (Vrapi).

To that end, cross-dressing and cross-gendered casting is a means of subverting gender norms and codes inside and outside the theatre. To quote Terri Power: "women playing male roles in Shakespeare's plays offers equality on our stages and liberates women from limitations placed upon them in our patriarchal society" (1). To glocalize Shakespeare, and in particular *Hamlet* is to read gender as an ambiguous construct that evolves, just like Shakespeare, through a network of social, political, and temporal resonances. Xhuvani as a gender-crossed and cross-dressing Hamlet produces an

amalgamation of identities as spectators simultaneously see Xhuvani (actor), Hamlet(character), male, female, man, woman, femininity, and masculinity—all these categories diffuse any cohesive notion gender identity. Thus, Hamlet becomes an Albanian sworn virgin who defies the gender binary and creates new ways to play the game. Reading Hamlet as an Albanian sworn virgin is possible because of the palimpsestic nature of non-anglophone adaptations. The palimpsest traces and assembles gender identities from various Albanian and English histories and in doing so reconceptualizes Hamlet's gender as multiplicitous. Glocalizing gender in what is arguably Shakespeare's most influential work contributes to the development of gender politics and theatrical feminism in countries like Albania; countries whose cultural identity is heavily influenced by Western European gender politics via Shakespeare.

CHAPTER 5: POLITICAL ADAPTATIONS AND GLOCAL POLITICS IN *JULIUS CAESAR*

Fan S. Noli translated *Julius Caesar* in Albanian in 1926, but due to the work's inherent political tones, a professional production was not staged in Tirana, Albania until 2019. The translation received a lot of attention in pre-communist Albania because the theatre was not yet built. Despite the construction of the national theatre at the start of Enver Hoxha's communist regime, *Jul Cezari* was prohibited from the stage because of its potential to incite political rebellions. Therefore, literate Albanians continued to consume Shakespeare predominantly in translation. In fact, reading Shakespeare in isolation or orally in groups became "a performative event" (Quinn 169) for establishing the value of the Albanian language which was still being formed. At first, the political matter of Noli's *Jul Cezari* responded to his pre-communist historical moment when King Ahmet Zog's monarchical rule placed Albania under direct threat of invasion from bordering forces.[65] As the translation then circulated through the communist era, the pre-communist political context, as I will show, was transformed, not replaced, by the politics of another totalitarian ruler. This was possible because of the corporeal rhetoric that encumbers Noli's political translation and Albania's political theatre.

Although many Shakespearean works have been politicized as propaganda, reflective, or subversive efforts, *Julius Caesar* is overly popularized because its plot is rooted in the historical fall of a real Empire. Therefore, "this is a play whose very blood—that which gives it life and motion—is politics" (Hartley 90). In *Shakespeare and*

[65] Because *Makbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *Jul Cezari* were translated and published in the same year, their original historical context is the same.

Republicanism, Andrew Hadfield explains that the critical debate about the political influence of theatre is usually divided between critics who view theatre as "a powerful social institution" that government feared would stir opposition or rioting, and those who view it as "form of escapist entertainment, possibly a safety valve for excess emotion, but hardly a serious political forum" (4-5). Hoxha deemed theatre a powerful institution. As a result, he prevented *Jul Cezari* from reaching the Albanian stage because it could have provoked people to act against him. Alas, it took nearly a century for *Jul Cezari* to be performed before an Albanian audience. Ivica Buljan's 2019 post-post-communist production nonetheless remains infiltrated by the political moments of previous Albanian governments whose memories survive in Noli's translation via corporeal rhetoric and imagery. Noli and Buljan are already engaged in a diachronic political conversation because Shakespeare productions use Noli's translations.[66] Consequently, the *Jul Cezari* adaptations are together understood as a palimpsest of Albania's temporally evolving political situation. Examining this theatrical peculiarity can help critics understand how local political theatre shapes and is shaped by Shakespeare.

In *Shakespeare and Political Theatre in Practice*, Andrew James Hartley explains that political theatre is largely impacted by Brecht's epic theatre which encourages audiences to resist full immersion in the performance. Brecht's alienation effect seeks to keep audiences at a critical distance so they will not associate with the characters (Hartley 13). By focusing instead on the larger socio-political and economic narrative, audiences can analyze their "own political reality" (Hartley 13). The alienation effect allows

[66] Noli's translation of *Jul Cezari* is the only one that exists in Albania.

audiences to "process the character in context, analyzing their behaviour intellectually as the microcosmic manifestation of broader economic and cultural issues" (Hartley 14).[67] As such, political theatre exposes its own form to allow spectators to see the act of seeing. What makes theatre political then is the agency it grants to its audiences. This Brechtian concept was further realized by Brazilian theatre director Augusto Boal, whose *Theatre of the Oppressed* transforms spectators into spec-actors. Therefore, the goal of political Shakespeare is to show the larger social forces that manipulate both characters and spectators in hopes of freeing them from their passive roles and placing them in active ones.

Buljan's *Jul Cezari* tries to free Albanian audiences from their passive roles as spectators and citizens by setting the performance outdoors where its social and political content is immersed in the socio-political and cultural context of its location. By staging the production literally outside of the theatre, Buljan demonstrates that political theatre is grounded in social and political reality. To be more specific, the performance begins with a stage outside the theatre and progresses further from it until it ends up outside the National Theatre. As the performance moves across these spaces, it demands the active participation and motion of its audience. Thus both actors and audiences are performing the kind of intellectual and physical change which political theatre demands. However, I attest that political theatre is not simply invested in present local and socio-political context, but rather, it engages with multiple histories, cultures, and localities at once. As Melani Budianta puts it, adaptations "linguistically, stylistically as well as

[67] In practice, the alienation effect is possible by the visibility of stage theatrics, specifically, technologies.

ideologically—blur one into another" (152). Jean Chothia also argues that political adaptations are "shaped by the emotional currents and political preoccupations of the specific time and place in which [they are] produced" (115). While I completely agree with Chothia's relational and contextual approach to political Shakespeares, I also insert that non-anglophone political adaptations are shaped by many socio-political currents that are both local and global. This is evidenced in the Albanian adaptation of *Jul Cezari* which by employing Noli's translation embodies pre-communist, communist, and post-communist Albanian realities, in addition to English and Roman political traditions.

Non-anglophone adaptations contain a plethora of socio-political signs that continue to surface. For this reason, I agree with Hartley's assertion that assessments of political theatre must be "provisional, plural, and contextual" to account for all the human and nonhuman elements that are involved in its process (11). I believe this approach to political theatre aligns with Richard Paul Knowles' "materialist semiotics" process in which the critic looks at the performance, the conditions of production, and the conditions of reception as mutually operating forces (19). Knowles views theatrical performances as sites for the "negotiation, transmission, and transformation of cultural values" for specific communities and their historical moments (10). In performance, Knowles argues, "society, history, nationality, ethnicity, class, race, gender, sexuality, ability, or other social identities can be both instantiated and contested" (10). This is especially true for Shakespeare performances, and specifically, non-anglophone adaptations. Eventually, Hartley argues that political theatre (by way of Shakespeare) is a "complex nexus of forces which shape those myriad meanings for the individual audience member" (29). I set forth that this nexus where identity politics collide might be better

assessed through glocalization because as Muqtedar Khan suggests, “Social reality can be mapped only by simultaneously considering both [local and global] forces” (86).

To understand how non-anglophone adaptations like *Jul Cezari* produce political meaning to empower the local community, critics need a glocal methodology that accounts for the palimpsestic relationship of the translation and the production. Again, the translation’s accrued political significations from pre-communist and communist Albania are embodied in the post-post-communist performance through Noli’s and Buljan’s shared emphasis on the body. In other words, the palimpsestic relationship of the *Jul Cezari* adaptations is revealed through textual and visual corporeality. By tracing the glocal body politics of the adaptations, I reveal that the political figure of Caesar can be read at once as the fictional and historical Julius Caesar, Ahmet Zog, Enver Hoxha, Sali Berisha, and Edi Rama. Non-anglophone adaptations of *Julius Caesar* are glocal and therefore produce multiple Caesars. The plurality of Caesars stemming from these glocal Albanian adaptations distort (by multiplying) any singular idea of *Julius Caesar*. Thus, glocal Shakespeares as a methodology points to the instability of political Shakespeare adaptations. Thinking of local and global political adaptations as culturally, temporally, and geopolitically evolutionary works helps Shakespeare users disrupt the global domination of Western politics which advances neocolonialism.

My intention is not to imply that the glocal context of the *Jul Cezari* adaptations will be equally understood by individual audience members. That is impossible because audiences are not monolithic. Instead, I suggest that Albanians share a unique, nearly half a century long history of communism and isolation from the world which Buljan rhetorically and visually alludes to, therefore, an Albanian audience is more likely to

generate a communal interpretation and/or response. For example, as Buljan's production was successfully performed in numerous cities in Albania, I note that the regional communities and individual spectators interpreted aspects of the production personally. Buljan said, "It is not necessary to tell directly who Julius Caesar is, the audience is very intelligent and can understand who each of the characters can be" (Kredo). However, since the adaptation is obviously concerned with politics, I imagine that locals interpreted the politics of *Caesar* as Albanians. Furthermore, the fact that only one translation and one production of *Julius Caesar* exist in Albania invites audiences and critics to think of their political meaning(s) comparatively. Although the identification of Caesar in Albania will continue to evolve with future adaptations and political moments, what remains the same thus far is the practitioners' political commitment to liberal change. Of course, this too can change since political theatre is not inherently liberal or left-leaning. Nonetheless, I avow that glocal Shakespeares, in Albania and beyond, invite the multiplicity of reception because it further destabilizes Shakespeare.

Political Bodies in Translation

Noli translated *Jul Cezari* in 1926 while living as a political refugee in Berlin. As a politician on the run, he avoids political allusions between Rome and Albania in his translation, just like Shakespeare abstains from direct connections between Caesar and Elizabeth or James I.[68] His introduction instead criticizes political regimes through the

[68] Noli explains that Shakespeare in naming the play after Caesar proved to be a "practical Anglo-Saxon businessman" because he profited from the commercial value of Caesar's myth and he did not appear to side with the "republican liberators" (9).

character analyses of Brutus and Cassius. Noli plainly favors Brutus' political system and philosophy. The translation yields a clear message to Albanians about Romans: Caesar was a great general but also a "grotesque tyrant," therefore "giving Brutus and Cassius the right to kill him in order to liberate and save the republic" (Noli 8). Noli portrayal of "Brutus as a wholly positive folk hero" coincides with the messages of 1970s Italian productions where Caesar was also represented as a threatening yet disembodied dictator (Tempera 339). Usually, countries which have experienced totalitarian regimes instinctively portray Caesar as a tyrant and Brutus as the hero.[69] Whether in translation or in performance, *Julius Caesar* in Southern Europe was subversive to the contemporary political moment. Noli's local political subversion begins by corporealizing *Jul Cezari*.

The anatomical, body-conscious rhetoric of *Julius Caesar* is emphasized in Noli's *Jul Cezari*. This is a deliberate decision on Noli's part to portray the Albanian republic as a general body in order to unify the collective public against a dictator. The translation empowers Albania citizens to take physical action during critical political times. Miranda Fay Thomas' examination of the manipulative power of hand gestures might help clarify this endeavor. Thomas argues that physical "gestures are embodied social metaphors: they are the epitome of the political as personal, and vice versa" (1). That is to say that textual or performative gestures like handshaking, signing, or rearing a knife can "convince a crowd of people to take action" and "alter the course of history" (Thomas 1). The theatricality of bodily action in *Julius Caesar* therefore demonstrates the "performative nature of politics" (Thomas 1). Political theatre, let alone political change,

[69] Of course, there are exceptions to every rule.

needs to be corporeal. It is precisely the performative nature of political action that Noli highlights in his translation through corporeality.

To begin, I compare the body-centered rhetoric in *Julius Caesar* to a blazon. The "anatomical blazoning, the praise or blame of the body in parts," writes Laura Friedman, is a gendered process wherein the male poet "displays his control of the mistress and text among men" as a way of asserting his social status (Friedman 101). Shakespeare blazons the Roman body politic as a male body, specifically, Caesar's body. Noli amplifies this corporeal rhetoric in translation, thereby localizing the work to carry out his political agenda while also linking Albania's body politic to European politics. In this process, Noli privileges the androcentric body politic to inspire physical political action. To put it differently, Noli represents government as a political body in order to inspire people to take physical action against it when it is oppressing them.

The Roman republic is anatomized as a masculine body with Caesar as the head of the body politic. Because his head is a source of authority, when the conspirators speak of the death of Caesar and his tyranny, they describe it as a beheading instead of the traditional stabbing. Caesar's physical body, specifically his head, functions as a stand-in for the state because he is the principal body of Rome. His followers then become limbs. Take for example, Brutus' speech about Mark Antony being "a limb" (2.1.164) of Caesar's Roman body:

> And for Mark Antony, think not of him,
> For he can do no more than Caesar's arm
> When Caesar's head is off. (2.1.180-2)

Mos u mejtoni, pra, për Mark Antonin.
Si krah i Jul Cezarit s'prish dot punë,
Pasi t'ia presim kokën Jul Cezarit. (Noli 66-67).

Don't worry about Mark Antonin.
As a limb of Julius Caesar he can't tamper our work,
After we behead Julius Caesar. (translated back)

The blazoning here is physical and male, and it begins with the head. Although the bodily rhetoric remains present in the translation, Noli alters the agency in these bodily interactions. Specifically, in Noli's text, Brutus affirms that they will cut off Caesar's head and he avoids the passive voice that Shakespeare's Brutus uses to distance them from the beheading. By emphasizing this violent act against the highest body of the republic, Noli is reinforcing the ableist idea that bodies require agency and strength in political affairs. His translation speaks directly to the political moment of Zog's pre-communist Albania when women were entirely absent from the parliament.[70] Noli intentionally emphasizes *Caesar's* body rhetoric in translation to argue that revolutions belong to responsible male bodies whose corporeal deeds result in political change.

To present Julius Caesar as an unfit tyrant, Noli directs readers to his physical inadequacy. Caesar's body as a political analogy is riddled with rhetoric of weakness and illness in order to undermine his authority and the need for his fall. For example, Cassius wonders how the "tired Caesar" (1.2.115) who cries for help "as a sick girl" (1.2.128) "is

[70] Albanian women gained full voting rights in 1945.

now become a god" (1.2.123). Noli inflames Cassius' body-centered language which rhetorically weakens Caesar:

> You gods, it doth amaze me
> A man of such a feeble temper should
> So get the start of the majestic world
> And bear the palm alone. (1.2.135-8)

> Ju, o perëndira,
> Çuditem qysh njeri si ky trup-dobët
> Iu sul mbi supet botës madhështore
> Dhe mbretëron mbi të pa shoq, i vetëm. (Noli 35)

> You, o gods,
> I'm amazed how someone weak-bodied like this
> Came unto the shoulders of this magnificent world
> And he reigns over it without a friend, alone. (translated back)

Caesar's weakened body in Albanian is read as a burden to the commonwealth. This able-bodied rhetoric prioritizes bodily strength in a male ruler above all else. The body of the politician is thus directly tied to the body politic. Other than the weak body which almost allowed Caesar to drown, his epileptic seizures have been publicly noted as his primary weakness. Casca retells that during Caesar's coronation, "He fell down in the marketplace and foamed at mouth and was speechless" (1.2.251-2). For Noli, Caesar's physical weakness implies that the body politic is weak and needs to be purged of its

anomality. To contextualize this in pre-communist Albania, a reader would be coerced to regard King Zog as a detriment to the political body of Albania because his power was not his own, but it was borrowed from foreign militias. Brutus, in whom I argue Noli saw himself, on the other hand, is physically competent.

After Caesar is killed, Antony heads the revolution against the conspirators with his own body talk. He does so "by 're-membering' Caesar: showing us his wounded body" (Thomas 14). That is, by remembering Caesar's legacy during his eulogy speech, Antony is reconstructing the failed political body that was Caesar. Like a criminal investigator, he narrates the circumstances of Caesar's wounds by relating each bodily affliction to the male body that caused it. Stefan Dudink claims that "As the bodies of absolute rulers were divested of their divine political authority, the bodies of citizens and secular political rulers became one of the sources from which newly conceptualized political authority was supposed to spring" (Dudink 155). Therefore, by dismembering the elite body, the people would rule again. This is possible because as Katherine Walker argues, Mark Antony encourages people to essentially consume Caesar's body as a way of recycling "magical matter of the corpse" by "obtain[ing] pieces of the assassinated man's effluvia or blood as valuable mementos of the deceased great figure" (216). By dividing his body into consumable memories of authority, each plebeian gains a bit of his corporeal "magic," but in doing so the republic has no authoritative head, only executive parts. Based on Noli's reading, the redistribution of power from the dictator back to the people is welcomed because Caesar was not a stable or fit body for rule.

For Noli, the physical riddance of old and the emergence of new political bodies is a necessary and desired step. Although I am hesitant to suggest that Noli wished to

insight physical violence, this is a strong possibility. Furthermore, Noli also disapproves of Antony and sees him as a replacement of Caesar. It is with judgment that Noli translates Antony's proclamation that he has "neither wit, nor words, nor worth," (3.2.214). Noli entirely corporealizes it as such: "S'kam as kokë, as gojë, as sy" (I don't have a head, mouth, or eyes) (120). Although Antony denies having the bodily features that make up a governing head to replace Caesar, he does become the intermediate head of Rome by uniting the people to rise against Brutus and Cassius. One political body is replaced by another. Noli uses corporeal rhetoric to shows readers that the people can influence the political body.

It doesn't come as a surprise then that in his analysis of Caesar's assassination, Noli praises "the murderers of tyrants…as liberating leaders" and he asserts that "the murder of the tyrant was considered a high deed and a patriotic duty of every free citizen" (9). By first commending the people who take action against tyrants, Noli then criticizes those that "stayed in a cold and terrorized side and left Brutus and Cassius alone in the mud" (10). Noli's political analysis of the population is comparable to Cold War adaptations of *Julius Caesar*, notably Marlon Brando's 1953 film, where citizens were shown to "only react to the choices offered them; they [did] not initiate political action" (Miller 99). Noli's introduction also condemns this "cold-war quiescence" of the "passively gazing people" (Miller 99). Noli's interpretation and translation prime readers to recognize that tyranny can only be prevented or resolved when people take action. His disapproving assessment also targets the lack of support he personally received from Albanians while Ahmet Zog chased him out of his PM seat and the country. Noli suggests that the people paid dearly for this "fatal attitude" because they entered a

tyranny which "future generations carried on their necks until the empire was destroyed and it disappeared" (20). To contextualize his critiques in Albania's pre-communist political moment is to understand that Albania suffered under Zog like Rome did under Caesar.

In pre-communist Albania, the translation's vilification of Caesar corresponded to Noli's motive to depose King Ahmet Zog who later became "a symbol of the dark past" (Puto and Dhima 72). However, Noli's message against Caesar's tyranny proved to be very relatable to Albanians during Hoxha's communist rule too. Hoxha's dictatorship made him a stronger candidate for comparison against Julius Caesar. As such, journalist Andrea Stefani writes that "Enver was a Caesar," an "Albanian-communist version of Caesar" (Top Channel).[71] Stefani justifies his analogy by suggesting that "40 years of dictatorial rule is more than enough to prove that Enver was a Caesar" (Top Channel). His comparison of Caesar and Hoxha as dictators coincides with Noli's diagnosis of Caesar as "the dictator of Rome" (7). Hoxha followed Caesar's strategy closely. Like Caesar, Hoxha successfully unified the people against a common enemy in WWII, only then to use his Yugoslav-backed military power to take down political rivals, all in the name of liberty. Because political Shakespeares[72] are primarily understood through their local, socio-political context, Albanian readers during communism would have been able

---

[71] Top Channel Albania, "Rikthehet 'Jul Cezari'. Shfaqja teatrale në ambientin e jashtëm të teatrit" YouTube video, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dMnJLpgDkZ4.

[72] Political Shakespeare usually refers to performances, not translations, but I use the term to accommodate both forms of adaptation.

to interpret the same corporeal rhetoric that calls for bodily action against Hoxha's oppressive regime.

However, within the palimpsestic nature of memory, or what Gilles Deleuze calls the "coexistence of sheets of past" (qtd. in Silverman 62), memory of Zog's tyranny from pre-communist Albania would continue to resurface in their communist present. In such context, Noli's *Jul Cezari* palimpsestically consists of a "cult of [oppressive] personalities" from "different stages of Albanian nationalism" (Puto and Dhima 62, 71). In addition to drawing parallels between Zog, Hoxha, and Julius Caesar, Noli's introduction conditions Albanian readers to also consider Caesar's fictional identity, both Shakespearean and classical, thereby resulting in the palimpsestic production of multiple Caesars.

The glocal process of reading *Jul Cezari* might be understood further by example of the plebeians who declare that they will divide, as instructed by Brutus, to listen to Cassius and Brutus separately and then "compare their reasons" (3.2.10). Albanian readers are thus instructed by Noli to listen to the histories of the fictional and real Caesars as cautionary tales that relate to their own socio-political context. The play's concurrent speeches attest to the possibility of multiple histories, and therefore multiple Caesars. The abundance of Caesars in Noli's translation is occasioned by the glocalization process wherein real, myth, past, present, local, and global entities which continuously interact with and inform one another. This multiplicity challenges Shakespeare's political authority while also helping scholars understand that Albanian political adaptations are body-centered.

Although Caesar plays a secondary role in the play due to his limited lines, as noted by Horst Zander and others,[73] his presence is always felt. According to Zander, "All the characters constantly think about Caesar, talk about Caesar, refer to Caesar, and are haunted and spellbound by Caesar" (6). His spirit survives because of his momentous fame. Caesar is what Linda Charnes calls a "notorious identity"— a legendary figure who has been culturally and diachronically "disfigured by fame" (Charnes 1,3). Noli recognizes Caesar as such when he describes him as "a caricature of himself" (8). Caesar is a notorious identity because he is both fictional and historically real, and those identities distorted to create a new multiplicitous identity that encompasses his Roman, Shakespearean, and now Albanian realities. He's been disfigured both literally and metaphorically through cultures, spaces, and times. Each time he is reborn in with an adaptation only to be killed again. To add to this point, Hema Dahiya says that "Caesar's character is revealed through different viewpoints expressed by different characters. What he actually is remains rather ambiguous to the reader" (Dahiya 147). As such, Nasse Behnegar declares that Caesar "represents more than one personality" especially because Shakespeare compressed time and as a result Caesar's ghost appears after three days in a Jesus-like fashion (Behnegar 80). To these points, I posit that Caesar's notoriety makes him glocal as he represents "the experience of being reiterated" (Charnes 1).[74] His

[73] Horst Zander sums up that "Brutus utters 720 (which represent 27.8 percent of the drama), Cassius 505 (19.5 percent), and Antony 328 (12.6 percent)—whereas Caesar's portion is limited to only 150 lines, in fact, to no more than 5.8 percent of the text." (6).

[74] Julius Caesar's legend is not foreign to Albania. The Latinization of the Albanian alphabet is in part due to contact with the Roman Empire. Historically, Caesar's battle of Dyrrhachium was set in what is now Dürres, Albania. As a result, tourists can presently follow Caesar's trail through Albania in tours.

glocal identity can be understood as a rhizome of Caesarian assemblages from history and fiction, past and present, communist and post-communist, all interacting and ever-continuously transforming the Caesarian celebrity. The palimpsestic process that produces multiple glocal Caesars is traced through Noli's political allusions to the body.

While the translation signified many Albanian Caesars, those identities are always already in conversation and sometimes at odds with multitemporal and multicultural fictional and historical Caesars, for such is the nature of glocal Shakespeares. Noli creates these links between Albanian politicians and Shakespearean reconfigurations of Julius Caesar in order to relate Albanian history to a grand European political identity. Noli's use of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* to implement political change articulates Albania's own glocal identity: it aspires to be both local and global, European and not European. Thus his endeavor reproduces the colonial notion of Europe as the center of progress and civility—making Shakespeare a spokesperson for Europeanness. Because Shakespeare's *Caesar* is read as criticism of political oppression, Shakespeare becomes a global symbol of resistance, forgoing that he belongs to an empire too. But the glocal process embodied in Noli's translation reveals that the identities of Shakespeare's political figures are unstable and intercultural, therefore they cannot represent any dominant power. As such, there is no need to aspire to European politics via Shakespeare because when Shakespeare is recognized as glocal (which I have argued he is), then the notion of a singular Shakespeare or a unified European identity is dismantled. All this becomes apparent when we read *Julius Caesar* glocally.

Body Politics in Performance

In 2019, Noli's translation finally premiered in Albania under the direction of well-known Croatian director Ivica Buljan. The production was performed outdoors in the theatre square of Tirana where Albania's National, Experimental, Metropolitan, and Opera and Ballet theatres are located within walking distance of each other. According to the director, the outdoor setting is inspired by medieval European theatre where actors and directors performed in different locations called stations around the city, and they used music to lure in spectators. This form of theatre created "a live communication between actors and spectators" (Kredo). Buljan attempts to replicate this theatrical interaction by staging the production in four locations within the theatre square. The performance begins in the empty public swimming pool between the two national theatres and moves to the park across the theatres. The third phase with Caesar's death is staged in front of the Ministry of Interior, and the last stage is set in the open space in front of the National Theatre of Albania where protestors opposed its demolition.[75] Buljan's staging choice is a political one. By taking the production out to the public, where *Jul Cezari's* political corporeality will be embodied by actors and audiences alike, Buljan invests in a political Shakespeare.

Buljan's approach is inspired by Bertolt Brecht. Brechtian theatre wants to change how spectators think, so it breaks the fourth wall to make actors and spectators are aware of each other's presence. Moreover, Brechtian theatre, Laura Bradley explains, requires actors and spectators "to retain critical and political awareness" (5). The essence of Brecht's theatre is that it encourages and seeks to empower political consciousness.

[75] Despite the long and weary protests, unfortunately the National Theatre of Albania was demolished on May 17th, 2020.

While Brecht achieves this estrangement between actors and spectators by surreal background or experimental acting, Buljan, who is invested in political consciousness and action, does this through realism. The public and circulating mise-en-scène demands the spectators and actors to reenact political protests by gathering in a socio-politically charged setting, thereby, dissolving the sheltered illusion of the theatre. Political theatre and political reality become one through performativity. In this process, Noli's body-centered rhetoric is embodied throughout Buljan's body-conscious performance and as a result, spectators are encouraged to interpret Caesar's identity palimpsestically based on current and past political contexts.

Long before the body takes center stage in the performance, the viewers are primed by the promotional material to perform a corporeal interpretation of the production. The program cover displays three raised fists, two of which show faceless men arguing in the parliament. In the forefront fist, a silhouette of Enver Hoxha is seen with a raised fist. Buljan defended this artistic choice by arguing that "Enver Hoxha is part of Albanian history and the history of the world. Today in modern times, especially in post-communist places, people try to erase everything from that time from their memories [..] but I believe the new generations need to familiarize with that period" (ABC News Albania).[76] He finds Shakespeare's nuance useful in relaying the multiplicity of history across nations. Buljan's approach to Albanian Shakespeare actually encourages spectators to see the rhetorical and visual corporeality of the production palimpsestically.

---

[76] ABC News Albania, "Vepra "Jul Çezari" vjen ne qiell te hapur me regji te Ivica Buljan" YouTube Video, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R7LI7S6z_u8.

I venture to say that Buljan is thinking glocally because he understands Noli's Caesar as the embodiment of the historical Caesar, Hoxha and Rama at once. His approach proves that non-anglophone adaptations are glocal because they are always already involved in intercultural processes of exchange. Political theatre in Albania centers on physicality in order to prompt the body politic into action. This is demonstrated in Buljan's Brechtian production and Noli's translation. To understand how the two negotiate political meaning a glocal reading is necessary.

The body rhetoric of the translation and performance suggests that there are many Caesars as a way of saying that tyrannical rulers continuously resurface. Likewise, it enforces the idea that the body politic has and continues to implement political change by means of physical gathering. This becomes quite apparent in the production where the actors and spectators' bodies are proximate. When spectators recognize the constancy of body politic, then they are empowered toward change in their present socio-political moment. Consequently, the three fists in the flyer trump Hoxha's dictatorial fist as a means of saying that the power belongs to the people. The power to rise against tyranny is literally in their hands. As a long-lasting symbol for resistance, the abundance of revolutionary gestures like the fist, conditions audiences to expect a political performance. The production empowers the republic to create change in their local government, but it grants power only to the men of the republic. This is symptomatic of the work of *Julius Caesar* and the translation that upkeeps a male-centric stance. Ultimately, political resistance is branded with the rhetorical and visual prowess of patriarchy.

Political resistance for Noli and Buljan is above all physical. The body-centric production illustrates the responsibility of citizens in actively acting against tyranny and tyrannical leaders. Throughout different political circumstances, the people's collective power remains constant even when leaders change. For example, in the opening act Marullus disparages the citizens because they now cheer for Caesar as they once cheered for Pompey. Then again, in the third act, as Mark Antony delivers his funeral speech, the citizens condemn Brutus for ridding them of Caesar's ambitious tyranny immediately after having praised him. What is perhaps interpreted in these scenes as a fickleness of character, in Buljan's performance suggests that the people naturally change because the leadership calls for change. Emily C. Bartels argues that plebeians are not fickle, but their political action is limited to only reaction (388). While that may be the case for the play, in non-anglophone adaptation, political action is not passive reaction. As such, Noli and Buljan stress the power of the body politic to not only respond but to enact political change. According to Murat Ogutcu, in Early Modern England "tyrannous rule was depicted on the stage as a result of passive servitude where people did not defend their rights" (120). As such "it could be acted against only in an active and aggressive way" (Ogutcu 121). The corporeality that traces Noli's and Buljan's *Jul Cezari* demonstrates a similar line of thinking where the oppressive body can only be dismantled by the collective action of the body politic.

Buljan's adaptation ultimately empowers the body politic through Noli's body rhetoric and the physical manifestation of gathering and moving. However, as Dustin Gish and Bernard Dobski explain, the notion of the body politic usually evokes a risky and nationalistic "image of unified community in which individual parts are fully

incorporated and rendered utterly subordinate to the interest of the whole" (1). Indeed, the *Jul Cezari* production attempts to unite its spectators as Noli's translation did. But these political motives make sense in the context of communist country. Nationalism for Albania was a survival response against invasion and colonialism. Nonetheless, the production's intended body politic is better understood as a liberal unit rather than a national one. Even so, audiences and populations are not uniformly liberal. For instance, in Albania there are many nostalgic communists, among many democrats, socialists, etc. Brecht himself was opposed to the undifferentiated mass audience. The diversity of spectators and political context in nation states lead Gish and Dubski to argue that marginalized or oppressed individuals "by being aware of their particular status in the whole…are made aware of the need to constitute an order or whole that transcends partiality" (22). Therewith, consent is not only present but necessary in the body politic. From this perspective, the body politic is not in opposition to radical democracy or liberalism. Lastly, I contend that the palimpsestic nature of *Jul Cezari* contradicts any nationalist regime by showing that body politic is formed through Shakespeare's glocal politics.

Julius Caesar, Andrew Hartley explains, is a politically tricky play because it "does not clearly champion either side" (91). Depending on its socio-political context, it can be subversive, propagandist, or apolitical. Shakespeare's politics as many have noted remain politically and philosophically ambiguous. However, in a local Albanian performance, despite the lack of evidence against Caesar's tyranny, the very mention of tyranny is meant to trigger post-communist spectators into relating Caesar with their own local, historical tyrant. This idea is enforced by the director, actors, promos, and mise-en-

scène. Then, by treating Buljan's adaptation as a palimpest, I show how its political rhetoric leaves traces of multiple historical, temporal, fictional, and real Caesars who resurface in performance because they are all signified by the corporeal language of the translation that Buljan is faithful to. The production's bodily-centered performance also broaches the gap between actor and spectator, theatrical and political to show that non-anglophone political Shakespeares are glocal and should be read as such.

Buljan envisions *Jul Cezari* as "the first political thriller in all times" which "is current not only in Albania, but also in the world" (Alla). His message is distinctly glocal because it accounts for local interpretations of the idea of Julius Caesar across the globe. Buljan's adaptation of Fan Noli's *Jul Cezari* results in a complex system of multifarious identities. Because Noli's adaptation is an assemblage of pre-communist and communist significations on its own, the performance expands the glocal palimpsest to include the post-post-communist socio-political context of its present time as well. Therefore, this glocal production is understood by the emphatic linguistic and visual body rhetoric which multiplies the Caesarian identities present and possible.

There are numerous political interpretations that emerge from the translation-based performance. Primarily, it is a critique of the historical figure Julius Caesar. The magnitude of his name transcends all borders and adapts to create many Caesars. This is possible through the global cultural and economic network of Shakespeare's own industry and legend. Notorious identities like Julius Caesar, Mark Antony, and Cleopatra travel and multiply. While there are local Caesars reproduced around the globe, what makes Shakespeare especially glocal is the assemblage of *Caesars* found in one locality alone. The list of Albanian *Caesars* begins with communist dictator Enver Hoxha who

was at first celebrated as a defender from foreign invasion but then turned into a tyrant, enslaving his own nation. His tyranny was replaced by Sali Berisha who seemed at first as a Brutus for liberating Albania from their communist shackles, but soon turned to a *Caesar* by defrauding and bankrupting the country. Current Albanian president Ilir Meta who faced an impeachment trial for trying to cancel municipal elections is another post-post-communist *Caesar*. Lastly, his opponent, Prime Minister Edi Rama claims a Caesarian role for accusations of fraudulent elections and more pertinent to the theatre community, for approving the demolition of the National Theatre of Albania. The variety of significations herein discussed, I argue, is a result of glocalization. The spectators experience these Caesars in isolation and as an assemblage—treating history as a network of palimpsestic memories that yield overlapping (glocal) identities in performance.

The production seeks to put the spectators in "a continuous physical and intellectual activity" (RTV)[77] to show them how to engage in politics. Their engagement is of course physical. As audience members move and carry their chairs through the scenarios, their counter-performance is made legible. In other words, the production sheds light on the co-dependent nature between spectator and actor. The spectators are performing their individual roles as well. This is all to highlight performative power in acting against oppressive systems. The production is thus linguistically, scenically, and receptively political. The choice of space, as the director claims, is "both a "political and an aesthetic statement" because the audience "must move from scene to scene, which are

[77] RTV Klan, "Jul Çezari, nje vrasje tek Ministria e Brendshme" YouTube Video, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bHLmUXHl--U.

natural not theatrical" (RTV). This motion mimics the geospatial movement of *Caesar* across cultures and times to show how each movement is a performance of political glocalization. I regard the aesthetics of this experimental production to be political insofar as they reinforce the corporeal rhetoric which Noli used to politicize *Jul Cezari*.

Buljan is not the first to produce this sort of performative political activism. Suzanne Gosset, for example, recounts the 1998 political production of *Pericles* directed by Joe Banno and Cam McGee. Their production utilized seven small stages in Washington DC and "the tour guide, Gower, led the audience from one to the next" (Gossett 23). The production was politicized not just by its location but more overtly by the flyers which consisted of current political events to condition the audience to think politically. In its political context, the politicized *Pericles* pointed to America's "journey from innocence to disillusionment: from 1968-98 (Gossett 23). The physical movement between American settings, Gossett reveals, wasn't as successful because it alienated audiences emotionally and physically. In *Jul Cezari* however, the embodied motion succeeds instead because its politics are threaded in language and performance by corporeality. Moreover, when interpreting the production, Gossett admits that critics were torn between reading the director's calls to current events or early modern political concerns (29). This issue of reception plays out differently with Albanian adaptations because they lend themselves more easily to glocal readings due to the glocal nature of non-anglophone adaptations and the limited number of adaptations. Non-anglophone adaptations like *Jul Cezari* demand a glocal evaluation in order to unfold its political consequences.

The politics of the Albanian Caesar are tied to corporeality which is evident throughout the production and even in the casting. Romir Zalla reprises his role as Caesar in Buljan's production of *Jul Cezari*, followed by Ervin Beljeri as Brutus and Amos Mujo as Cassius. The production also features popular television actor Gent Zenelaj in the role of Casca. The bodies of the actors contribute significantly to character embodiment. The casting choice of Romir Zalla as Caesar, for instance, is fitting with the corporeal emphasis of the adaptation. The actor's sheer height in comparison to the rest of the cast physically elevates his head above everyone else, thus embodying the physical and political power of Caesar as head of the body politic. This is particularly important during the coronation scene because Zalla's head is distinguishable amongst the crowd of followers around him. Interestingly, the corporeal politics of the Albanian adaptation have a stake in the theatre and ability politics of the country.

The political context and effect of *Jul Cezari* is dependent upon physicality, where gathering and moving is cause for political change. The physically savvy production in tandem with the body-centered Nolian language express performance as a political act. The performance begins in the empty public swimming pool between the two national theatres. The pool is out of service but has been filled with enough water to cover Cassius' ankles as he tells Brutus the tale of how he saved the weak Caesar from drowning in the "angry flood" (1.2.103) of the Tiber river. From the start, the production is rooted in performative and bodily narration. The intermediacy of the location reminds spectators that *Jul Cezari* rests in-between two primary identities, the historically-real and the theatrical Caesar. This is also known as "the problem of the "two Caesars: the ailing and petulant old man, and the giant spirit standing colossal over the Roman Empire to be"

(Gray 2). As I have indicated, there are many Caesars. Therefore, the binarism of historical and real Caesars is further tangled with the multi-temporal and cultural identities of Caesars. This is demonstrated by the metaphor of this first public stage. The liminal space in between Caesars and between actors and spectators is made up of water and therefore constitutes those identities fluid and glocal. Theatre and reality are conflated but both require action.

The glocalization of the adaptation allows this political meaning to emerge. For instance, in the next setting, the performance is glocalized through the costuming choices. The meeting between the conspirators occurs in the small park across the pool. Specifically, in the scene where the conspirators meet at Brutus' home in the middle of the night, their disguises are not cloaks, but Hawaiian shirts and sun hats—an unusual choice for an autumn night. Their costumes glocalize American culture by distinguishing their bodies, not disguising them. The costuming throughout the show is modernized. Caesar is fitted in a suit at the beginning to indicate that his body possesses the most power and money. The suited Caesar also allows for the figure to be interpreted as a politician, both distant and contemporary to the present socio-political moment. The other actors gradually begin to lose layers of clothing to illustrate and empower the body in action. In other words, the body politic is literally made visible.

Actors and audiences are not separated by the false pretenses of a theatrical stage. In this Brechtian setting then, the audience is encouraged to simultaneously see (critically) and participate in political performance. By minimizing the gap between the audience and actor, the director equates political theatre with political action. As Andrew Hartley verifies, "all theatre is political since it partakes of the same reality as the rest of

life" (Hartley 3). Fittingly, Caesar's death takes place on a scaffold in front of the Ministry of Interior, a government department responsible for the protection of citizens' human rights and liberties. This location marks a distinct political allusion to people taking action in their own hands when the government fails to protect their democratic rights. By no means is the production inciting people to harm any government leaders or officials. Rather, it takes itself seriously as a protest by the performative act of physically bringing people together and moving them.

The performance as a form of protest hits home in the final public stage in front of the National Theatre of Albania. Prime Minister Edi Rama, who I previously described as another Caesar, announced plans to demolish the theatre and build a new one. People gathered in mass protests outside the theatre where *Jul Cezari* ends, to fight the destruction of a historical and cultural monument. When the production gathers people in this politically-contextualized space, it is enacting political performance; it oscillates between theatrical and real political performativity. As such, actor Gent Zenelaj argues that "This show will be 10 times stronger than the protests of the opposition or position" (ABC News Albania).[78] Buljan's production becomes a public protest by its setting and therein it urges audience members to realize their corporeal power as bodies in political action bring forth political change. If we understand political theatre to be rooted in socio-political empowerment then the actor/spectator is necessarily become, as Pascale

[78] ABC News Albania, "Aktoret e "Jul Cezarit": Efekti i shfaqjes me i forte se 10 protestat e opozites" YouTube video, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nywnNE5lT3Q.

Aebischer describes, "response-able/responsible" (19) for their active participation. It is through the outdoor staging that the public and the private world of politics integrate to suggest that political acts are and should always be seen and judged by the people.

The notion of glocal politics is not new to the global Early Modern world. While investigating the 18th century diplomatic practices of global trade, Felicia Gottmann describes sea ports as "a politicized 'glocal' space, where diplomatic recognition locally provided a touchstone for the global acceptance of the [Prussian East India] company" (Gottmann 425). In this instance, Gottmann argues that "Diplomatic ritual thus became an important tool of self-legitimization: through demonstrative acts of diplomatic recognition these hybrid and second-rate global and local players were able to mutually reinforce their importance as legitimate representatives of sovereign European states and enterprises" (431). Non-Anglocentric adaptations in Shakespeare studies are often treated as ports for legitimizing the nation's value for Western colonial institutions. The glocalization of the field would therefore transform this power structure by revealing that national political identities are constantly exchanged. This essay endeavors to do just that by glocalizing the politics of *Julius Caesar*.

A glocal reading reveals that political meaning can be multiplicitous in non-anglophone adaptations. *Jul Cezari* produced, for example, many Caesarian identities. In fact, the warm reception of *Jul Cezari* in Tirana led the production to tour around major cities in Albania. Each relocation adds a newer Caesarian to the glocal palimpsest of Caesars. It's possible that in these regions[79] *Jul Cezari* achieved accrued new

[79] Marissa Greenberg defines a region as "a discrete geopolitical unit with official borders and jurisdictional autonomy" (341).

interpretations since Albanian regions come their own dialects and cultural customs. However, the theatre troupe continued to stage performances in front of public spaces and government buildings, and because the promotional materials were uniform, I maintain that, for the most part, spectators would be conditioned to see the corporeal rhetoric as a reference to Albania's premier tyrants before any regional and personal associations took place. And so, I argue that Albanian adaptation is truly regionalized and further glocalized through its ambitious Eastern European tour.

Conclusion

In this chapter, not only have I argued that Noli's translation and Buljan's performance of *Jul Cezari* focus on the body as a means of promoting physical, political action in Albania—I emphasize that reading translations and performances palimpsestically leads to an understanding of such political meanings. Because the production uses the translation, in order to understand one, you must understand the other. Therefore, a glocal reading that traces the corporeal meaning of both adaptations palimpsestically is necessary. By reading these adaptations glocally, we are better equipped to comprehend how they produce political meaning.

Political meaning(s) in non-anglophone adaptations like *Jul Cezari* are produced glocally insofar as adaptations are always already engaged in an intercultural process that involves many histories, places, and time periods. Non-anglophone adaptations are like palimpsests because they accrue political meaning through negotiations between translations and performances from various cultural and socio-political milieus.

Consequently, a glocal reading of *Jul Cezari* shows that there are multiple Caesars. These variant Caesars parallel the complex political and cultural identities of immigrants and minority groups who embody "multiple identities at one time" and whose "identities shift and change over the course of time and changing circumstances" (Spickard 4). This multiplicity of political identities in non-anglophone adaptations demonstrates that political meaning is glocal and therefore unstable.

The politics or political philosophy of *Julius Caesar* is always in flux between cultures, times, and geopolitical locations. Therefore, to understand how political theatre empowers non-western audiences, Shakespeare scholars must consider the glocal identities of the audience and the glocal nature by which political meaning is produced in local Shakespeares. The glocalization of Shakespeare's political works marks Shakespearean politics as intercultural which negates the dominance of white Western political philosophy. In other words, by glocalizing Shakespearean politics, Shakespeare users can destabilize Shakespeare's neocolonial agency.

CHAPTER 6: GLOCAL USERS AND MEDIATIZED ADAPTATIONS: *II HENRY VI AS A CASE STUDY*

In *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*, Margaret Jane Kidnie speaks of "communities of users who accept, reject, or, more often, debate" the authenticity of new Shakespeare editions and adaptations (7). This community that controls and limits the legitimacy of new Shakespeares in circulation consists of readers, spectators, editors, publishers, and theatre practitioners (Kidnie 30). Kidnie clarifies that the verdict on Shakespeare's work is "continually produced among communities of users through assertion and dissension, not legislated once and for all" (31). Although Kidnie recognizes the authoritative presence of users, in her perspective, their authority comes from their willing participation in Shakespeare's industry. These select few users are what some call the privileged gatekeepers of Shakespeare studies. Valerie Fazel and Louise Geddes, on the other hand, in their seminal work *The Shakespeare User*, suggest that in addition to "readers, performers, or academics," the Shakespeare user is also "a gamer, a programmer, an online shopper, an Instagrammer, a patron, a student, a self-proclaimed fan, a corporation, a search engine, or a software program" (4). The focus here switches from passive reception to use and creation which are just as potent in the flux of Shakespeare studies. Thus, Fazel and Geddes tend to both the users who are unwittingly consuming Shakespeare and to those on the periphery, who are molding, and not just gatekeeping the field's borders.

Fazel and Geddes are attempting to destabilize Shakespeare's singular authority by redefining what Shakespeare is, who uses Shakespeare, how and to what end; thus, avoiding the concentration of power in any one way, place, or user. Their redefinition of users, in fact, aims to dissolve the hierarchy of users and usage. Their re-conception of

the Shakespeare user is an attractive one because it is inclusive of human and non-human agents, and it presupposes a force of resistance by means of user inclusivity. As such, Fazel and Geddes attest that all users actively "contribute to the cultural phenomena we think of as Shakespeare" (3). The Shakespeare user is a consumer who "assumes the right of access to Shakespeare" (4), and thereby redistributes Shakespearean authority outside of academia to change what Shakespeare looks like within and beyond Web 2.0. The expansion of digital culture permits all users with internet access to recreate Shakespearean archive and consequently reshape Shakespeare. Ultimately, the wide span of Shakespeare users and use proves that Shakespeare does not exist in a vacuum but is always entangled with and through digital forms and media.

While I commend the broad and all-inclusive view of Shakespeare users, I remain attuned to the issue of equitable distribution and access. In conversation with Fazel and Geddes, I first explain that Shakespeare users are always already glocal because they engage with Shakespeare through global technology. The internet has the "ability to collapse temporal and spatial separation," (Fazel and Geddes 13), therefore making glocal users possible. Conceptually and broadly defined, glocal Shakespeare users are local participants who consume and remake Shakespeare through global digital technologies. Specifically, online and offline interactions allow local users to become glocal by using social media and streaming software to access Shakespeare. The concept of glocal users and glocal use distributes Shakespeare's social capital and more accurately represents the complex network of Shakespearean interactions. However, as Fazel and Geddes also admit, "all networks are not created equal, and the degree of use by individuals is conditioned by not only their own interest, but also the social,

technological, and cultural constraints that inhibit them" (11). Therefore, the power of glocal Shakespeare users to change Shakespeare is still determined by a hierarchy of local value. For example, the contributions of glocal Albanian Shakespeare users do not merit as much influence in Shakespeare studies because they are evaluated by Western neoliberal standards. The low value of Albanian users' contribution to Shakespeare is also a reflection of a larger neocolonial force to which Shakespeare has been an accomplice.

Glocalization brings a new set of issues to Shakespeare studies. I begin to tackle the hierarchization of Shakespeare users by proposing that Shakespeare studies and specifically Shakespeareans invested in social justice must first invest in the analysis of glocal Shakespeare users for the sake of equitable evaluation and the overall evolution of Shakespeare. Even the dissension between glocal users can be useful for understanding what gaps need to be addressed and what new gaps are being made by glocal Shakespeare users in new media Shakespeare. Ergo, I ask how does thinking glocally about Shakespeare users change the way mediatized Shakespeare is produced, accessed, consumed, and archived? In this chapter, I narrow my analytical focus to the relationship of glocal Albanian users to Shakespeare adaptations. Shakespeare scholars often deem Balkan adaptations illegitimate because they assess them based on neoliberal, Western Euro-American standards. To counter this form of erasure, I encourage Shakespeare critics of local and global adaptations to engage in the analysis of user history and culture. That is to acknowledge the identity politics that shape the individual or collective perspectives of glocal users. For this reason, I call for a closer examination of the role of cultural identity in shaping how Shakespeare users interact with and respond to

adaptations in order to better understand the work and to circumvent legitimation in Shakespeare studies.

I am particularly interested in the individual and collective identity politics that impact the overall use and evolution of Shakespeare since communities of users exhibit a multitude of cultural, historical, political, ethnic, racial, gendered, linguistic, and economic identities that influence their interaction with and consumerism of Shakespeare. For instance, Ruben Espinosa explains that for Latinx users linguistic and ethnic identity are at the heart of accessing and remaking Shakespeare (43). Similarly, for Albanian users, political and historical identities dominate Shakespeare adaptations. Albanian users specifically demonstrate that 'we' are not all globally post-historical.[80] Therefore, I argue that the local identities of Shakespeare users impact how they use and interact with Shakespeare adaptations through global media technologies.

I advance that glocal users evaluate adaptations, be they translations or performances, based on their own lived and learned experiences. All users bring their individual and cultural baggage, but there are locally unique users whose histories and identities are tied to Shakespeare's global name. For instance, Albanian Shakespeare users interpret Shakespeare according to their historically contingent identities which oscillate between Europeanness and Albanianness. In addition to their local manipulation of global technology, Albanian users are also glocal because they rely on Shakespeare's global economic and symbolic capital for the legitimation of their local economy and

[80] By post-historical, I am referring to the notion of one separating one's cultural history from present modernity.

culture. This chapter considers the glocal position of Albanian users in Shakespeare media studies in search of methodological approaches to Shakespeare that rectify the inequitable distribution of user power.

In the section to follow, I explore the role of glocal users in Shakespeare studies by focusing especially on glocal spectators. I borrow Dennis Kennedy's simple yet succinct description of spectators as "those who look" in contrast to the audience which he describes as "those within hearing" (2009, 5).[81] To avoid idealizing the spectator by claiming that all can be or are glocal spectators, instead, I suggest that spectators become glocal when their criticisms and online participation in global Shakespeare adaptations are influenced by and conveyed through their respective local cultural identities.[82] Glocal spectators of Shakespeare adaptations, particularly non-anglophone performances, are always navigating between their local and globally-aspiring identities. Therefore, the best place to investigate glocal use and spectatorship is in international Shakespeare events. I turn my attention to the 2012 Globe to Globe festival, organized and staged in Shakespeare's Globe with world-wide theatre companies and users participating in a multicultural celebration of Shakespeare. First, I will analyze how glocal spectators reacted to the international event and how they responded to other users. Then I consider

[81] Kennedy uses audience "to refer to a group of observers of a performance while spectator refers to an individual member of an audience" (5). My use of the term spectator tries to compensate for both seeing and hearing, without the intention of privileging sight.

[82] These categories of use are fluid as users can occupy multiple roles synchronously or asynchronously, however, I center on spectators because my archival materials indicate that those engaging with the Albanian adaptation assumed the roles of spectators before engaging further as critics and social media users.

what these responses can tell us about the role of glocalization in new media Shakespeares.

When interacting with Shakespeare, Pascale Aebischer asks that "we adopt an ethical standpoint as we decide how to look, where to look, what medium to look through and how to take responsibility for looking" (3). Glocal Shakespeare is a response to this call. My methodology produces a "spectatorial plenitude" which requires that the spectator be consciously "response-able/responsible" (Aebischer 6, 19).[83] According to Aebischer, the "theatre's capacity to endow both actor and spectator with the ability to respond, to contribute to the production of images and to bring their own personal experience into play" is what gives it its "ethico-political edge" (Aebischer 6-7). This is all to say that neither spectators nor theatres are passive agents. As such, I pose that glocal spectatorship is enabled by the embodied agency and history of the theater—a technological tool in itself "whose affordances have a determining impact on how plays may be staged and viewed within them" (Aebischer 13). Then, placing Albanian actors and spectators in an Albanian production of *II Henry VI,* within a historically bound locus, results in the Albanianization of English history in a globally recognized place. However, this experience is short lived. As the director of the Globe to Globe festival Tom Bird writes in the event description, the artists are performing in their own languages, but "within the architecture Shakespeare wrote for."[84] Consequently, the

[83] Aebischer's notion of response-able and responsible spectators comes from Hans-Thies Lehmann.

[84] Bird's address can be found here: http://globetoglobe.shakespearesglobe.com/archive/2012/.

Globe theatre does not fully permit the productions or users to be local—in that space all becomes glocal. Thus, the Albanian adaptation of *II Henry VI* exists between similitude and difference.

The Globe to Globe festival is truly an excellent example of global Shakespeare: a multitude of local users engage with Shakespeare's global capital in one of the most authoritatively symbolic places, the Globe theatre itself. Unlike the Olympic games, which inspired the World Shakespeare Festival, these series of events were distinctly situated in London. Consequently, the festival was a callback to Shakespeare's universality, by literally bringing back local capital into England's economy and culture.[85] Alexa Huang submits that "at the core of the touring phenomenon is the idea of returning to Britain as a geocultural site of origin (performing 'within the architecture Shakespeare wrote for'), as an imaginary site of authenticity" (qtd in Desmet 2017, 18). Thus, cultural and artistic legitimacy is linked to a physical performance site which enforces Shakespeare's English authenticity by contrast to the 'others' it temporarily includes.[86] It comes down to a quid pro quo exchange where local users (theatres, practitioners, actors, etc) gain global albeit temporary recognition in Shakespeare's popular circles, and Shakespeare benefits from critical engagements with local productions.

[85] The Globe is a very much so a tourist landmark and we should not separate its cultural from the economic profitability because both feed into Shakespeare's global myth.

[86] If I may speculate, I also consider the opening of the festival, marked by Sir Kenneth Branagh reciting Caliban's monologue, as a way of staging and thereafter appropriating a "native" character for the sake of the Globe.

To understand how culturally, economically, and academically profitable the Globe to Globe festival was for Shakespeare studies all one has to do is look at the volume of publications that followed shortly afterwards. Two notable edited collections are Susan Bennett and Christie Carson *Shakespeare Beyond English* and Paul Edmondson, Paul Prescott, and Erin Sullivan's *A Year of Shakespeare*. What I take issue with yet again is that Shakespeare criticism is prone to global interpretations of local adaptations.[87] In his introduction, Erin Sullivan speaks about the distance between journalistic and academic theatre reviews as a matter of 'them vs. us': "they treat theatre as news, we treat it as history" (2013, 15). Sullivan goes on to suggest that this collection of journalistic and academic reviews is different because it is integrative and depends on secondary materials for interpretation. But that is not always the case. For instance, the Albanian adaptation of *II Henry VI* was negatively assessed based on its lack of adhesion to the 'original' play and its faithfulness to outdated performance styles. [88] Although, as I will argue later, these characteristics reflect the glocal nature of the adaptation which is both historically Albanian and performatively English. For this reason, I advocate for glocalized readings of non-anglophone adaptations. For now, I use this discrepancy to point to the hierarchy of local users in Shakespeare studies.

[87] I repeat that the global in such cases refers to a homogenizing Western Europeanization.

[88] It's worth noting that the reviews were not written but Albanian speakers. This goes to show that the hierarchy of Shakespeare users is indeed real since Albanian users, spectators, and scholars, to be exact, were absent from the academic discourse that surrounded this 'global' affair.

But I regress that the location of the festival sustains nostalgia for authentic Shakespeare since the adaptations are linguistically and culturally not English, therefore they are othered by Shakespeare users who do not think glocally.[89] Through a close reading of spectator responses to the Albanian adaptation of *II Henry VI* in the Globe to Globe festival, I conclude that it is necessary to account for glocal spectatorship in mediatized Shakespeare adaptations and in the online/ offline "event-ness" of said adaptations.[90] Because my interest lies in the identity politics of spectators, I focus on the cultural identity of Albanian spectators, as it understood both individually and collectively, and how that identity shapes user interaction. Overall, by acknowledging the role of glocal users, Shakespeare critics will be better equipped to produce inclusive and equitable evaluations of non-anglophone adaptations, thus embracing the cultural interconnectedness and dissension which digital technologies introduce to Shakespeare studies.[91]

---

[89] This call to a white, male, English authority can be circumvented by using instead a global mediatized platform. Online Shakespeare platforms like the Globe Player produce virtual glocal spaces with the potential to redistribute Shakespeare's cultural and capital authority. For instance, had this festival been digitalized via media outlets so to altogether exist in a global medium and space, it would have avoided defaulting to colonial universalisms despite the Globe's good intentions. Although digital and media platforms carry their own set of local authorities and accessibility issues, I believe that digital media Shakespeare is more glocal because of technology's inherent global outreach.

[90] William Sauter defines "event-ness" as a concept wherein "theatre manifests itself as an event which includes both the presentation of actions and the reactions of the spectators, who are present at the very moment of the creation. Together the actions and reactions constitute the theatrical event" (11). Geoffrey Way goes on to argue that "liveness is only one factor that contributes to the audience's experience of eventness" (393).

[91] Here, I consider Espinosa's invitation to "not only to consider the unfamiliar but also to resist the tendency to locate in similitude (similitude in Shakespeare's world and our

Case Study

The Globe to Globe festival, running from April to June, featured all 37 plays in more than 40 languages (Bennett and Carson 1). For the glocal spectators who experienced the event in person, the Globe provided short plot synopses for each scene through surtitles which seemed to be "appreciated by native speakers in the audience as by the English-only spectators" (Bennett and Carson 7). Bennet and Carson relay that "many companies opted for selected words in English to ensure moments of interaction with the entire audience" (7) before the organizers asked them to stop. This was an "artificial restriction" given that the "use of English words and phrases particularly in reference to technology and popular culture, is one of the defining characteristics of our global economy. Therefore, to restrict this practice and to ignore the commonplace hybridization of language as much as culture produced a particular artifice that insisted on the performances as 'other'" (Bennett and Carson 7). I agree that English is a global tool and to use it locally is to show how glocal the world is, with or without Shakespeare. The Albanian production participated in this glocalization as the very last line of the performance—"sound some drums and trumpets, and to London all / and may such days

own) only a positive valence instead of the stifling nature that such similitude encourages" (61). Glocalization is rooted in integration and multiplicity, but naturally contradictions arise and demand our critical embrace.

to us befall"[92]—was spoken in English.[93] More importantly, Albanian language is 'naturally' Anglicized. For example, the words "commonwealth," "parliament," "republic," and "duke" remain the same, as noted in the performance. This is significant for it emphasizes Albania's global ambitions in tying their political language to that of England, thus creating a political bridge linguistically. The glocal language used by the Albanian actors in *II Henry VI* invites spectators to interpret the adaptation glocally—thinking of their own local identities entangled with the global force of Shakespeare.

But glocal contributions, as I have argued, are not always assessed glocally; they follow Western academic and theatrical standards that demerit and potentially erase certain Shakespearean localities. While some reviewers anticipate the local and global palimpsestic cultural identity of non-anglophone adaptations, others do not. For instance, when Aleksandar Saša Dundjerović reviews the *Henry VI, part 1-3* staged by Serbian, Albanian, and Macedonian national theatres as a Balkan trilogy—"an intercultural mini-festival within the Festival proper" (161)[94]—he tries to mindful of the assemblage of Albanian and English culture. Dundjerović is interested in the transcultural and transnational retelling of England's civil wars as seen through the recent experiences of

[92] The line was slightly modified as observed from comparison to the Folger edition which reads as "Sound drum and trumpets, and to London all; / And more such days as these to us befall!" (5.3.33-34). This change is indicative of local users adapting a global language for their own convenience, thus further glocalizing the performance.

[93] The Albanian translation for the production was provided by Shpresa Qatipi and Piro Tanku

[94] Despite what the term trilogy advertises, the companies had no collaboration prior or after the show. This is reflective of the collective individualism which nation states embody.

the Balkan civil wars. He is signaled to this interpretation through the promotional material which featured militant imagery to mark communist oppression and to distinguish the adaptation as Balkan with an English twist. Specifically, the Albanian flyer included an image of WWII bunkers built by Enver Hoxha to ward off invasion during Albania's seclusion from the rest of the world. Dundjerović prefaces his critical review by explaining that "Nations recently liberated from the Ottoman Empire appropriated Shakespeare as a way of connecting themselves with the wider framework of European culture" (161). On a similar note, the Artistic Director of Shakespeare's Festival, Dominic Dromgoole stated that "the concept of blending the Albanian history with today's thoughts on Albania's life and politics, and a thorough understanding of the English history, is an equilibrium that is hard to achieve and I believe the play succeeded in doing so perfectly" (qtd in Filipi).[95] But Dromgoole speaks from a place of privilege having been privy to the director's commentary driving the adaptation which other English and European spectators were not. The variety of positive, negative, and apathetic responses is indicative of each spectator's palimpsestic relationship with the adaptation and Albanian culture and history.

When director Adonis Filipi rehearsed and staged the production on a local stage in Tirana the production was well received by locals, but then Filipi had to adjust the production according to the physical space of the Globe, where it was met with harsh criticism. The downfall, therefore, of the production was in part due to the mistranslated physicality of the work's mise-en-scène. The production's emphasis on local history was

[95] Filipi, Adonis. "Henry VI/2." https://adonisfilipi.com/henry-vi-2/.

interpreted as dull and its allusion to English history through performance style was deemed outdated. To be exact, Filipi's production of *II Henry VI* offered a representation of "infantile political behaviour" which was "clearly recognized by the Albanian audiences" (Dundjerović 164), but not by the English or European spectators. Although the Albanian users had an advantage over the non-Albanian-speaking spectators, the final product was judged by Western European theatre standards and professionals, leading to an underwhelming and misunderstood consensus. This is often the risk in international productions with tourist spectators. Even Dundjerović, who was trying to understand the production's glocal nature, at the beginning called it the "least accomplished of the trilogy" (165). He said that the "very old-school style of acting," the costumes that "were a cross between nineteenth century opera and *Star Trek,"* and the mixture of "electronic prerecorded-music" with live acoustics outdated the performance (Dundjerović 165).[96] While I admit that the outdated choices and its faithfulness to the text's language (marked by lack of action)[97] are valid causes for disliking the performance, I contend that these very elements which make it a "ponderous slow-motion parliamentary epic" (Kerri) also make it glocal.[98]

[96] For instance, the live folk music was especially appreciated by Albanian spectators because it appealed to an Albanian tradition.

[97] Trueman writes that the production is "too reliant on the text, forgetting that barely half of the audience can keep up."

[98] As a reminder, glocal Shakespeares exhibit multiple temporally, spatially, and historically entangled identities but always emphasize the local culture.

Lack of historical and political context surrounding the production led to a negatively assessed performance. For instance, Craig Melson suggested that "The Albanian version lives up to all the wrong caricatures of the nation" (2012). This comment points to the pre-existing stereotypes that Western reviewers bring to the production.[99] Melson highlights only one positive in the production: "Bujer Asqeriu plays the rebel leader, Jack Cade, with a commanding performance. His delivery is powerful and, despite the unimpressive performances of his underlings, he remains a strong force. His performance is a refreshing contrast to the pantomime nobles he opposes" (2012). Peter Orford seconds this appreciation of action because it is the easiest to communicate without language. This too, I suggest, is reflective of Albanian spectatorship. The revolutionary character is the most appealing for Albanian spectators seeking to relate to the "common man" who stands against the monarchy, whereas Indrit Cobani as Henry "plays a very bored, dull and mumbling King" (Melson). Eventually, Dundjerović comes around to see Filipi's vision of power as a child's game, hence why the performance opens with "three children on scooters playing around the stage and wearing paper crowns" (165). As the director reveals, the "slow and static result" was intentional (Dundjerović 165). Without this insider knowledge of the cultural history of Albania reflected in the director's agenda, European critics naturally continued to misunderstand the production. Ultimately, the evaluations further displaced Albania from Shakespeare's hierarchy of users.

[99] The other two Balkan productions received warmer critical receptions because they assimilated to modern theatricality by staging more physical action, whereas the Albanian production tried to embody Albania's glocal relationship to Shakespeare.

Among such theatre reviews, artist and spectator Dan Hutton claims that he couldn't "remember the last time [he] saw such a shoddy, lazy production of a Shakespeare play" (2012). He adds that "Filipi has managed to create a production one of Shakespeare's most political plays which says almost nothing" (Hutton 2012). Other spectators like Igor Toronyilalic, suggested that the production was the "Borat moment in this festival" (2012). In addition, Matt Trueman's review rated the production two out of five stars. Likewise, social media users who had been spectators replied to Trueman by claiming that "The Albanian Part 2 looked [sic] like the work of a theatre company from a country which has spent too long largely friendless and isolated from much of the world. They seemed to have little idea about stagecraft now outside Albania" (Trueman). This critical comment reveals a larger truth about the glocal position of Albania as a country that both is and isn't European. This socio-political inequity that divides Albania from Europe is projected in Albanian theatre. As I've tried to demonstrate, there is a hierarchy of glocal Shakespeare users (local spectators who spectate and review adaptations through digital media). This imbalance of access to and visibility in Shakespeare studies is ultimately based on larger global socio-political injustices. I hope I have shown that there is a standing issue of access to Shakespeare because glocal Shakespeare users from particular localities are marginalized. My project in its entirety tries to address this gap by glocalizing Shakespeare studies. To confront these issues, I recommend glocal readings of non-anglophone adaptations that require Shakespeare users to think palmpsestically about cultures, temporalities, and geopolitical borders.

Overall, the reviews of the Albanian *II Henry VI* production at the Globe to Globe illustrate that the gap between glocal users is determined by who assesses non-

anglophone adaptations of Shakespeare and how. The dissension between European and non-European users is apparent to both spectators and academics. For instance, one spectator commented: “The Albanian crowd was great though. They really seemed to love it. Standing ovations. It felt like I'd been watching a different play to them” (qtd in Kerri 2012). Similarly, Christy Desmet, in summarizing Michael Dobson’s cross cultural theatre experience as an “uninformed spectator” of “foreign Shakespeares” at the Globe to Globe festival, submits that the mise-en-scène worked “against his ability to understand and appreciate” the adaptation (2017, 16). The discord between Albanian and English (or Western European) spectators is a useful measurement of the socio-political tensions that divide Albanians from Europe’s economic, cultural, and political capital. I attend to this issue of cross-cultural theatre by proposing that glocal Shakespeare methodologies can inform spectators and minimize the negative evaluations which ostracize glocal Albanian users. Of course, that is easier said than done because it requires Shakespeare’s gatekeepers to willingly and actively glocalize their academic practices. Yet, I believe that digital media plays a major role in revealing the need for glocal thinking, and it also offers a platform where those emendations can take place.

Glocal Spectators and Digital Media

New media is a powerful field where Shakespeare user hierarchies are not eliminated but transformed as more marginalized users begin to participate and/or consume Shakespeare. Digital media such as YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Globe Player are only few of the platforms that have transformed how, why, and when glocal users engage with Shakespeare performances, theatrical and otherwise. Stephen

O'Neil argues that such new media spaces can "bridge the gap between popular culture and Shakespeare's more institutional markings" (4). Through social media posts, blogs, vlogs, and many more digital media outlets, users who might not have previously had access or sway in Shakespeare studies are now empowered to take ownership and expand Shakespeare. Digital media use also highlights differences in the way glocal spectators approach Shakespeare adaptations. But this discord can be useful for the evolution of Shakespeare and new media because it places old and new gaps on a new type of stage.

The dissension between glocal spectators becomes apparent in the social media responses to the critics' reviews. An English blogger, in a humorous response, simply commented that the Albanian *II Henry VI* got "it so wrong" that they were driven to drink from their disappointment with this "school-like production" (qtd in Kerri). However, Albanian spectators defended the production because they were better equipped to understand how Filipi's production expressed Albania's European/non-European identity based on their own local and global cultural background. To be exact, most Albanian spectators, as evidenced by the reviews and comments, grasped how the production spoke to both local Albanian histories imbued with weak kings and country rebels, and the Albanian aspiration for inclusion in English history signaled by early modern costuming and blocking. A theatrical style, in other words, which responds to Albanian cultural identity. But only the director, Albanian spectators and media users, the festival producer and Dundjerović were able to appreciate the production because they approached their analyses glocally, whereas other academics, spectators, and practitioners analyzed it based on their Western European expectations of theatricality and Albanianness. This is

why I propose that reading adaptations glocally is a more socially equitable approach to Shakespeare to begin with.

Alternatively, digital media spaces enable glocal Shakespeare users to glocalize the adaptations online by correspondence and disagreement.[100] As such, the sites of criticism posted by Hutton, Trueman, Kerri, and Toronyilalic were transformed by media users who defended the Albanian production and therefore made their social disadvantage in Shakespeare studies known. Glocal Albanian spectators engaged with media to respond to the negative evaluations and thereby illuminated how negative evaluations stem from the existing hierarchy of users that privileges Western European culture. The users had a lot more to say about Igor Toroniyalalic's review, specifically, his comment that the "Albanians were exceptionally Albanian" sparked an uproar between Balkan spectators. The online discourse quickly turned into a debate about nationalism. Others insisted that nationalism had nothing to do with the bad review and that the negative reception is just a result of a bad performance. Thereafter, the responses became personal and offensive. This disagreement serves to prove my point that glocal spectators from certain nations often approach their use of Shakespeare from a shared cultural identity.[101] As Dennis Kennedy explains further, intercultural spectators receive

[100] Lastly, I add that glocal spectatorship occurs both synchronously and asynchronously without altering the dynamics of the intercultural exchange, as is evidenced by this ten-day long chatroom discord.

[101] In this case study, I position myself as a glocal user of the *II Henry VI* adaptation for two reasons. First, my position is glocal in the sense that I was not physically present in the Globe theater at the time of the event, rather I accessed this local production through the Globe Player, a global tool. Second, I consider myself a glocal spectator because my Albanian-American cultural heritage produces a mixed network of significations which affect my interpretation of the production.

foreign aspects of a performance by incorporating "the onstage signifiers into their own expectations and understandings" (2009, 131).[102] A network of glocal spectators naturally produces online discord.[103] I regard the connections and disconnections made by online media spectators and users as inadvertent efforts to glocalize the adaptation by showing how its identity is multiple and in-between Albanian and European traditions. The intercultural exchange of opinions shows that the spectators' local identities impact how they interpret Shakespeare adaptations and how they interact with other spectators in global media platforms.

In *The Spectator and the Spectacle*, Kennedy suggests that intercultural performances are marked by one or more cultures foreign to the Shakespeare text, therefore the audience might recognize Shakespeare and not the theatrical mode, or vice versa (2009, 116). Consequently, "the spectator of interculturalism is both inside and outside the scene" (Kennedy 2009, 116). This is the case with the Albanian production of *II Henry VI* at the Globe to Globe festival. The non-Albanian spectators, here generalized philosophically not quantitatively, were witnesses to an intercultural performance which displayed a political Albanian interpretation of the play through Early Modern acting styles. From the previously noted responses, the Albanian spectators seemed to relate to, enjoy, and understand the production. However, the non-Albanian, and especially the

---

[102] Kennedy uses the term intercultural spectator, but I insist that glocal spectator is a better term because it offers nuance for understanding interculturalism as a function of global technologies too.

[103] I refer to the glocal Albanian users interchangeably as spectators because they performed both roles.

English spectators who reviewed the productions, did not embody the glocal (European/non-European) cultural identities of the Albanian spectators and could not estimate the performance's allusion to what Deleuze and Guattari call the intermezzo—a state of being "always in the middle, between things, interbeing, intermezzo" (25). Therefore, by interpreting the production based on their own European standards and values which are not inclusive of Balkan cultures, they continue to shelter Shakespeare from 'others.'

But first, to explain the glocal identities of Albanian spectators I defer to Susan Bennett who claims that "even where memory seems to be exercised as individual cognition, it relies, always, on a connectedness of the social" (1996, 8). For example, Albanian spectators share a unique history of seclusion which plays a forefront role in their cultural identity. Then the Albanian spectator becomes glocal because they perform their roles as spectators by filtering the spectacle through their local identity which is formed by remembering shared socio-political history. Quoting Michael Schudson, Bennett writes: "[The] act of remembering is … occasioned by social situations, prompted by cultural artifacts and social cues that remind, employed for social purposes, even enacted by cooperative activity" (1996, 8). Therefore, Bennett argues that "how we construct and engage memories cannot be seen as an individualized act but, instead, something prepared by the dissemination of a collective history and lodged in the physical selves of its subjects" (1996, 9). Contrary to this perception, Dennis Kennedy argues that "audiences are not homogeneous social and psychological groups, their experiences are not uniform and impossible standardize, their reactions chiefly private and internal (3). While I agree that theatrical reception is very nuanced, I also believe that

there can be exceptions to this rule because histories are both personal and collective, and can be embodied and understood on both levels. As such, glocal Albanian spectators embody their cultural history and exercise it during theatrical events. For this reason, I set forth that spectators are simultaneously local and multicultural, a phenomenon that is highlighted by the use of digital media. The Albanian spectators of *II Henry VI,* for instance, are situated between their Albanian and European identities and this allows them to understand the production accordingly.

My goal here is not to suggest that glocal performances belong only to glocal spectators. Instead, I wish to accent the discrepancy that exists in the way that non-anglophone adaptations are evaluated and by whom. This gap, I suggest, could be reduced by encouraging Shakespeare users, especially critics and scholars, to think and act glocally. For instance, Albanian spectators whose cultural and political positions have been forcefully communal are capable of similarly collective experiences that vary from those of European spectators.[104] On the other hand, the English spectators[105] at the Globe to Globe lack the historical and political knowledge about Albania to comprehend how and why the King's performance is weak or the Cade's is powerful.[106] That's why they analyze the production based on their Western performance, historical and textual stands

[104] I make this claim on the assumption that the older groups of spectators visible in the Albanian Globe to Globe production who are also spoken about in criticism share the lived experience of communism.

[105] Again, I am referring generally to those who engaged with the Albanian production in online reviews.

[106] Post-communist Albanian theatrical is inherently political and liberal, seeking to empower the people and resist tyranny and government corruption.

and history of Shakespeare. However, this needs not be the case. By thinking palimpsestically about the relationship of Balkan and European cultures, Shakespeare users can produce more accurate evaluations and thereafter dissolve hierarchical differences.[107] I believe that this is possible now more than ever because digital media enable interconnectivity. In fact, the rise of media in Shakespeare studies demands an evaluation of the role of glocal spectators.

Glocal Spectatorship and Liveness

Glocal spectators who view and write about Shakespeare on new media outlets through local or multicultural identities are redefining live theatre by extending the event-ness of any performance to a boundless and borderless medium.[108] Thus, the role of liveness in Shakespeare performance studies is continuously shaped by digital growth media technologies. Technology plays an equally performative part in the relationship between spectators and performance. As a result, glocal spectators and users redefine liveness based on asynchronous and synchronous online media interactions that can be but are not essentially dependent on presence. For instance, in the case of the *II Henry VI*, Albanian spectators were able to respond to the dismissive evaluations of the critics

[107] To reflect the interdisciplinary nature of glocalization, it would be fruitful if Shakespeare users, specifically critics and scholars, conferred with or even surveyed the locals before evaluating and analyzing an adaptation. There is no reason why scholarship cannot be glocal and in dialogue form.

[108] Yet as David C. Moberly argues the openness that sites like Wikipedia offer for Shakespeare users is still haunted by "paradigms of exclusivity" (88). Even if it is "radically participatory" (102), the site makes obvious and perhaps enforces a gender gap and digital elitism.

through media posts, thereby creating new dialogues that destroyed the single story of the reviewers. That is all to say that Shakespeare adaptations can longer function or be thought about without also considering how new media is changing Shakespeare and Shakespeare users. But I repeat that through digital media new issues emerge or old issues resurface. Liveness is one of the tricky issues that persists.

Dennis Kennedy's perception of spectatorship is rooted in liveness.[109] He uses television as a medium to explain that live events are real, but the experience of liveness is slippery. At first, he admits that television as a form of media enables millions of people to watch the same program at the same time, thereby creating an audience, "though an audience without presence" (Kennedy 6). Regardless, he posits that asynchronous audiences, or singular spectators, do not experience the essence of the event as it was intended. For Kennedy, theatrical performances and theatre audiences must be corporeally present in order to perform their role. In other words, Kennedy necessitates the gathering of individuals because "live performance gains its power from an audience from its vanishing" (15). He specifies that presence in any performance is nowadays voluntary, therefore spectators at a live event are united not only by what they receive but also through "their unnecessary presence at a disappearing act" (Kennedy15). My line of thinking differs from Kennedy's because I do not accept physical presence as

[109] I borrow my definitions of live and mediatized from Philip Auslander. He describes "live performance as "the kind of performance in which the performers and the audience are both physically and temporally co-present to one another" (60) and mediatized performance as "performance that is circulated on television, as audio or video recordings, and in other forms based in technologies of reproduction" (4). Naturally, these definitions evolve as the concept of liveness and the media platforms grew.

a prerequisite for shared experience, especially in the face of digital media. As Erin Sullivan argues, digital technologies empower audiences to watch and respond to performances in a different, new way that "makes spectatorship visible" without demanding physical presence or synchronicity (2018, 60). In social media, for instance, spectator responses can be recorded, archived, accessed, and reassessed at will. Therefore, lack of corporeal presence does not make a performance or event any less live or lively.

While some scholars approach digital and theatre technologies as threats to the ontology of performance and Shakespeare's original aesthetic, others consider stage and digital technologies already embedded in theatrical experience. Peggy Phelan, for instance, values the essence of live performance because it resists mass media reproduction. For Phelan, performance is ephemeral; it cannot be copied or reproduced (147). Alternatively, Philip Auslander complicates the binary between live and mediatized performance, to suggest that live forms are not ontologically different or economically independent of mediatized forms (7). In other words, recording or mediated technologies make the idea of "live" possible by way of contrast. This is noted by the recorded performances of the Globe to Globe adaptations which are now available for purchase on the Globe Player. Live and mediatized Shakespeare adaptations might realistically compete in an economic market, but even so, both digital forms are always-already related and in exchange, just like the local and global. Auslander digresses into this point as he suggests that "liveness must be examined not as a global, undifferentiated phenomenon but within specific cultural and social contexts" (3). The appreciation and

necessity of liveness for Auslander is tied to social and cultural functions. Liveness has the power to create communities beyond the physical scope of the theatre.[110]

Erin Sullivan explains that theatre is traditionally defined by "concentrated co-presence, both in time and place, which has power to move, overwhelm and transform" (59). Whereas Phelan and Auslander are concerned with the liveness of performance, Sullivan shifts focus to social media which enables locally situated audiences to "bring broadcast theatre to life by sharing their experiences" (60). For productions like the ones from Globe to Globe which were both live and recorded, digital technologies create a multiplicitous community of user/spectators. Thereafter, liveness is dependent on digital as much as physical presence. By rethinking presence and liveness, Sullivan creates opportunities for engaging with Shakespeare in a digital era.

By introducing glocal spectatorship, I engage in the debate of live and mediated performance to show that the medium does not alter the means of reception—that power lies strictly with the spectator. For this reason, the Albanian spectators of *II Henry VI* interpreted the production according to their local community and maintained these discussions on online global platforms. The social and political aspects of Shakespearean adaptation are equally affective in their live and mediatized forms. Therefore, I concur that live and mediated Shakespeares are not separate entities, but co-dependent. In fact, the discord that resulted from the aforementioned online dialogues reveals that the

[110] For instance, liveness in political Shakespeares like Julius Caesar plays a more significant role if the production is committed to the spectator becoming a spec-actor or activist.

"liveness" of the event was transferable to online platforms. The concept of live theatre has therefore necessarily evolved to include any performance's digital after-*live*-ness.

Performance as a process of cultural memory is indebted, according to Peggy Phelan, to the idea of presentism (146). However, performance in a mediatized world is always changing and so is the notion of liveness. Both performance and liveness are conditional to local and global technological developments. As Philip Auslander rightfully argues, "the relationship between live and mediatized forms and the meaning of liveness [should] be understood as historical and contingent" (8). The liveness of the performance and the liveness of the event (mediatized performance) are not at odds, but rather they are conflated by social and cultural memory. In this sense, the liveness of a performance can be as glocalized as the performance itself. As a glocal Shakespeare user myself examining the archival remains of the *II Henry VI* production, I have pieced together memories of a live event to show that Shakespeare scholars are also performing the act of remembering. What matters now is how, why, and for whom we remember.

Moving Forward

This chapter began with a simple premise that Shakespeare users are always already glocal because they access Shakespeare locally through global technologies. I focused gravely on a specific branch of users, the glocal spectators, because any project committed to changing how scholars engage with non-anglophone Shakespeare adaptations must acknowledge the positionalities of spectators and critics alike. But I hope that this conversation grows beyond glocal spectators and scholars. It would be fruitful, for instance, to explore how non-human users like websites, algorithms, video

games, software and more, embody glocality and to what extent that impacts the identities of other glocal Shakespeare users. I imagine glocal technologies can change digital literacy and revolutionize how we read Shakespearean translations and how we watch Shakespearean performances. And I also remain wishful that the glocalization of Shakespearean archives will eventually eliminate the institutional elitism of digital archives and offer new opportunities for open access.

For me change starts with Shakespeare adaptations. It is especially in non-anglophone adaptations where I see how multiple and ever-evolving Shakespeare is. Non-anglophone and bi- or multi-lingual adaptations are never either local or global because they rely on linguistic, geographic, temporal, and cultural exchanges which ultimately glocalize Shakespeare. Glocal Shakespeare in Albania, whose cultural identity is in an in-between state of Europeanness and Albanianness, offers a way to understand such adaptations and to also expose through them the unstable authority of Shakespeare. By glocalizing Shakespeare, I aim to break the spell of Shakespeare's universal authority which upholds Western European dominance over localities.

Glocal Shakespeare in Albania is only the beginning. Even the glocal readings I have offered in this project are bound to multiple and evolve. Glocalization resists stagnation because singularity and originality in Shakespeare no longer reflect our glocal world. Of course, as is the case with any critical methodology, glocal Shakespeare does not come without caveats. Consequently, some may view glocalization as an overambitious concept and a demanding practice. And while that may be the case, it is worth exploring because its roots are steeped in hopefulness, interdisciplinarity, and progress.

My hope is that this critical glocal approach will be useful to Shakespeare users outside of Albania and Europe. For instance, glocal Shakespeare in borderland studies could offer another way for Chicanx and Indigenous writers and theatre practitioners to study the multiplicity of histories on the U.S.-Mexico border and create more complex adaptations. The palimpsestic nature of glocal Shakespeare highlights the socio-political and cultural similitude and difference that emerges from Shakespeare adaptations on the border, without compromising user identities. For a more specific example, I turn to Ruben Espinosa's "Stranger Shakespeare," where he explains that Mexican Americans experience a cultural identity between the borders where one is "*not quite* American and *not quite* Mexican" (58). Espinosa approaches this nuanced "instability of identity" (59) as a critically and culturally enriching signifier where being *both* opens new possibilities. This is precisely how glocal Shakespeare works; it looks at all the Mexican and American histories, temporalities, and geographies simultaneously embodied in Chicanx Shakespeare adaptations and investigates new meanings for Shakespeare and for identity politics.

Espinosa urgers Shakespeare scholars to resist "readings that offer superficial connections and hasty assumptions" about cultural and national identities and to instead "employ a cross-historical approach that engages contemporary understandings of ethnic, racial, and cultural politics" which "deviates from the comfortable, historically focused, and Eurocentric views that so often guide our thinking in early modern studies" (61). Espinosa performs this work in his teaching by encouraging Chicanx and Latinx students to adapt Shakespeare on the basis of their culturally and historically nuanced identities. In response to Espinosa's call for a better critical approach for reading

Shakespeare, I introduce my own cross-historical, temporal, and spatial methodology that engages with cultural and national identities of Shakespeare in adaptation to show the oscillation between similitude and difference. My purpose is to offer a locally and globally conscious approach that empowers local Shakespeares and dilutes Shakespeare's global Western authority. At first, I propose glocal readings and adaptations to Shakespeare critics who admittedly have more sway in directing the evolution of Shakespeare studies. As Kidnie's book reveals, there is an inequitable distribution of power among Shakespeare users—critics and scholars tend to be the gatekeepers of Shakespeare studies. As a Shakespearean scholar I entrust that this work digresses from gatekeeping Shakespeare studies and invites more scholars to do the same.

Lastly, as an educator committed to social justice pedagogy, I set forth this glocal methodology to reflect the multicultural and in-between identities of my students and to equip them with a critical means for destroying white supremacist ideologies that marginalize them institutionally by way of Shakespeare. Glocal Shakespeare as a classroom methodology should be an experiential experiment; one that encourages students to analyze how a Shakespeare text or performance applies to their culture. More importantly, glocal Shakespeare pedagogy prompts students to analyze how their multifarious identities reflect or deviate from Shakespeare in order to inspire them to exercise creative and critical agency over such differences. In *Teaching Social Justice Through Shakespeare*, Adhaar Noor Desai intimates that the goal of close reading in the classroom is to "give students, not Shakespeare, authority" (12). Thinking glocally about Shakespeare is a step toward helping current and future Shakespeare and Early Modern scholars to see themselves in literary discourses and to create a place for themselves

where there isn't one. To quote Wendy Beth Hyman and Hillary Eklund: "One of the most valuable elements of studying Shakespeare and Renaissance literature is this constant reminder that things can and do change" (7). Adapting how we think with, about, and through Shakespeare can bring a world of change.

WORKS CITED

Aebischer, Pascale. *Shakespeare, Spectatorship and Technologies of Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Alexandra Heller-Nicholas, "Blood Feuds and 'Bloodlands': Steven Kastrissios' Albanian Horror-Fantasy." Melbourne: Metro no. 195 (2018): 24-27.

Alla, Adela. "*Jul Cezari* rikthehet për publikun në sheshin e teatrit" Agjencia Telegrafike Shqiptare, 2019, https://ata.gov.al/2019/10/23/foto-jul-cezari-rikthehet-per-publikun-ne-sheshin-e-teatrit/.

Auslander, Philip. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Austin, Robert. "Less is More: Towards a Sustainable and Reliable Media in Albania." Eds. Marta Dyczok et al. *Media, Democracy and Freedom: The Post-Communist Experience*. Switzerland: Peter Lang, 2009.

Bancroft, Angus. *Roma and Gypsy-Travellers in Europe: Modernity, Race, Space, and Exclusion*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2005.

Barker, Simon. "'It's an actor, boss. Unarmed': The Rhetoric of Julius Caesar." In *Julius Caesar: New Critical Essays*. Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2002, pp.227-240.

Bartels, Emily C. "Julius Caesar: Making History." In *The Oxford Handbook for Shakespearean Tragedy.* Oxford UK: Oxford University Press, 2016, pp.374-389.

Barthelemy, Anthony Gerard. *Black Face, Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southern*. London: Louisiana State University Press, 1987.

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation studies*. 3rd. London: Routledge, 2002.

Baumann, Karoline Johanna. *The Stage as Palimpsest: Conceptions of Time and Temporality in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida and The Two Noble Kinsmen.* Berlin: Ergon Verlag, 2018.

Behnegar, Nasser. "Who Is Shakespeare's Julius Caesar?" in *Shakespeare and the Body Politic*. UK: Lexington Books, 2013, pp.79-94.

Belluscio, Gjovani and Flora Koleci."Veçori gramatikore dhe strategji origjinale në përkthimin e "Othellos" së Fan Nolit nga anglishtja." *Fan S. Noli me 130 vjetorin e lindjes 1882-2012: Konferenca Shkencore Ndërkombëtare*. Korçë: Fakulteti i Edukimit dhe Filologjisë, 2012, pp. 232-244.

Bennett, Susan and Christie Carson. *Shakespeare Beyond English: A Global Experiment.* Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Bennett, Susan. *Performing Nostalgia: Shifting Shakespeare and the Contemporary Past*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Bhattacharji, Shobhana. "'I Like the Albanians Much': Byron and Three Twentieth-Century British Travellers to Albania." *The Byron Journal* 38, no. 1, (2010): 39–48.

Blumi, Isa. "The Commodification of Otherness and the Ethnic Unit in the Balkans: How to Think about Albanians." *East European Politics and Societies* 12, no. 3 (1998): 527–569.

Bosman, Anston. "Shakespeare and Globalization," in *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010, p. 285-302.

Bradley, Laura. *Brecht and Political Theatre: The Mother on Stage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2006.

Budianta, Melani. "Hijacking Shakespeare The Three Faces of Indonesian *Julius Caesars*" in *Shakespeare's Asian Journeys: critical encounters, cultural geographies, and the politics of travel.* New York: Routledge, 2017, pp.135-158.

Bulman, James C. *Shakespeare Re-Dressed Cross-Gender Casting in Contemporary Performance*. New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2008.

_____. *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance*. London: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Burt, Richard and Lynda E. Boose, *Shakespeare, The Movie, II: Popularizing the plays on film, TV, video, and DVD*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Canka, Mustafa. "Only Memories and Emptiness Remain: The History of Ulcinj's Afro-Albanian Community in Montenegro." *LeftEast*, 2013. https://www.criticatac.ro/lefteast/only-memories-and-emptiness-remain-the-history-of-ulcinjs-afro-albanian-community-in-montenegro/.

Cantor, Paul A. "Reality Czech: Tom Stoppard Discovers Shakespeare Behind the Iron Curtain." *The Review of Politics* 78, no. 4 (2016): 663-679.

Callaghan, Dympna. *Shakespeare without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Charnes, Linda. *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Chess, Simone. *Male-to-Female Crossdressing in Early Modern English Literature: Gender, Performance, and Queer Relations*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Chothia, Jean. "*Julius Caesar* in Interesting Times." *Remaking Shakespeare: Performance Across Media, Genres, and Cultures.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp.115-133.

"Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Considers the Report of Albania." *OHCHR*, Geneva, 2018, www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=23976&LangID=E.

Connell, Raewyn. "The Northern Theory of Globalization." *Sociological theory* 25.4 (2007):368–385.

Çoku, Ornela. "The Old Lexicon and its Stylistic Functions Expressed by Fan Noli in the Work of Macbeth. A Comparative Study between the Original Text of Shakespeare and the Translated one by Fan Noli." *Anglisticum Journal* 4, no. 10 (2015): 24-37.

Czajka, Agnes and Jennifer Suchland. "Mapping the Margins of Europe: Race, Migration, and Belonging." *PhiloSOPHIA* 7, no. 2 (2017): 205–214.

Dahiya, Hema. "Paradoxes of Politics in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar." *The Critic Shakespeare: Essays in Appreciation.* Kurukshetra: The Shakespeare Association, 2010.

Delabastita, Dirk., and Lieven d' Hulst. *European Shakespeares Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age.* Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co., 1993.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Demo, Elsa. "Është Makbeth Ky Që Shoh Përpara?" Peizazhe Të Fjalës, 2018, https://peizazhe.com/2018/04/11/eshte-makbeth-ky-qe-shoh-perpara/.

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

Desmet, Christy. “Import/Export: Trafficking in Cross-Cultural Shakespearean Spaces.” *Multicultural Shakespeare: translation, appropriation, and performance* 15.1 (2017): 15–26.

De Waal, Clarissa. *Albania Today: A Portrait of Post-Communist Turbulence*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2005.

Doja, Albert. “Folkloric Archaism and Cultural Manipulation in Albania under Socialism,” in *The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945-1991,* ed. Aleksandar Bošković and C. M. Hann, Zurich: Lit Verlag, 2013.

Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield. *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. 2nd ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Drouin, Jennifer. “Cross-Dressing, Drag, and Passing: Slippages in Shakespearean Comedy.” In *Shakespeare Re-Dressed: Cross-Gender Casting in Contemporary Performance*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2008, 23-56.

Dudink, Stefan. “Cuts and Bruises and Democratic Contestation: Male Bodies, History and Politics.” *European journal of cultural studies* 4, no. 2 (2001): 153-170.

Dundjerović, Aleksandar Saśa. “Inter-Theatrical Reading: Theatrical and multicultural appropriations of *1-3 Henry VI* as a Balkan trilogy.” in S*hakespeare Beyond English: A Global Experiment*. Cambridge University Press, 2013, 161-169.

Edmondson, Paul et al. *A Year of Shakespeare: Re-living the World Shakespeare Festival*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013.

Eklund, Hillary Caroline, and Wendy Beth Hyman. *Teaching Social Justice through Shakespeare: Why Renaissance Literature Matters Now*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Elsie, Robert. *A Dictionary of Albanian Religion, Mythology and Folk Culture*. London: C. Hurst, 2001.

Elsie, Robert. *Historical Dictionary of Albania*. 2ed. Toronto: The Scarecrow Press, 2010.

El-Tayeb, Fatima. *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Emadi, Hazifullah. “Women’s Emancipation and Strategy of Development in Albania.” *Economic and political weekly* 27, no. 19 (1992): 999-1002.

Espinosa, Ruben. “Stranger Shakespeare.” *Shakespeare quarterly* 67.1 (2016): 51–67.

"FAN NOLI DENOUNCES ZOGU'S ENTHRONEMENT." *New York times*, 1928, https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1928/09/07/95832391.html?pageNumber=9.

Fazel, Valerie M, and Louise Geddes. *The Shakespeare User: Critical and Creative Appropriations in a Networked Culture*. Cham: Springer International Publishing AG, 2017.

Fields, Karen E. and Barbara Jeanne Fields. *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*. London: Verso, 2012.

Francesca T. Royster. "White-Limed Walls: Whiteness and Gothic Extremism in Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus." *Shakespeare quarterly* 51.4 (2000): 432–455.

Friedman, Laura. "Displaying Stella: Anatomical Blazon and the Negotiation of Male Social Status." *Sidney Journal* 30, no. 1 (2012): 101.

Garber, Marjorie B. *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing & Cultural Anxiety*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Goldberg David. "Racial Europeanization." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29, no. 2 (2006): 331-364.

Gossett, Suzanne. "Political *Pericles.*" In *World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performance*. Routledge, 2005, pp.23-30.

Gottmann, Felicia. "Mixed Company in the Contact Zone: The 'Glocal' Diplomatic Efforts of a Prussian East Indiaman in 1750s Cape Verde." *Journal of Early Modern History* 23, 5 (2019): 423-441.

Gray, Patrick. "Caesar as Comic Antichrist: Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and the Medieval English Stage Tyrant." *Comparative drama* 50, no. 1 (2016):1-31.

Greenberg, Marissa. "Critically Regional Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 37, no.3 (2019): 341-363.

Gregor, Keith. *Shakespeare and Tyranny: Regimes of Reading in Europe and Beyond.* Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publisher, 2014.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Tyrant: Shakespeare on Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2018.

Gruber, Siegfried. "Household and Family in Albania at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century." *Albania: Family, Society and Culture in the 20th Century,* ed. Andreas Hemming, Kera Gentiana, and Enriketa Pandelejmoni. Zürich: Lit, 2012, pp. 19-34.

Hadfield, Andrew. *Shakespeare and Republicanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hall, Kim F. *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Shakespeare and Literary Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

_____. *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Hartley, Andrew James. *Shakespeare and Political Theatre in Practice.* Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Heng, Geraldine. *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Hoenselaars, Ton. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2004.

_____. "Towards a European History of Henry V." *Shakespeare in Europe*. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 2014, pp. 9–32.

_____. *Shakespeare and the Language of Translation*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2012.

Hoti, Alma. "Racial Discirmination in Albania and The Role of the Commissioner of Protection Against Discrimination (CPD) Analysis of Cases of Racial Discrimination Time Period 2010-2014." *Global Journal of Politics and Law Research* 3, no.6 (2015): 67-95.

Houlahan, Mark, "Hekepia? The Mana of the Maori Merchant," in *World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performance*. Routledge, 2005, 141-148.

Huang, Alexa. "Global Shakespeares as a Methodology." *Shakespeare* 9.3 (2013): 273-290.

Huang, Alexander C. Y. *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

_____. "*Shamlet*: Shakespeare as a Palimpsest." Shakespeare Without English: The Reception of Shakespeare in Non-Anglophone Countries. New Delhi, Dorling Kindersley Ltd., 2006, pp. 21-45.

Huang, Alexander. “Shakespearean Localities and the Localities of Shakespeare Studies.” *Shakespeare studies* (Columbia) 2007: 186–204.

Hutcheon, Linda and Siobhan O’Flynn. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Hutton, Dan. “’Henry VI Part 2’ by William Shakespeare.” DanHutton.com. https://danhutton.wordpress.com/2012/05/13/henry-vi-part-2-by-william-shakespeare/.

Jola Alimemaj, “Hamleti ‘transgender’ dhe dublikimi i vuajtjes shekspiriane.” Tirana: Shekulli, 2015, http://shekulli.com.al/hamleti-transgender-dhe-dublikimi-i-vuajtjes-shekspiriane/.

Jones, Ann Rosalind and Peter Stallybrass. *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Joubin, Alexa A. and Aneta Mancewicz. *Local and Global Myths in Shakespeare Performance*, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Joubin, Alexa A., “Global Shakespeares as Methodology.” *Shakespeare* 9.3 (2013): 273-290.

_____. “Global Shakespeare Criticism Beyond the Nation State.” *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance*. London, Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 423-440.

“*Jul Qezari* në agoren e Teatrit Kombëtar, regjisori: Për të kuptuar tiraninë” KredoNews, 2019, http://www.korrieri.net/jul-qezari-ne-agoren-e-teatrit-kombetar-regjisori-per-te-kuptuar-tiranine/.

Kadare, Ismail. “Hamlet, The Difficult Prince” in *Essays on World Literature: Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare*. Restless Books, 2007, pp. 129-208.

Kadija, Refik. “William Shakespeare in Albania.” *Linguistic and Communicative Performance* 2, no.1 (2009): 36-43.

Këlliçi, Klejd and Ermira Danaj. “Promoting Equality, Perpetuating Inequality: Gender Propaganda in Communist Albania.” *History of Communism in Europe* 7 (2016): 39-61.

Kennedy, Dennis. “Global Shakespeare and Globalized Performance” in *Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance*, 2017, pp. 441-457.

_____. *Foreign Shakespeare: Contemporary Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

_____. *The Spectator and the Spectacle: Audiences in Modernity and Postmodernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Kera, Gentiana. "Age at Marriage in Interwar Tirana." *Albania: Family, Society and Culture in the 20th Century,* ed. Andreas Hemming, Kera Gentiana, and Enriketa Pandelejmoni. Zürich: Lit, 2012, pp. 35-50.

Kerri. "Globe to Globe: Henry VI, Part Two in Albanian." Planes, Trains, and Plantagenets, 2012, http://www.planestrainsandplantagenets.com/2012/05/globe-to-globe-henry-vi-part-two-albanian-albania/.

Khan, Muqtedar. "Constructing Identity in Global Politics." *American journal of Islamic studies* 15, no. 3 (1998): 81-106.

Kidnie, Margaret J. *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

King, Russell, and Nicola Mai. "Italophilia Meets Albanophobia: Paradoxes of Asymmetric Assimilation and Identity Processes Among Albanian Immigrants in Italy." *Ethnic and racial studies* 32.1 (2009): 117–138.

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

Kushi, Sadini. "Gendered Legacies of Communist Albania: A Paradox of Progress," *Open Democracy*, 2015, https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/5050/gendered-legacies-of-communist-albania-paradox-of-progress/.

Lehmann, Courtney. "'Turn off the dark': A Tale of Two Shakespeares in Julie Taymor's Tempest." *Shakespeare bulletin* 32, no. 1 (2014): 45-64.

Lemon, Alaina. "Without a 'Concept'? Race as Discursive Practice." *Slavic Review* 61, no. 1 (2002): 54–61.

Li, Victor. "Globalorientalization: Globalization through the Lens of Edward Said's Orientalism." *Ariel* 51.1 (2020): 3–30.

Liedeke, Plate and Anneke Smelik, *Performing Memory in Art and Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Loomba, Ania and Martin Orkin. *Post-Colonial Shakespeares.* Taylor and Francis, 2003.

Loomba, Ania. "Shakespeare and Postcolonial Performance." *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2007, pp.121-138.

_____. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2005.

Loomba, Ania, and Melissa E. Sanchez. *Rethinking Feminism in Early Modern Studies Gender, Race, and Sexuality*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2016.

Lubonja, Fatos. "Albania After Isolation: The Transformation of Public Perceptions of the West." Ed. Andrew Hammond. *The Balkans and the West: Constructing the European Other, 1945–2003*. England: Routledge, 2004, pp.127-135.

Madeira, Cláudia. "The 'return' of Performance Art from a Glocal Perspective." *Cadernos de arte e antropologia* vol. 1, no 2 (2014): 87–102.

Martini, Xhafer. *Shekspiri dhe Kanuni*. Tirana: Enja, 2015.

Massai, Sonia. *World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performances*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Melson, Craig. "Globe to Globe: Albanian Henry VI is Henry the Terrible." PlayShakespeare.com, 2012, https://www.playshakespeare.com/henry-vi-part-ii-reviews/theatre-reviews/globe-to-globe-albanian-henry-vi-is-henry-the-terrible.

Miller, Anthony. "*Julius Caesar* in the Cold War: The Houseman-Mankiewicz Film." *Literature Film Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (2000): 95-100.

Miller, Gemma. "Cross-Gender Casting as Feminist Interventions in the Staging of Early Modern Plays." *Journal of international women's studies* 16.1 (2014): 4–17.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Questions of Modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Moberly, David C. "'Once more to the breach!': Shakespeare, Wikipedia's Gender Gap and the Online, Digital Elite." *Broadcast Your Shakespeare: Continuity and Change across Media*. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2018, pp. 87-104.

Mudure, Mihaela. "Blackening Gypsy Slavery: The Romanian Case." Ed. Raphael-Hernandez. *Blackening Europe: The African American Presence*. New York: Routledge, 2004, pp. 263-284.

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. "Global Multiculture, Flexible Acculturation." *Globalizations* 4.1 (2007): 65–79.

"Në personalitetin e Luiza Xhuvanit ndjej tingujt dhe shpirtin e Hamletit," Tirane: Dita, 2015, http://www.gazetadita.al/ne-personalitetin-e-luiza-xhuvanit-ndjej-tingujt-dhe-shpirtin-e-hamletit/.

Nikolli, Fatmira. "Hamleti mbërthyes i Luiza Xhuvanit. Ferri shekspirian vjen me të gjitha ngjyrat." *Balkan Web: Gazeta Shqiptare*, 2015,

https://www.balkanweb.com/hamleti-mberthyes-i-luiza-xhuvanit-ferri-shekspirian-vjen-me-te-gjitha-ngjyrat/.

Noli, Fan S. *Hamleti, Princ I Danimarkës.* Tirana: Onufri, 2005.

_____. *Jul Cezari*. Tirane: Shtëpia Botuese VEKTOR Editions, 2015.

_____. *Makbethi*. Tirana: Onufri, 2005.

_____. *Tragjedia e Othello's Arapit Te Venetikut (1604)*. Boston: VATRA, 1916.

Ognjen Obradović. "Performer's Body: Cross-Gender Casting as an Estrangement Technique in Theatre." *Etnoantropološki problemi* 15.3 (2020).

Ogutcu, Murat. "Julius Caesar: Tyrannicide Made Unpopular." *Parergon* 34, no. 1 (2017): 109-128.

Ohueri, Chelsea W. "Mapping Race and Belonging in the Margins of Europe: Albanian, Romani, and Egyptian Sentiments." Diss. University of Texas at Austin, 2016.

O'Neill, Stephen. *Shakespeare and YouTube New Media Forms of the Bard*. London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 2014.

Orford, Peter. "Henry VI Part 2." *A Year of Shakespeare: Re-living the World Shakespeare Festival*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013, p. 79-82.

Orgel, Stephen. *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Orkin, Martin. *Local Shakespeares: Proximations and Power*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Pandelejmoni, Enriketa. "Religion and Gender in Albania 1967-2009." *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe* 31 no. 2 (2011): 19-23.

Papagjoni, Josif. "'Makbethi' në teatër një ëndërr e keqe, pse aktorët ngjanin si kukulla," Gazeta Shqipatre, 2018, http://gazetashqiptare.al/2018/03/22/makbethi-ne-teater-nje-enderr-e- keqe-pse-aktoret-ngjanin-si-kukulla/.

Peterson-Bidoshi, Kristin. "The 'Dordolec': Albanian House Dolls and the Evil Eye." *The Journal of American folklore* 119, no. 473 (2006): 337-355.

Peterson, William. "The Singapore Arts Festival at Thirty: Going Global, Glocal, Grobal." *Asian theatre journal* 26.1 (2009): 111–134.

Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. Taylor and Francis, 2003.

Philip Auslander. “Digital Liveness: A Historico-Philosophical Perspective.” *PAJ Baltimore, Md.* 34.3 (2012): 3–11.

Power, Terri. *Shakespeare and Gender in Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Purcell, Steve. “Are Shakespeare’s Plays Always Metatheatrical?” *Shakespeare bulletin* 36, no. 1 (2018): 19-35.

Puto, Artan and Mimoza Dhima, “The Cult of Personality: King Zog I and Enver Hoxha.” *International Journal of Social and Educational Innovation* 3, no. 5 (2016): 61-72.

Putzi, Sibylla. *A to Z World Superstitions & Folklore: 175 Countries - Spirit Worship, Curses, Mystical Characters, Folk Tales, Burial and the Dead, Animals, Food, Marriage, Good Luck, and More*. Petaluma: World Trade Press, 2008.

Qafleshi, Enkelena. “How Shakespeare Was Received in the Albanian Literture and Culture – a General History.” *Linguistic and Literary Broad Research and Innovation* 3, no. 1 & 2 (2014): 42-56.

_____. *Rikthim Tek Shekspiri: Studim Monografik*. Tirana: Geeer, 2008.

Quinn, Aragorn. “Political Theatre: ‘The Rise and Fall of Rome and The Sword of Freedom’, Two Translations of ‘Julius Caesar’ in Meiji Japan by Kawashima Keizō and Tsubouchi Shōyō.” *Asian Theatre Journal* 28, no. 1 (2011): 168-183.

Rancière, Jacques. *The Emancipated Spectator*. London: Verso, 2009.

Ritzer, George. “The Globalization of Nothing.” *The SAIS review of international affairs* 23.2 (2003): 189–200.

_____. *The McDonaldization of Society*, 7th ed. Oaks, Calif: SAGE, 2013.

Robertson, Roland. “Globalization or Glocalization?” *The Journal of international Communication.* 18. 2 (2012): 191-203.

_____. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage, 1992.

_____. “Glocalization.” *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2018, pp. 1-8.

Robinson, William. “Social Theory and Globalization: The Rise of a Transnational State.” *Theory and society* 30.2 (2001): 157–200.

Rogers, Irwin. “Making Connections through Cultural Memory, Cultural Performance, and Cultural Translation,” *Studies in Art Education* 40, no. 3 (1999): 198-212.

Roudometof, Victor. *Glocalization: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2016.

_____. "Recovering the Local: From Glocalization to Localization." *Current sociology* 67.6 (2019): 801–817.

_____. "Theorizing Glocalization: Three Interpretations." *European journal of social theory* 19.3 (2016): 391–408.

Russell, Anne. "Tragedy, Gender, Performance: Women as Tragic Heroes on the Nineteenth-Century Stage." *Comparative drama* 30.2 (1996): 135-157.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Sandten, Cecile. *Shakespeare's Globe, Global Shakespeares: Transcultural Adaptations of Shakespeare in Postcolonial Literatures*. WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2015.

Schechner, Richard. *Performance Studies: An Introduction,* 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Sauter, Willmar. "Thirty Years of Reception Studies: Empirical, Methodological and Theoretical Advances." *About performance* 10 (2010): 241–263.

Schoel, Josie. "Cosmetics, Whiteness, and Fashioning Early Modern Englishness." *Studies in English literature, 1500-1900* 60.1 (2020): 1–23.

Schwandner-Sievers, Stephanie. "Albanians, Albanianism and the Strategic Subversion of Stereotypes." Ed. Andrew Hammond. *The Balkans and the West: Constructing the European Other, 1945–2003*. England: Routledge, 2004.

Seeff, Adele, "Indigenizing Shakespeare in South Africa." *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance*. London: Oxford University Press, 2017, pp.531-548.

Shakespeare, William. *Julius Caesar.* ed. David Daniell. London: Arden Shakespeare, 1998.

_____. *Othello*. eds. Ayanna Thompson and E.A.J Honigmann. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2016.

_____. *Macbeth*. eds. Sandra Clark and Pamela Mason. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2015.

_____. *Hamlet.* eds. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

Shurbanov, Aleksandŭr and Boika Sokolova. *Painting Shakespeare Red: An East-European Appropriation*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2001.

Silverman, Max. *Palimpsestic Memory: The Holocaust and Colonialism in French and Francophone Fiction and Film*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2013.

_____. "The Palimpsestic Imagination." *Journal of Romance Studies* 14, no. 3 (2014): 100-102.

Singh, Jyotsna G. *Shakespeare and Postcolonial Theory*. London, UK: The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2020.

Smale, Alison. "It's a Grim Life for Albanian Women," *The Associated Press*, July 2, 1991, https://apnews.com/article/cdd9a6bf013bb254d2df98f2e70c5931.

Smith, Ian. "White Skin, Black Masks: Racial Cross-Dressing on the Early Modern Stage." *Renaissance Drama* 32 no.1 (2003): 33–67.

Stefani, Andrea. "Përse Enver Hoxhës duhet t'i japim atë që i takon Cezarit?" Top Channel, 2014, https://top-channel.tv/2014/07/04/ti-japim-enverit-ate-qe-i-takon-cezarit/.

Spickard, Paul R. *Multiple Identities Migrants, Ethnicity, and Membership*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Stone, James W. *Crossing Gender in Shakespeare Feminist Psychoanalysis and the Difference Within*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Stillars, Stuart. *The Shakespearean International Yearbook: Volume 13: Special Section, Macbeth. The Shakespearean International Yearbook*, 1st ed. Farnham: Taylor and Francis, 2017.

Stribrny, Zdenek. *Shakespeare and Eastern Europe*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

Sujata Iyengar and Miriam Jacobson, "Introduction," in *The Routledge Handbook of Shakespeare and Global Appropriation*. New York: Routledge, 2019.

Sullivan, Erin. "Olympic Performance in the Year of Shakespeare." In *A Year of Shakespeare: Re-living the World Shakespeare Festival*. London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013, pp. 3-11.

_____. "The Audience is Present." *Shakespeare and the Live Theatre Broadcast Experience*. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2018, pp. 59-75.

Tempera, Mariangela. "Political Caesar: *Julius Caesar* on the Italian Stage" in *Julius Caesar: New Critical Essays*. Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2002, pp. 333-344.

Thomas, Miranda Fay. “Political Acts and Political Acting: Roman Gesture and Julius Caesar.” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 19, no. 1 (2016): 1-24.

Thompson, Ayanna. *Colorblind Shakespeare: New Perspectives on Race and Performance*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

_____. *Passing Strange: Shakespeare, Race, and Contemporary America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

_____. *Performing Race and Torture on the Early Modern Stage*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Todorova, Mariia Nikolaeva. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Tomes, Jason. “His Majesty” in *King Zog: Self-Made Monarch of Albania.* The History Press, 2011.

Toronyilalic, Igor. “Globe to Globe: Henry VI, Parts 1, 2 and 3, Shakespeare's Globe.” TheArtsDesk.com, 2012, https://theartsdesk.com/theatre/globe-globe-henry-vi-parts-1-2-and-3-shakespeares-globe.

Uçi, Alfred. *Shekspiri ne Boten Shqiptare: Koncepti Shekspirian I Tragjikes: Ese Kritiko-Letrare*. Shtëpia Botuese Marin Barleti, 1996.

Unruh, Delbert. “Petr Matasek: Actors, Puppets, Kinetics, and Poetry,” *TD&T* 54, no. 2 (2018): 62-65.

Vrapi, Julia. “Regjisori Enko Fezollari: Hamleti ‘im’ nuk do të ndryshojë për botën, por bota për të.” *SOT News*, 2015.

Walker, Katherine. “Shakespeare and the Magic of Mummy: Julius Caesar’s Consumed/ Consuming Bodies.” *Preternature* 7, no. 2 (2018): 215-238.

Willett, John. *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1992.

Woodcock, Shannon. “‘Against a Wall’: Albania’s Women Political Prisoners’ Struggle to Be Heard,” *Cultural Studies Review* 20, no. 2 (2014): 39–65.

World Trade Press, *Albania Women in Culture, Business & Travel: A Profile of Albanian Women in the Fabric of Society*, Petaluma: *World Trade Press*, 2010.

Worthen, William B. *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Zander, Horst. "*Julius Caesar* and the Critical Legacy," in *Julius Caesar: New Critical Essays* Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2002, p.3-58.