A Chinese Coriolanus and British Reception: A Play Out of Context?

Lin Zhaohua’s Coriolanus, translated by Ying Roucheng, and retitled in Chinese as Great General Kou Liulan, was originally performed by the Beijing People’s Art Theatre in the Chinese capital in 2007. It played at the Edinburgh International Festival last August for “two days only” – and four thousand ticket holders came to see it. Born in 1936 and emerging as a director after the chaos of the Cultural Revolution, Lin is now recognized as “one of the most innovative and sought-after stage directors in contemporary China” (Fei 179). No wonder that the British media and audiences turned to this production, or so it seems, to learn about the world’s new Superpower as much as to go to see a play by Shakespeare. Dominic Cavendish in The Daily Telegraph described it as being a milestone “on that all-important journey towards better cross-cultural understanding” (“Edinburgh Festival 2013: The Tragedy of Coriolanus, Playhouse, review”) while Lyn Gardner of The Guardian complained that it seemed “determined to offer no comment on the society that spawned it” (“The Tragedy of Coriolanus – Edinburgh Festival 2013 review”).

This ethnographic gaze is not surprising. During my interview with Lin Zhaohua in 2011, when I was in Beijing researching his work on Shakespeare appropriation, he told me excitedly that he had just been in discussion with “a man from Edinburgh” (personal communication, 2011). But how would Coriolanus fare when transferred to the Scottish stage, my Chinese interpreter wondered afterwards? “Will Westerners be able to understand him?” she asked me. Alexa (Alex) Huang argues that touring performances at international festivals of intercultural Shakespeare, and particularly East Asian Shakespeare, are inevitably used “to interrogate Asian and Shakespearean idioms as cultural signifiers” (Huang, “What Country, Friends, Is This?” 54). Whether the reviewers of Lin’s Edinburgh Coriolanus loved it or loathed it, each response essentially revolved around the same question: to what extent did this recognizable Shakespeare play give Western spectators an understanding of contemporary Chinese politics and culture?²

² Senior Lecturer in English Literature, York St John University.
¹ Hereafter BPAT.
² Of course, by having focused primarily on reviews in the mainstream British media, I have ignored the views of a sizable percentage of the audience: the many young mainland Chinese students who came, not only to see a famous British play by a famous Chinese director, but also to get cut-price tickets to see their favourite bands. The student concession tickets at the Edinburgh Festival were a fraction of the price of concert tickets in Beijing.
Resisting Maoism in late communist Chinese theatre

Most strikingly for Western audiences, used to the “peony-strewn chinoiserie” of touring productions by China’s National Theatre or Ballet (Dickson) or the Royal Shakespeare Company’s recent adaptation of the Chinese classic *The Orphan of Zhao*, in Lin’s *Coriolanus* there were none of the painted faces, elaborate embroidered costumes or acrobatics associated with traditional Chinese theatre forms. Instead, Chinese actors in modernist costumes walked about on the stage and engaged in “spoken” drama in front of ladders propped against a high brick wall. It was bare, abstract, and denied the spectators any certainty of time or place. The citizens, dressed in uniformly loose tunics, brandished uniformly long staves, whilst an equally stylized Coriolanus strode in wearing a gleaming golden breastplate. Counterpoised to this throughout were the two distinctly urban, distinctly early twentieth-century Chinese heavy metal bands which slid in and out on either side of the stage.

It is not surprising that Lin Zhaohua was once branded a “harbinger of strangeness” and a “rebel against the classics” (Li 87). Although in the People’s Republic of China in the 1980s this was as much a political criticism as an aesthetic judgment, as any break with the Socialist Realist, Stanislavskian model of spoken drama promoted by the State was considered to be suspect. With his collaborator, the contemporary playwright Gao Xinjian, who would later win the Nobel Prize for Literature, Lin is credited with beginning the Little Theatre Movement (Zhao) “which changed the dramatic landscape” (Chen 66) establishing an existential Chinese theatre experimentalism in a culture which, for the previous decade or so of the Cultural Revolution, had been reduced to the production of eight state-approved revolutionary operas, ballets and plays. Their trilogy of contemporary plays, *Absolute Signal* (1982), *Bus Stop* (1984) and *Wild Men* (1986), inspired a generation of spoken theatre practitioners to start experimenting with non-realist forms influenced by the conventions of Chinese traditional theatre and newly rediscovered foreign avant-garde artists such as Brecht and Beckett.

However, unlike Gao, when the State’s tolerance for their work reached its limit, and the rehearsals for their fourth collaboration – *The Other Shore* – were closed down (Zhao 10), he did not retreat into self-imposed exile in Europe, but stayed living and working in the country’s political, and politically conservative, capital, turning from contemporary Chinese work to famous foreign and Chinese classics. Yet this in itself had deep cultural implications at the time. After all, it was only a dozen years earlier that theatres had been freed

---

3 Late communism refers to the transitional periods in China and the USSR beginning in the early 1980s with Deng Xiaoping’s Open Door Policy and Mikhail Gorbachev’s Perestroika as both societies shifted from “pure” communism to a more ambivalent, hybrid period of economic and social liberalisation.
from the restrictions enforced on them by Jiang Qing, actor, leader of the Gang of Four, Mao’s wife, and orchestrator of the Cultural Revolution, who stated that:

The entire world of literature and arts was talking and producing the ‘famous’ (ming), the ‘foreign’ (yang), or the ‘ancient’ (gu); it was an utterly repugnant atmosphere filled with sentiments favouring the past over the present, favouring the foreign over the native, favouring the dead over the living. (Fei 167)

So, when Lyn Gardner of The Guardian dismissed his Coriolanus as “offering empty spectacle in the place of nuanced political comment and metaphor,” she was strongly upbraided in the comments section below by a young Chinese woman, writing under the username lili_peony, who had been involved in the Edinburgh tour:

I totally understand why LG, as [...] someone from the “free world” feels that the political side was sidestepped. Yes, in an ideal world, in a world of no political persecution, we’d all love to use the right of free speech and express our minds in various art forms. But hello, haven’t you ever heard about all the horrible stories about what happened to people who dare to utter one word of disagreement, even just some insinuation? I think having chosen this play is one brave movement itself. (“The Tragedy of Coriolanus – Edinburgh Festival 2013 review”)

As scholars Li Ruru (Shashibiya) and Alexa (Alex) Huang (Chinese Shakespeares) have explored in relation to Shakespeare in Mainland China, and Dennis Kennedy has explored in relation to political Shakespeare behind the Iron Curtain (Foreign Shakespeare), sometimes simply the act of putting on a play is the political comment and metaphor. Lin Zhaohua is a complex case because of his longevity and status. The bad-boy of Chinese theatre also rose, at one stage, to become the vice-President of the Beijing People’s Art Theatre. For me, what is often most intriguing is how practitioners appear to work within the restraints of the system, yet encode their work with slippery, ambivalent details that to outsiders of that system may seem “opaque” or simply absurd (as opposed to the obviously political absurd).

Lin Zhaohua argues that

I don’t like politics. Nor do I like to let ideology dominate the content of art. Art is art itself. I would not add ideological views into art. My works serve neither for Shakespeare nor ideology but only myself. They convey what I would like to say. (Lin)

To ask an artist if they produce “political theatre” in China is to suggest that the drama and the artists have been appropriated by the State as mouthpieces
for Party propaganda, and is, therefore, an affront to their sense of artistic integrity. During Lin’s youth, his entire training had been dominated by the Maoist philosophy of the arts, formulated at the Yan’an Forum in 1942, indeed these talks “have remained the single most important document, an ‘ideological guide’ for the Chinese Communist Party in regard to matters of arts and literature” (Fei, 129). According to Mao Zedong:

All dark forces endangering the masses of the people must be exposed, while all revolutionary struggles of the masses must be praised – this is the basic task of all revolutionary artists and writers. (Fei, 138)

Lin Zhaohua repeatedly insists that he is not a political director, yet Coriolanus is undeniably one of Shakespeare’s most overtly political tragedies, and the fact that it is variously interpreted as a critique of the abuse of autocratic power or as a warning against the fickleness of the masses is significant here. Translated by his mentor, actor Ying Ruochen, just before the latter’s death in 2003, this Coriolanus does not set out to offer easy answers, and anyone who came hoping to see a simple critique of power relations between the Chinese government and the citizens in today’s People’s Republic would be left unsatisfied.

Ying’s posthumously published autobiography Voices Carry: Behind Bars and Backstage During China’s Revolution and Reform reveals in a very personal story the tensions that artists and intellectuals have had to struggle with throughout the second half of the twentieth century, as he was imprisoned for three years in 1968, at the height of the Cultural Revolution. He reveals how, after his arrest, he was continually questioned about Lin Zhaohua’s suspected involvement with “a supposedly secret society within the Red Guards that had diabolical designs on the CCP and Mao himself” and how the Party interrogators “thought that Lin was involved because he was a leader among the younger men” at the theatre (Ying and Conceison 56-57). It is, I would argue, the very ambiguity over where the director’s and translator’s political sympathies lie that make this production from China so intriguing and nuanced. What is clear, both from the details of his interview with me, and his post-Cultural Revolution career path, is that Lin Zhaohua, from the beginning of his directing career thirty years ago, had consciously and publically set himself up in opposition to the now outdated Maoist doctrine of the arts: “The slogan for the Communist Party is that ‘art should serve the working class.’ This is nonsense. Art serves the intellectuals” (Lin). Because theatre experimentalism in China was regarded as a “decadent” form (Zhao), for an “elitist,” educated audience (Zhang and Schecher), his protest against cultural indoctrination has not needed to be through overt political statements, dramatic or otherwise, but through a quiet re-appropriation of theatrical form as primarily art-for-art’s-sake.
Chinese Intraculturalism

The most accessible innovation for the Edinburgh audience was Lin Zhaohua’s incorporation of two Beijing bands, one heavy metal, the other more indie rock, into BPAT’s production. These bands were used, not only as incidental music but, as commentators have put it, as a metaphorical “battle of the bands” (Dickson) between Coriolanus/the Romans and Aufidius/the Volscians. From the moment that the citizens first invaded the stage, simultaneously surging in from both backstage and the aisles, a frenzied, guitar accompaniment rocked the auditorium as the musicians joined them to take over the centre of the space. “Throughout history, there has always been conflict between the ruling class and the people, and there always will be,” explained Lin Zhaohua. He continued:

I like rock music and because I need to show the conflict between the ruling classes and the people, I felt rock music was the best to show this.

(MTViggy)

“Heavy Rock Coriolanus Turns up Volume at Edinburgh Festival” shouted the BBC headline. Andrew Dickson of The Guardian, veteran reviewer of the World Shakespeare Festival and Globe to Globe, loved it, describing it as surprising, gnarly, and as adding “volcanic energy” when the bands Miserable Faith and Suffocated “slide in periodically from the wings and punctuate the action with frenzied surges of nu-metal” (Dickson). Cavendish of The Telegraph, in another thoughtful review found it an “arresting concept” evoking “China’s tumultuous embrace of Western influences” (“Edinburgh Festival 2013: The Tragedy of Coriolanus, Playhouse, review”). Gardner, no doubt placing the conceit in the category of “empty spectacle,” showed her disdain by barely mentioning it.

Many reviewers centred their analyses of the rock bands on this perception of Western influence, however. In fact, Brian G Cooper of The Stage felt that the production was altogether too Western, complaining that in Lin’s Coriolanus, the “uniquely Chinese theatrical influences are conspicuously absent” throughout (Cooper). Yet Chinese theatre has several distinct theatrical traditions. These include puppet theatre and traditional Chinese theatre or xiqu, such as Beijing Opera. Since the early 1900s, Chinese spoken theatre or huaju, although originally a Western import, has also been central to Chinese culture, with many of China’s most important playwrights during the twentieth century choosing to write for this rather than for indigenous forms.

In recent years, however, contemporary directors have overtly experimented with “intercultural and intracultural” hybridity, especially for touring productions (Li, Richard III) and this has developed certain “chinoiserie” expectations about “authenticity” in the British audiences who go to see them. Director Wang Xiaoying’s Richard III by the National Theatre of China was one
of the hits of the Globe to Globe Festival in 2012, partly because of the way in which he incorporated elements of Beijing Opera into a spoken drama. Speaking of his influences and aims for his adaptation, he said:

I saw the original Richard III play last year in Beijing starring [Hollywood actor] Kevin Spacey, which was fabulous and remained true to Shakespeare's original work. However, the [World Shakespeare Festival] is a platform for different countries to showcase their own culture. I believe that other countries will also fuse unique cultural elements into Shakespeare's plays. (Wang)

Cooper was perhaps hoping for such clear signs of fusion in Lin’s Coriolanus, and may have been disappointed that the “exotic” traces of this traditional theatre were replaced by what he saw as a Western norm. Nevertheless, although the intracultural elements in Lin’s work are less obvious and less traditional than Wang’s, there was something in these rock bands that was fundamentally Chinese. Firstly, they reminded me of the musicians in Beijing Opera, who often sit onstage, visible to the audience (Yang). And while British audiences expect lutes and flutes to accompany Shakespeare, Beijing Opera goes for clashing cymbals (if not thrashing guitars) whenever a General or king enters the scene (Yang 84). Could this supposedly Western-style production be rather more Chinese then we give it credit for? Furthermore, rock music in China has a political heritage. Its first post-Cultural Revolution rock god, Cui Jian, entertained the students in Tiananmen Square, his “Nothing to My Name” becoming part of the soundtrack to the demonstrations. Time Out noted that, “Lyrically opaque, it conveyed a sense of longing that enabled it to be interpreted as a love song or a plea for political solidarity” and is “the anthem around which widespread agitation for greater freedoms in China first coalesced” (Time Out). Even as late as December 2013, Cui Jian had pressure put on him by Chinese State television to remove the song from his set for the annual Chinese New Year Gala. He withdrew from the programme in protest (Chinese rock star Cui Jian quits New Year show over Tiananmen song).

Play out of context?

Dickson was at an advantage when he wrote his review – The Guardian had sent him to Beijing to interview the master dramaturge Lin Zhaohua in his own theatrical space. But he also did his homework, seeking out answers to the things he did not know or did not immediately understand. This could not be said of most of the reviewers on BBC Radio 4’s Saturday Review from the Edinburgh Festival, who, it appeared, had not even done a preliminary internet search of their subject before attempting to analyse it for the nation. Tom Sutcliffe, hosting, described Lin’s Coriolanus as
a very dull production. Pu Cunxin [as Coriolanus] comes to the front of the stage and many of the scenes are blocked geometrically so the characters are all speaking out at us, not addressing the characters that they are actually talking to in those scenes, and it gave it a very rigid, very formal feel which I felt just drained all the excitement out of it. (Sutcliffe)

Pu Cunxin, one of China’s leading actors of stage and screen, and Lin Zhaohua’s long-term collaborator, was “a bit RSC,” conceded David Schneider on the Saturday Review panel, “a bit RSC meaning he loves the costume, he loves the swagger, the swish of the cloak and standing with one leg forward and leaning on it”. Sutcliffe took this up: “It’s a very old kind of actor manager style. Or it looks that way to us” (Edinburgh Festival Special).

Ay, there’s the rub. It looks that way to us. Martin Hoyle writing in the FT saw “rhetorical moments” which found “the individual actor caught in an attitude that fleetingly resembles the pose of a Victorian theatrical print or cut-out character for a toy theatre” (Hoyle). And those fleeting resemblances were certainly there. But that was not all that was there. In the swagger, the swish of the cloak, the fixed postures, were echoes of other generals from other Chinese traditions. In Beijing Opera, for example, “As soon as a player enters the stage, he or she must firstly stop and present himself or herself to the audience by striking a pose known as liangxiang” (Yang 79). Likewise, that aura of disengagement which had so disconcerted Sutcliffe, once inspired Brecht, who developed his concept of the alienation or V-Effect, after watching a performance by the Beijing Opera star Mei Lanfang.4

The Saturday Review panellists were quite right about the crowd scenes, though. These scenes which must have been so electrifying in Beijing were indeed “limp” (Sutcliffe). Mostly young, middle class looking girls and boys with shiny hair, the citizens resembled overseas students rather than democracy protesters or rioting peasants; and, it turns out, that due to funding limitations for the flights to Scotland, this was exactly what they were. Lili_peony, commenting on Lyn Gardner’s review, argues that, with one hour’s training and one rehearsal, these locally recruited Chinese extras from Scotland’s universities were actually pretty good in the circumstances, if not as “menacing” as Gardner would have liked (“The Tragedy of Coriolanus – Edinburgh Festival 2013 review”). Thus Sutcliffe was able to introduce his BBC review with the statement that

the production seems to studiously avoid any allusion to popular discontent in China or any direct suggestion that a notionally socialist country might have its own patrician class. (Sutcliffe)

4 Lin’s later work is not ideologically Brechtian, however, and his and Ying’s Coriolanus, although engaging with alienation aesthetically and thematically, resists any clear binary.
Yet in the original Beijing production Lin had controversially deployed one hundred angry, untrained migrant farm labourers as the citizens, their everyday work clothes clearly visible beneath their costumes, and the audience laughing uncomfortably when Coriolanus asked the citizens’ representatives, “Have you washed?” (Shakespeare and Ying). Although urban unrest is rare in China these days, there are frequent clashes in rural areas between displaced peasants and the government endorsed companies that take their land. So this casting choice alone, according to Shen Lin, professor at the Central Drama Academy in Beijing, clearly placed “Roman history in the context of China today” (Shen 229). In his interview with me Lin explained,

In Coriolanus, I was influenced by what happens around us. I cast real min gong [migrant farm labourers] to express my ideas about society – it was my way to express who are the real heroes. (Lin)

As always, this enigmatic answer was not expanded on. Just who does Lin consider to be the heroes of his society? Is it the Great General? Or is it the People? My interpreter avoided conveying any ambivalence in his tone, and reminded me that “New China was built with the peasants’ hands” (Lin).

However, Chinese of an older generation, such as William Sun (Sun Huizhu), Shanghai Theatre Academy “professor at large” and a respected playwright/director himself, had a different perspective, tackling the idea of heroes in his article for the Coriolanus programme:

My guess is that the translator Ying Ruocheng and the director Lin Zhaohua’s shared interest in this play, about a leader devoured by the masses he arrogantly believes he is leading, could be attributed to their experience in China’s Cultural Revolution. (Sun)

In fact, in China this production generated heated political debate, as demonstrated by the range of responses reported by Shen in his chapter in Shakespeare in Asia (What use Shakespeare? China and Globalization). Were Lin and his collaborators taking “an anti-socialist and anti-democratic stance against the Chinese Revolution?” Were they propagating “hierarchism and neo-conservatism?” Or were they critiquing “the corrosive power of cultural plebeianism” and venting “long pent-up frustrations with the damnable system of the People’s Art” (Shen 230-231)?

On Saturday Review only David Schneider responded to this:

There was for me a frisson about the politics though – there was that scene where they do discuss whether the herd, the populace, should have any rights at all and I think that if you do contextualise a Chinese director putting on Coriolanus and letting it speak for itself, for me there was a glow in those scenes. (Sutcliffe)
Alexa Huang contends that “The dynamics of British reviews of intercultural performance are symptomatic of a tendency to read contemporary Asian arts in political ways in the West.” What is more she observes that “the patterns of reception history of touring productions also point toward a lingering ideological investment in fixed notions of cultural authenticity” (Huang, 2013, 58). However, in this case it appears that sometimes the reviewers’ inability to read the politics in contemporary Chinese performance led to their sense that the production was therefore inauthentic, both culturally and politically.

Conclusion

Western reviews of Lin’s Coriolanus forces us to ask whether, therefore, there is a problem with the production itself, the place in which the production takes place or the inability of the audience to read the cultural signifiers? The innovations in Lin’s Coriolanus can be read as a response to the changes in late communist Chinese society. However, as Yan Haiping has pointed out, such readings often only make sense in the context of the “home” culture’s “socially bound performatative collectivity”:

> Theatre audiences [are] socially bound and defined groups and theatrical experiences [are] socially anchored events [that] make the ahistorical, asocial, and ultimately transcendental humanist aesthetics hardly self-evident. Such a sociohistorically anchored nature is most strongly demonstrated in the history of modern Chinese theatre and the development of its aesthetics. (Yan 109)

When a play is performed “out of context,” such as at an international festival, the danger is that the historical and social significance of a production gets “lost in translation” or becomes “opaque” if the host culture audience is not familiar with the cultural aesthetics of the particular production or if, as in this case, those aesthetics do not match preconceived notions about Chinese theatre. This can be seen in several of the responses to Lin’s Coriolanus in Edinburgh featured above: on one hand such an ethnographic approach to intercultural theatre appears to open up a cross-cultural dialogue, yet the miscommunications that occur can end up telling us more about the anxieties and prejudices of the host country. To conclude, I end on an unanswered question: should we judge a production as a failure if we do not understand it, as did some reviewers, or is it an opportunity to learn, and learn to appreciate a little more about what theatre is in the world today, as did so many other reviewers and spectators? Maybe both approaches are flawed, because both reduce the production to little more than an ethnographic curiosity.
WORKS CITED


**Production Images**


Embedded still

Cast and musicians, ‘Coriolanus’ from ‘2013 The Tragedy of Coriolanus’ YouTube posted by EdintFest. Available from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MjKaUmLvQII
Migrant workers as the citizens confront Pu Cunxin as Coriolanus from the 2007 production at the Beijing People’s Art Theatre ‘Coriolanus’ Asian Shakespeare Intercultural Archive. Available from http://a-s-i-a-web.org/

BPAT cast including migrant workers as the citizens from the 2007 production at the Beijing People’s Art Theatre ‘Coriolanus’ Asian Shakespeare Intercultural Archive. Available from http://a-s-i-a-web.org/