

Finally, since the original *History of Cardenio* has been given up for lost, one of the most intriguing challenges is to detect Theobald's hand and any traces of Shakespeare and Fletcher in the adaptation. As I have tried to show, Charles David Ley's critical observations and textual decisions, although in some cases debatable, offer some responses to the challenge. However modest, his contribution to the *Cardenio/Double Falsehood* issue needs to be reckoned with.

last name is "Della Gatta"

Citation: Della Gatta, Carla. "Cultural Mobility and Transitioning Authority: The Cardenio Project." *The Quest for Cardenio*. Eds. David Carnegie and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. 329-43. Print.

19

Cultural Mobility and Transitioning Authority: Greenblatt's *Cardenio* Project

Carla Della Gatta

The name 'Cardenio' has signaled a variety of stories for the past few centuries: an Italian fable, a subplot in Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, and a lost play by Shakespeare. More recently, the reinvigoration of this lost *Cardenio* by Shakespeare and Fletcher has become a form of global currency.¹ Gary Taylor's 2006–11 reimagining of Theobald's script, Stephen Greenblatt and Charles Mee's 2008 production, and Bernard Richards's 2009 reconstruction were further thrust into the spotlight in 2010 with the publication of *Double Falsehood* in the prestigious Arden Shakespeare series. Questions of authenticity and the role of creative interjection arose alongside skepticism about the surge of interest in the play.²

Focusing on Greenblatt and Mee's subsequent cultural mobility project, in which Greenblatt circulated various source texts to fund satellite plays throughout the world, this essay will explore the transition of authority and the inspiration for creativity that Shakespeare as a brand name enables. Looking closely at one of these productions, written by Jesús Eguía Armenteros in Spain, I will argue that the project ultimately decenters authority from the playwrights and scholars involved and gives it to the characters within the story.

Cardenio in Boston and *The Cardenio Project*

In May 2008, a play called *Cardenio* was performed at Boston's American Repertory Theater. The A.R.T. website advertised the play as 'a romantic romp that has

¹ I would like to thank Stephen Greenblatt and Jesús Eguía Armenteros for their communication with me regarding the project. I could not have conducted this research without their assistance.

² Arden's publication spurred several productions in 2010–11: Gregory Dolan's *Cardenio* reconstruction at the RSC in Stratford-upon-Avon, *Double Falsehood* at the Classic Stage Company in New York, twice at the Union Theatre in London, and at the Maddermarket Theatre in Norwich. All gave prominence to Shakespeare and Fletcher as originating authors.

audiences roaring with laughter. A thoroughly modern comedy 'filled with 'countless winks at the Bard'.³ The play was written by noted Shakespearean scholar and Harvard professor Stephen Greenblatt, in partnership with playwright Charles Mee. Oddly, the plot does not follow the Cardenio story at all, but another story from *Don Quixote* known as 'The Curious Impertinent' (see Valerie Wayne's essay in this volume). The play presents the wedding of Anselmo and Camila, after which Anselmo asks his friend, Will, to flirt with his wife to test her honour. Anselmo's parents arrive with a lost Shakespearean script, and the plot thickens with Shakespearean theatrical conventions. There is a play within a play, lovers who separate and come back together, musical and dance numbers, and modern language mixed with Elizabethan costuming.

Greenblatt has discussed the process of making the story (and the story within the story) work for his and Mee's modern script: 'where something immediately clicked for us was not in the principal Cardenio story but rather in the distorted mirror image of that story that the priest in Cervantes reads to Cardenio and Dorotea at the inn' (Greenblatt et al., 84). By turning a narrative embedded within the Cardenio story, 'The Curious Impertinent', into the main plot, Greenblatt and Mee subverted which set of lovers reflected the other.

Reviews of the production were less concerned with the plot's origins than with Greenblatt's authorship and the presence of a comedy at the A.R.T. Boston art reviewer Kilian Melloy noted that 'part of the play's charm proceeds from a sense that the A.R.T. is letting its hair down'⁴ and critic Ed Siegel thanked Greenblatt, Mee, the A.R.T., and Shakespeare for 'bringing some laughs back to the Loeb Drama Center'.⁵ The origin of the plot was described by critics as 'a play by Shakespeare that exists only in fragments'⁶ and that the play was 'an attempt to piece together the Bard's *Cardenio*'⁷ even though Greenblatt was most interested in the movement of ideas from one culture to another.⁸ None of these theatre reviews mentioned 'The Curious Impertinent' by name, though Frank Rizzo commented that 'only the slightest suggestion of what the maybe-work was like... comes from a brief deconstructed play-within-the-play in the second act'.⁹ The A.R.T. included both a

history of Cardenio and plot summaries of Cervantes's *Don Quixote* and Theobald's *Double Falsehood* in their marketing brochures.

How did a play entitled *Cardenio*, without presenting the Cardenio story directly, appear in Boston in 2008? Greenblatt was an admirer of Mee's work and told him that for decades he had been 'studying the creative mobilization of cultural materials in Shakespeare' (Greenblatt et al., 78). He asked if he could observe Mee's writing process from 'conception through the writing and performance' of a play.¹⁰ Instead, Mee suggested that they write a play together. Greenblatt accepted the challenge to create this play from the tools and stories he had analyzed throughout his career.¹¹

Following the Boston performances, Greenblatt's interest in cultural mobility inspired *The Cardenio Project*; he sent his script in translation, and translations of source materials, to many theatre companies around the world, asking them not to perform his play, but to rewrite the story in their own cultural terms. Plays were written in twenty cultures and various languages across the globe—Bengali, Japanese, Croatian, and Spanish, to list a few. The motivation behind the project was not validation, discovery, or recreation of a lost Shakespearean text. Rather, Greenblatt wanted

to see what happens when they adapt and transform the materials to their own theatrical and national cultures. I'm going to have all these plays translated back into English, so we'll have a sophisticated version of the old elementary school telephone game in which you see what happens when a message is passed around.¹²

The Cardenio Project is similar to a 'telephone game' because of the movement of the story, yet the notable difference stems from Greenblatt's desire for the texts to deliberately change as new people encounter them rather than become misinterpreted as they do in a telephone game.

The Cardenio Project in Alcalá

The Cardenio story came full circle when Jesús Eguía Armenteros was invited to participate in the project. Eguía Armenteros's 2008 play, *The Cardenio Project*,¹³ was performed by Yelmo de Mambrino Teatro in Alcalá de Henares in Spain, which, as it happens, is the birthplace of Cervantes. The Spanish adaptation highlights the dilemma

³ 'Cardenio', Boston American Repertory Theatre <<http://www.amrep.org/cardenio/>>, accessed 4 June 2008.

⁴ 'Cardenio', *EDGE Boston*, <<http://www.edgeboston.com/index.php?ch=entertainment&sc=theatre&sc2=reviews&sc3=performance&id=73369>>, accessed 15 May 2008.

⁵ 'Review: "Cardenio"', *WBUR*, <<http://www.wbur.org/2008/05/16/review-cardenio>>, accessed 16 May 2008.

⁶ Cassandra Csencsitz, 'Marry Me Some More', *American Theatre*, 25/5 (May/June 2008), 23.

⁷ Frank Rizzo, 'Cardenio', *Variety*, <<http://www.variety.com/review/ve1117937149.html?categoryid=33&cs=1>>, accessed 15 May 2008.

⁸ In an interview with Boston A.R.T. Associate Dramaturg, Ryan McKittrick, Greenblatt said, 'For me this whole process has been about the idea of cultural mobility' (Ryan McKittrick, 'From Lake Como to Cambridge: An Interview with Stephen Greenblatt and Chuck Mee', published 1 May 2008 by Boston American Repertory Theatre <<http://www.americanrepertorytheater.org/inside/articles/articles-vol-6-i4-lake-como-to-cambridge>>, accessed 25 November 2010).

⁹ Rizzo, 'Cardenio'.

¹⁰ McKittrick, 'Lake Como to Cambridge'.

¹¹ Greenblatt taught a course at Harvard called 'Shakespearean Playwriting'. Mee guest-lectured, and they asked the students to list Shakespeare's ten best devices, which they candidly acknowledged they would use for their own play (McKittrick, 'Lake Como to Cambridge').

¹² McKittrick, 'Lake Como to Cambridge'.

¹³ Like Greenblatt and Mee, Eguía Armenteros revised his script after the first performance of the play. My analysis of the plot is based on a reading of the 2008 script and a recording of the performance provided by Eguía Armenteros from February 2009. Since this essay was completed, Greenblatt's website provided translations into English of adaptations from around the world; for the Eguía Armenteros version I have preferred to retain my own translation for many quotations, but page numbers are close to those of the website script. See <<http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~cardenio/spain-script.html>>.

of retaining Shakespeare's authority, without a Shakespearean text, in the face of Cervantes as a source.

Greenblatt gave Eguía Armenteros 'three reference texts: Shakespeare's *Cardenio*,¹⁴ Cardenio of Greenblatt and Mee, and Part Four of Book One of *Don Quixote*, where [Cervantes] developed the fables of "Cardenio" and in turn, within it, the fable of "The Curious Impertinent"'.¹⁵ At the time, Eguía Armenteros was reading *William Shakespeare* by Victor Hugo, but also found inspiration in Homer's *Odyssey* and Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*.¹⁶ Eguía Armenteros's process was similar to Shakespeare's and Greenblatt's; he incorporated themes and stories from different cultures and time periods. Further, he blended the Quixotic themes of dreams and reality with postmodern speech and staging. Greenblatt's project of mobility gave Eguía Armenteros the platform to negotiate Cervantes's ideas in a modern context. For Eguía Armenteros, his 'entire play is an attempt to rethink what Cervantes had thought'.

Unlike Greenblatt's focus on Shakespearean themes and devices, Eguía Armenteros's script addresses *Don Quixote*'s primary theme of imagination versus reality. Eguía Armenteros's play raises questions of violation and control, mirrors and replication, and ultimately the authority of authorship (Cervantes versus Shakespeare). He shifts the action to take place inside the mind of an Author/Psychologist¹⁷ and in modern urban places such as a coffeehouse and the streets of Madrid. Quixote and Sancho Panza, two sets of lovers, and Greenblatt himself are all characters in the Spanish version. The plots of the play's two couples (the Author and Luscinda, Fernando and Dorotea) are interwoven and interspersed with scenes involving the two vagabonds. The Author is concerned with the question, 'What is real?' and tries discussing it with Greenblatt's pre-recorded voice at the play's opening.¹⁸ Greenblatt says 'your play will be the answer' (4). Through the Author's multiple roles as author to Quixote and Sancho's story, Anselmo to Luscinda, and psychologist to Dorotea, he concludes that 'this Cardenio Project has driven [him] crazy' (63).

The events onstage are a reflection of the project itself. In the play's opening scene, Greenblatt's character tells the Author, 'You're free to do with [the play] as your imagination sees fit' (4), which were Greenblatt's directions to Eguía Armenteros in

their communication about the project. For Eguía Armenteros, this phrase was fundamental to the creation of his work, and through it, he decided that 'the piece and the characters would have only one theme in common: SUBJECTIVITY'.¹⁹ Subjective it was, for there are few direct connections to Greenblatt and Mee's play.²⁰ Greenblatt's quest to dissect and employ Shakespeare's style contrasts with Eguía Armenteros's preoccupation with dreams and reality. The innovation that Eguía Armenteros gave to his script was exactly what Greenblatt had envisioned; both used the same base texts along with other influences to address the issues that resonate in their cultures and experience.

The themes of violation and control take a new dimension in Eguía Armenteros's play. The Cardenio story involves Fernando's betrayal of his marriage promise to Dorotea; he only promises marriage to ensure a sexual interaction with her. In 'The Curious Impertinent', as well as in the adaptations by Theobald and Greenblatt, a violation of trust between the newlyweds occurs when the groom questions his wife's loyalty. In Eguía Armenteros's play, Fernando rapes Dorotea, and although the scene is staged to show Dorotea making sexual advances and performing fellatio, Fernando quickly becomes physically aggressive and rapes her onstage.

Unlike Cervantes, Theobald, Greenblatt, and presumably Shakespeare, Eguía Armenteros is less concerned with the two sets of lovers ending in unions than he is with the question of alienation and *Quixote*'s larger themes of reality and subjectivity. Theobald's play makes it clear that Violante (Dorotea) has been raped by Henriquez (Fernando) offstage, but Eguía Armenteros shows this action onstage and therefore increases the complexity between the characters. Eguía Armenteros questioned, 'How is it possible to write a play in which a raped woman kneels before her rapist asking for marriage? Both Shakespeare and Cervantes wrote that: a reflection of their time. I thought I should take the opposite side: the current position of a woman to rape. That was the beginning of everything.' Although Dorotea becomes victimized despite her initial advances, Eguía Armenteros's play subverts the model that only a male can trespass upon a woman.²¹

But the rape scene makes a larger statement about violation and control that goes beyond the physical experience of the two characters onstage. When Dorotea discusses the rape with the Psychologist (who is also the Author), he replies, 'A violation does not have to leave signs of violence' (41). The project itself at first appears as a violation of *Quixote* as the true source text. Because Greenblatt, a Shakespearean

¹⁴ Eguía Armenteros's reference to 'Shakespeare's *Cardenio*' is to *Double Falsehood*. Helena González Gutiérrez makes a similar comment: 'we have three texts from which [Eguía Armenteros] worked: Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, the newly discovered Shakespeare and Fletcher 'Cardenio', based on Cervantes' *Don Quixote* and the work written by Dr. Stephen Greenblatt in collaboration with Charles Mee which references the previous two' ('The *Cardenio* Project: Análisis de Su Puesta En Escena', unpublished essay, 40; private communication). The role of John Fletcher as collaborative author with Shakespeare is seldom mentioned; for most of this essay, of necessity, I follow *The Cardenio Project* in erasing him.

¹⁵ Eguía Armenteros, private communication, as are all further quotes from him unless cited otherwise.

¹⁶ Jesús Eguía Armenteros, 'Proceso de Creación de The Cardenio Project: Relación de los documentos Entregados', unpublished papers about his creation of the play, 1; private communication.

¹⁷ Eguía Armenteros's main character is billed as 'the Author & Psychologist' but I follow the script in referring to him simply as 'Author'.

¹⁸ Jesús Eguía Armenteros, 'The *Cardenio* Project', unpublished playscript for Yelmo de Mambrino Teatro, Alcalá de Henares, 3. Page numbers will be given in the text for further references to the play.

¹⁹ Eguía Armenteros, 'Proceso', 1.

²⁰ This holds true for the other adaptations in the project. 'None of the adaptations remotely resembles the other, and none replicates our own play, though all clearly derive from the narrative materials I had provided and all are, in significant ways, versions of the Cardenio story' (Greenblatt et al., 90).

²¹ Elsewhere in this volume Bernard Richards discusses his decision to stage the rape; Lori Leigh examines the implications of the rape; and Carnegie and Leigh describe the rehearsal exploration of seduction or rape in the Wellington production.

scholar, created the project and uses Shakespeare as the author of focus, it downplays Cervantes's work as the authority and creator of the story.

Yet the game of telephone, and its echoes, becomes apparent in the transition of the story to Spain and Eguía Armenteros's plot. Shakespeare consistently sets up characters, and sets of characters, to mirror each other with opposing outcomes. Greenblatt and Mee followed suit, and Eguía Armenteros's version complicates the idea of mirroring even further. In Eguía Armenteros's play, Luscinda tells the Author that Fernando wants to take her picture. The Author says he doesn't mind, since 'They are only photos. They do not signify anything' (38). Mirrors are both reflection and representation at once. A photograph of Luscinda does not mean anything to the Author because it cannot reveal her truthfully.²² Adaptations of a *Don Quixote* subplot take on a different significance for a Spanish audience when instigated and interpreted through the lens of an international Shakespearean project.

Another mirror is the lead role himself, billed as 'Author and Psychologist' though referred to as Anselmo within the play. This doubling of character allows him to participate actively with both sets of lovers, building Eguía Armenteros's theory that the Curious Impertinent and Cardenio are one.²³ Further, much of the dialogue between Sancho and Quixote occurs while the Author is onstage at his desk. For example, at the beginning of Act 1 Scene 5, the stage direction reads, 'Plaza de España. Quixote and Sancho hide in the bushes. The sound of the computer keyboard can be heard from the Author's cubicle' (12). The Author is silent, doing his work, but the stage direction joins him with Sancho and Quixote and at one point the Author interrupts their scene with 'No, Sancho, no. That's Quixote's part' (13) to control the scene. The Author creates the play in his own mind and composes his thoughts on his laptop, and the audience watches as his visions of Quixote and Sancho become enacted onstage. Helena Gutiérrez notes that 'at the moment in which Quixote has trouble keeping his dreams alive, the Author appears to help you to believe his lies'.²⁴ Both Quixote and Author seemingly create each other, the audience not knowing which is real. This exemplifies Eguía Armenteros's theme of subjectivity; if Quixote and Sancho aren't real, perhaps none of the other characters or the spectators who watch them are real.

Through the course of the play, the Author realizes that it is Quixote who gives meaning to the lovers' lives, and they need him for their stories to be resolved. The play

ends with the Author stating that he 'is lost. He's neither Cardenio nor Anselmo, he is both at the same time. . . . They are a mirror' (65). The Author says that 'Shakespeare mirrors Cervantes', and he and Quixote look at each other fixedly and the Author says 'Quixote I am' (66). This one character is Cardenio, Anselmo, Author, Psychologist, and Quixote all in one. The character is not simply a duo mirror as he is billed (Author/Psychologist), but an amalgam of all of these characters in one body. Because one character encompasses all these personas, he is the creator and the story at the same time. Eguía Armenteros creates this confusion of identity onstage to break down the walls not only between characters but also between the stage and audience. If Quixote imagines his story, he can imagine the audience too. There is not one Author in the play, which mirrors Eguía Armenteros's theme that there is no one playwright of the play. What is real is that the ability to imagine is in playwright and actor, character and audience. The Author's statement that he has 'lost' is a loss of a singular identity. He is not a man without Cardenio and Quixote embodied within his psyche.²⁵ Their dreams are also his, and therefore their agency (or lack of it) makes his questionable as well. Just as Greenblatt's Anselmo announces 'I am Cardenio' (Greenblatt et al., 89), the characters and the authors of the play are mirrors of each other, reflecting each others' work.

Authorship and Authority

Greenblatt's voice is heard overlapping the Author's in the opening scene while the Author stands alone onstage giving a monologue. The voice is within the brain of the Author, telling the Author about Greenblatt's project. In this very postmodern moment, Greenblatt plays himself in the production. The Author speaks Spanish, but the pre-recorded English-speaking voice of Greenblatt explains in English his interest in cultural mobility. Yet the audience did not understand the voiceover, in line with Eguía Armenteros's desire to allow the audience subjectivity about what was being performed rather than the concerns of reality. It is uncommon to have a dialogue in English and Spanish, without translations, in the Spanish theatre,²⁶ and it is certain that Greenblatt could not be recognized by his voice (and most likely not by face or name) to a Spanish audience.²⁷ The authority of the male English voice sets the stage but is not necessarily comprehended by the Author or the audience.

²² Susan Sontag says of knowledge gained through photographs that it will be 'a semblance of knowledge, a semblance of wisdom; as the act of taking pictures is a semblance of appropriation, a semblance of rape'. *On Photography* (New York: Picador, 1977), 84.

²³ Eguía Armenteros believes that 'The Curious Impertinent' is a mirror to the Cardenio plot. This view is expressed through the Author's statement that 'we need to understand them together to get the moral idea' (47). Gutiérrez comments that Cervantes could not afford to put Cardenio and the Curioso face to face as mirrors because of social conventions of courtly love ('The Cardenio Project', 4). This new reading of Cervantes influenced the narrative outcomes of Eguía Armenteros's characters, and the unity that results in his play is an internal quest for completion in contrast to the marital unions of Greenblatt and the older texts.

²⁴ Gutiérrez, 'The Cardenio Project', 43.

²⁵ Like Eguía Armenteros's Author/Psychologist, Greenblatt's first playwriting experience led him to feel at the will of his characters. He articulates the process as 'something that I can only describe as listening to the voices of the characters and transcribing what they had to say' (Greenblatt et al., 86). The characters become empowered with the ability to express and control even as the playwrights are aware that they are the ones writing the story.

²⁶ According to Eguía Armenteros, 'In Madrid the highest number of spectators is registered during the Autumn Festival, but the majority of productions in English have subtitles in Spanish. Nevertheless, to my knowledge, in the theaters of Madrid there never has been a play with synchronized dialogues in English and Spanish like Greenblatt and the Author maintain.'

²⁷ 'In Spain the professors of English have sole knowledge of who Dr. Greenblatt is, and these professors usually do not go to the rooms of alternative theater. In the program of the play there was a small explanation

Later in the play, Greenblatt's image appears behind the Author on a video conference when the Author is blockaded, trapped by his own creations onstage. Greenblatt's dialogue is pre-recorded and timed to appear as if he is in conversation with the Author. Again, Greenblatt speaks English and his appearance at this stage of the play is an interruption to the action. Greenblatt decenters the Author/Psychologist (or perhaps the character of Quixote) as creator of the action on stage. The Author initially looks to Greenblatt like an Orwellian Big Brother, dressed in a suit, who materializes to give directions. The Author questions why Cardenio would have left Luscinda, and Greenblatt says it's in line with the literary genre.²⁸ After the Author explains more about his idea of the Cardenio/Curioso mirroring, Greenblatt nods slowly, and as his image fades away, his voice lingers with 'I have so much interest in read your *Cardenio's* version' (48).²⁹

In the recorded version of the play, the audience can be heard chuckling. Not knowing who Greenblatt is or recognizing the importance of his scholarship, the man on the video conference's interruption is not fully understood by the audience, and the Author is left onstage to make his own conclusions. Yet Greenblatt's role in the play mirrors his role in the project; he is authoritative but absent, enabling others to challenge themselves the way he did, through appropriating a foreign text. Quixote, the Author, Eguía Armenteros, and Greenblatt are all mirrors and reflections, interrupting the plot while instigating it at the same time.

The use of Greenblatt in Eguía Armenteros's play is a device of alienation. In the puzzle of the play, with reality and imagination moving between the Author, Quixote, and the Psychologist, Greenblatt temporarily breaks the confusion for the characters and the audience. Whether reflecting or representing the real Greenblatt, the character's true identity is unimportant; what resonates, according to Eguía Armenteros, is the confusion of reality and fiction. The characters and audience learn that there is no true authorial centre within the play, and that unlike Greenblatt's version, it does not end with happy unions. No one character dominates, and the Author's creative control, Quixote's internal reality, as well as Greenblatt's interruptions, all point to the transitioning authority both in the play and in the global project.

that summarizes scene two: that Greenblatt, a Harvard Professor, had ordered to me to write something on the history of Cardenio. This was the only reference the public had to the project'. The demographic of the audience who chose to see Eguía Armenteros's play during the festival was quite different from those who frequent the Boston A.R.T.

²⁸ The scene opens with Greenblatt saying, 'All these questions are a literary genre convention. I don't understand why are you "blockade"' (46). The Author had not previously seen Greenblatt or asked questions. Greenblatt simply appears on the screen, which had not been used for any other effects, to offer his guidance. (For 'blockade', see next note.)

²⁹ This quotation is taken directly from the 2008 script. The Author says he does not speak English well, and Eguía Armenteros as playwright did not seek to replicate Greenblatt's sophisticated English. In this way Greenblatt too becomes a fictitious character, the authentic Greenblatt not represented onstage. In both the 2009 filmed production and the 2011 published script this line was changed to grammatically correct English.

Transitioning Authority

Greenblatt's project of cultural mobility raises the issue of cultural authority. For both plays the real Cardenio legend doesn't offer much more than a construct for action and plot points with different sets of lovers. Greenblatt and Mee chose to 'take the Anselmo story as our main plot and to give that story a comic resolution' (Greenblatt et al., 89). They candidly acknowledge their influences and sources for their play, from Shakespeare, to his source texts, to their students. Mee said, 'It's really stealing from a common treasury and running it through your own psyche, feeling no particular obligation to being faithful to the person you ripped off'.³⁰ Greenblatt was attracted to this very ability of Mee's to incorporate materials, and refers to him as 'a cunning recycler' (Greenblatt et al., 78). According to Greenblatt, Shakespeare 'reads this astoundingly original work [*Don Quixote*] and takes what he wants, what works best for his purposes', and Greenblatt and Mee follow his example.³¹

Yet Greenblatt initiated an international project in Shakespearean appropriations without having a Shakespearean text. The project was initiated prior to Arden's 2010 publication, and although the forgery theory had been largely discredited (see essays by Jackson, Proudfoot, and Taylor in this volume; but see also Stern's essay), there was no scholarly Shakespearean publisher of *Double Falsehood* at the time. Recognizing *Double Falsehood* as the closest possibility to a Shakespearean text, Eguía Armenteros didn't automatically accept it as superior. 'Regarding Shakespeare and Fletcher, or what of the original text was retained, I have to admit that some monologues seemed a clearly inferior work, conventional, too far from human'. *Double Falsehood's* association with or attribution to Shakespeare wasn't enough to maintain it as a dominant authority for Eguía Armenteros, and the conversations around Arden's publication are at the heart of Eguía Armenteros's themes about reality and control. Paralleling the ongoing discussion about the authenticity of *Double Falsehood* and the recent new scripts created by working with the story of Cardenio, Eguía Armenteros writes a play where the central question concerns the very power to create a story.

Greenblatt conceived the project, and the story's currency derives more from Shakespeare rather than Cervantes's story. Barbara Fuchs claims that 'the quarrels over Shakespeare versus Fletcher, or even a Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration versus a Theobaldian forgery, continue to erase Cervantes and the Spanish influence' (2009, 149). Arden's publication pushed this notion further. While American and British news outlets advertised the 2010 *Double Falsehood* Arden publication as a Shakespearean lost play,³² the major Spanish newspapers connected the Cardenio story and Cervantes.

³⁰ McKittrick, 'Lake Como to Cambridge'.

³¹ J. Peder Zane, 'Treasure Hunt for "Cardenio"', *News and Observer* (Raleigh, NC), 5 February 2009.

³² *The Times Online* ran an article entitled, 'Hoax Shakespeare play Double Falsehood turns out to be the real McCoy' and the *Guardian* announced, '"Shakespeare's lost play" no hoax, says expert' as the title of its article. Even Beth Hale's piece in the *Daily Mail*, 'Shakespeare's "lost" play is published... or is it just a *Double Falsehood*?', which questioned the announcement, only mentioned Cervantes once and focused on the



Figure 19.1 Poster for the A.R.T. Boston production of the Greenblatt/Mee *Cardenio*.

El País, one of Spain's leading newspapers, ran a picture of Cervantes and one of Shakespeare in their article, and although the article is titled, 'A forgotten Shakespeare play appears', the subtitle reads, 'A British professor rescues a play inspired by a lost manuscript of the English genius—Cardenio, a character in *Don Quixote*, is the protagonist of the eighteenth century tragicomedy' (16 Mar. 2010). *ABC*, another leading newspaper, ran the headline, 'A Play Attributed to Shakespeare Inspired by a Character of Cervantes' (16 Mar. 2010). The dual headlining of Shakespeare and Cervantes in Spain points to a cultural consideration of *Double Falsehood*'s appeal as derived from Cervantes's genius as well as Shakespeare's.³³

Shakespeare/Fletcher debate. *The Christian Science Monitor* and Reuters followed suit with little to no mention of Cervantes. See also Hammond's essay in this volume.

³³ The three major newspapers in Spain are *El País*, *El Mundo*, and *ABC*. The articles from *El País* and *ABC* are noted above, but *El Mundo*'s article from the same date (16 March 2010) does not mention Cervantes at all.

This transfer of authority, from Shakespeare back to his source, is also visible in the advertising images for the plays. Greenblatt says that some but by no means all the posters for the other production included an image or a mention of Shakespeare.³⁴ The A.R.T.'s website and all articles on *Cardenio* linked to their site show the main marketing image for Greenblatt's production as a black and white drawing of the feet of a bride and groom (Figure 19.1). Shakespeare's haloed face is inside the ball of the clichéd ball and chain attached to the groom. The only color on the poster is the golden halo and the matching gold title of the play. While the poster doesn't say that *Cardenio* is a play written by Shakespeare, it does not advertise any other writer (Greenblatt or the award-winning playwright Mee) or show any person (character or author) aside from Shakespeare's face.

By contrast, the Spanish poster shows Sancho Panza leaning over the shoulder of the Author/Psychologist, who is wearing Quixote's famous barber's basin helmet (Figure 19.2). The title, *The Cardenio Project*, is printed boldly across the top with only the word 'Cardenio' in red, and the remainder of the poster in black and white. Spanish audiences would recognize the characters of Sancho and Quixote because the Author is wearing the helmet of Mambrino. Both old and new are represented—a laptop and an old fashioned clock sit on the desk. While the Author looks confused, Sancho is smiling, happy in his dreams, with a pastoral backdrop that challenges the realism of a laptop and desk in the same setting. The Author looks to his work on the laptop, and Sancho, as a character of the Author's own creation, happily embraces him from behind. Underneath the name of the theatre on the Spanish poster, it reads, 'A project funded by a Mellon Grant to Professor Stephen Greenblatt of Harvard University' in English. Not only are the names of Greenblatt and Harvard mentioned, but Mellon is too. There is no reference to Shakespeare, no explicit mention of Cervantes, and Greenblatt is the only author referenced. At first glance, the poster sets up an expectation of a Cervantes adaptation, but framed by the three names in English, a foreign, and more specifically, a multicultural, presence becomes established.

The artistic currency that Shakespeare and Cervantes provide is inseparable from the monetary currency that enables further production. By including grant money in this dynamic, Greenblatt became the authority and Mellon money became the means for the project. The issue of money is also embedded in Eguía Armenteros's work. When asked what the main themes of his work were, Eguía Armenteros replied, 'In my last two works [there] are two questions that I always like to cite. In the first, [a character] asks the audience "Can anyone give me an annuity, please?" ... The last sentence of *Don Quixote* and the Author is "What do I have to do to get the life I want?"'. Eguía Armenteros's first question deals with money, and his second with the preoccupation of man to achieve his dreams. Monetary concerns and the dream/reality mirror are intertwined.

³⁴ Greenblatt, private communication.



Figure 19.2 Poster for the Yelmo de Mambrino Teatro production of *The Cardenio Project*.

Celia McGee mentions in her theatre review the monetary exchange involved in Greenblatt's project. She cites 'the \$1.5 million Mellon Foundation grant [Greenblatt] used in part to finance the "Cardenio" project' when assessing the merits of the performance.³⁵ Also, Greenblatt advertises the hefty sum in his recent essay about the project, 'Theatrical Mobility'. He recalls how he offered a portion of the grant to Mee to observe the playwriting process: 'I added that I had received a grant that would enable me to pay—handsomely, by the standards of a working playwright—for this privilege'. But 'Mee declined. He was not interested in money, he said, and he did not particularly like being watched' (Greenblatt et al., 78). Greenblatt then used the grant money that Mee had declined for the Project to commission the plays from all over the world.

³⁵ Celia McGee, 'Shakespearean Brushes Up his Playwriting', *New York Times*, 4 May 2008.

Cultural mobility funded by Mellon currency can be seen as reinforcing American authority in Shakespeare studies. For Fuchs (2009, 156), 'Canon-formation, the apotheosis of the national playwright (or poet, or novelist), and the dissemination of a national tradition are operations that occur in a transnational as well as national context'. Indeed, the first scene in Eguía Armenteros's play involves Fernando and Dorotea discussing an employee-of-the-month programme that Fernando feels is 'for the worker to feel part of a common project' (6). These are not the words or sentiment of the Author, the creator of the characters: these are the words and point of view of the rapist. Greenblatt's quest to involve numerous cultures from around the world is a true illustration that not one culture retains control or dominance.³⁶ Ultimately, *The Cardenio Project* moves authority between Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, Theobald, Greenblatt, Mee, Eguía Armenteros, Harvard, and Mellon. Each of these names carries a different level of prestige in various settings, and the Project ultimately decenters authority, and democratizes it as well.

Eguía Armenteros conclusively moves the centre of authority away from all of these authors. Quixote and the Author together speak the last lines: 'What if [Quixote] is the true Author of all this, even of Cervantes himself, of all of us? What if real life only exists in Quixote's mind and we are nothing but simple spectators imagined by him?' (67). Eguía Armenteros transfers the power of creative authority not to Cervantes or Greenblatt, but to the character of Quixote. The creations of the authors, the characters themselves, are the true authority holders as the story moves between cultures. The battle for authority that the project invites has a resounding winner in Eguía Armenteros's production; it is Quixote.

This does not undermine the power that Shakespeare holds in contemporary global culture. Fuchs (2009, 146) recognizes the fascination with *Double Falsehood* and *Cardenio* by 'the inordinately powerful academic Shakespeare industry'. Shakespeare as a brand name, identifiable and authoritative, creates a stage for others to establish their credibility by successfully reinterpreting his work. Douglas Lanier claims that '"Shakespeare" serves as a trademark for time-tested quality and wisdom, and so it lends legitimacy to whatever it is associated with'.³⁷ I agree with both Fuchs and Lanier, but in the case of a *Quixote* subplot reimagined in Spain, the Spanish adaptation gains strength by association with Cervantes, as well as with Shakespeare.

This is not to suggest that Shakespeare recognition does not carry the same weight in Spain, but it is a recent development in Spain's cultural identity.³⁸ Jose Manuel

³⁶ In Mika Eglinton's analysis of the Japanese adaptation, she too discusses the loss of a dominant cultural authority, stating that 'In this very "un-Shakespearean" play, Bardolatry, self-Orientalism and Japonism were hardly recognizable and neither was the text of Greenblatt and Mee', 'Metamorphoses of "Shakespeare's Lost Play": A Contemporary Japanese Adaptation of *Cardenio*', *Shakespeare*, 7/3 (2011), 340.

³⁷ *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 9.

³⁸ Keith Gregor claims that Shakespeare has not historically been revered or performed in Spain to the extent that he now is. He argues that Spain has embraced Shakespeare on a wider level since the 1990s due to a number of factors, including an expansion of the companies, locations, and approaches to production, with a shift away from the major cities and traditional interpretations to alternative adaptations in more rural

González claims that since the Treaty of London in 1604, Shakespeare and Cervantes 'have stood as national icons that represent and characterize two different nations and cultures though Cervantes has been spared from use as a commodity in the world market'. With their 'cultural and literary coexistence' in Spain, Cervantes and Shakespeare together can only be surpassed by their characters which not only endure, but continue to spark creativity in modern playwrights.³⁹

The Cardenio Project achieves its objective of fostering new work that incorporates texts from across cultures and centuries. Greenblatt instigated the project with an invitation to showcase creativity flowing through cultures, and it opened the door for playwrights from around the world to fortify their names. It passed on not only a story between cultures, but the question of authenticity and authorial power. The project highlights the cultural mobility of both Shakespeare and Cervantes, both of whom took their stories from fables of other cultures. 'Cervantes himself tells the story of Cardenio from an Italian fable, but it does not stop Cervantes from being the author of *Don Quixote*'. 'Cultural mobility' has a long history, and because the term was foregrounded by Greenblatt's scholarship and his examples of Shakespeare's use of it, it now almost exclusively refers to Shakespeare. All the writers whose works were used in the project were arbiters of this same mobility.

Although it is impossible to know the details of Fletcher and Shakespeare's *Cardenio*, hundreds of years later a project bearing Shakespeare's name inspired creativity, currency, and the exchange of ideas. 'Today, no one disputes intertextuality as a process of creation itself,' says Eguía Armenteros. 'Shakespeare' as a name and brand encompasses more than his own work, but Greenblatt's project in cultural mobility proves that the use of Shakespeare's name can foster new ideas about his work and also his source texts. The ongoing discussion and controversies are at the heart of Eguía Armenteros's production, questioning authenticity and Shakespeare's role in a story's currency.⁴⁰ It is through a Shakespeare project that Eguía Armenteros experienced

Quixote and Cervantes in a new way. Lanier claims that 'however we connect the man to the texts, the name "Shakespeare" identifies works that extend beyond what Shakespeare wrote (or what we think he wrote)'.⁴¹ But the project also reaches further back, to *Don Quixote*, the story that enraptured Shakespeare, and it became the source for Eguía Armenteros to expand his ideas and the foundation for a new play. Through centuries of mobility, crossing cultures, and gaining currency, the ultimate triumph is the ability of canonized authors and texts to continue to foster creativity and art. The project challenges the very dominance of Shakespeare that it upholds. Shakespeare's name provides the impetus for the project, yet the 'cult of Shakespeare' is called into question by the influence of other authors. Eguía Armenteros's production challenges the stronghold of Shakespeare within a Shakespeare project, creating a small chip in the 'cult of Shakespeare' that democratizes and decentres artistic authority.

⁴¹ *Shakespeare and Modern Popular Culture*, 8.

towns. He also cites the advent of the festival format and an openness to foreign productions and authors (*Shakespeare in the Spanish Theatre: 1772 to the Present* (London: Continuum, 2010), 1–6). José Manuel González attributes the shift to two major Spanish critical works of the early 1990s that addressed the history of Spain's relationship to Shakespeare, as well as the 1998 cultural celebrations of the 100th anniversary of Lorca's birth, and the Generation of 1898 (who admired Shakespeare). In addition, he argues, the Seventh World Shakespeare Conference held in Valencia in 2001 'brought international acknowledgment of the relevance and significance of Shakespearean scholarship in Spain' (*Spanish Studies in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, ed. González (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006), 10–11).

³⁹ 'What Else After Cervantes and Shakespeare?', *Cervantes and Shakespeare: New Interpretations and Comparative Approaches*, ed. José Manuel González (Alicante: Universidad de Alicante, 2006), 184. Gregor writes that 'Shakespeare is today the most widely performed of all foreign playwrights; that in production terms, his work outscores the combined efforts of all of Spain's classical authors' (*Shakespeare in the Spanish Theatre*, 1).

⁴⁰ For Fuchs, 'The studies of *Double Falshood* are thus symptomatic of a certain cult of Shakespeare that fetishizes the original Bard, the hand of the master, the inimitable creation. Questions of intellectual property, authenticity, and origins are all of paramount importance, but the inquiry itself is carefully charted so that all philological roads lead to Shakespeare' (2009, 145).