An Annotated Bibliography:

Criticism on Ninagawa Shakespeare 1985-2019

Introduction

This annotated bibliography focuses on the criticisms of Shakespeare productions directed by Yukio Ninagawa (1935-2016) since 1985 and aims to contribute to both the research on Ninagawa and recent studies on intercultural Shakespeare. Through this project, it has been found that many scholars criticised Ninagawa Shakespeare productions until the beginning of the twenty-first century, but scholars came to argue Ninagawa Shakespeare favourably after that. By tracing the history of criticism on Ninagawa’s Shakespeare productions, we can see that scholars tried to challenge his intercultural Shakespeare productions by incorporating a new perspective. However, theorising his intercultural Shakespeare adaptations, in which different theatrical modes are co-existing in a play, is still not easy work even in the twenty-first century.

Yukio Ninagawa was one of the world-leading theatre directors who staged thirty-two Shakespeare productions throughout his career. He directed his first Shakespeare production, *Romeo and Juliet*, at Nissei Theatre in Tokyo in 1974. His debut to the
international theatre was at the Edinburgh International Festival in 1985, where he staged his representative work, *Ninagawa Macbeth*. Since his debut, Ninagawa staged Shakespeare productions nineteen times at the foreign theatres throughout his career, including four times for *Ninagawa Macbeth*, twice for *The Tempest* and three times for *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Although Ninagawa mainly directed his productions in Japanese, he also conducted in English twice. One was *King Lear* collaborating with the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) in 1999, and the other was *Hamlet* in 2004. His Shakespeare productions are famous for the beautiful spectacles using Japanese cultural symbols (such as Buddhist altar and Cherry blossom), and Japanese traditional theatre styles, such as *Noh* drama and *Kabuki*.

Ninagawa’s Shakespeare has attracted many theatre critics and audiences worldwide since his first appearance on the international theatre circuit in 1985. However, despite the considerable reputation among theatre critics and audiences, literary scholars did not pay attention to Ninagawa Shakespeare productions seriously. As shown in this bibliography, it took three years after its first performance at Edinburgh for scholars to publish the first academic essay on *Ninagawa Macbeth*, written by Tetsuo Kishi. Nevertheless, Ninagawa Shakespeare has been getting more attention from scholars recently, and scholars become more tolerant towards his works.

Until 2003, scholars tended to disapprove of his productions as they regarded his creations as lacking in the authenticity and relationship between traditional Japanese theatre and Shakespearean original text. As many as half of essays published by 2003 (nine articles out of twenty pieces at that moment) criticised his productions for this reason. Kishi is a typical example, discussing Ninagawa Shakespeare as neither an authentic Shakespeare adaptation nor traditional Japanese theatre.
In the twenty-first century, many scholars have sought the value of Ninagawa Shakespeare as an original play instead of debating the validity of Japanese theatre and authenticity of Shakespeare within his productions. This project detects the majority of essays introduced in this bibliography admire Ninagawa’s works, and the number of those essays is increasing, especially since 2004. Scholars in favour of Ninagawa Shakespeare tend to appreciate the applicability of Shakespearean text when staging through different theatrical styles from the Shakespearean original context, and the new interpretations Ninagawa productions deliver. For example, Minami, who is the first scholar writing an essay from this perspective, pointed out Japanese literary allusions in Ninagawa Macbeth in his unpublished essay in 1991 (#5). Meanwhile, another type of scholars in favour of Ninagawa Shakespeare discusses his productions from a socio-cultural perspective. Although the number is smaller than the previous perspective, this trend continues to present. Scholars in this category analyse Ninagawa productions in the light of the Shakespeare perception in Japan from the Meiji Restoration, Japanese social circumstances after WWII and the influence of globalisation. For example, Andrea J. Nouryeh points out the Japanese dilemma after WWII in Ninagawa Macbeth in 1993(#8). The latest essay in this bibliography, Fielding’s Ph.D. dissertation (#54) in 2018 also discusses contemporary intercultural Shakespeare performances in Japan that reflect the relationship between Japanese and British theatre, and audiences’ responses vary depending on those situations.

Thus, researchers’ perspectives on Ninagawa Shakespeare has changed throughout the period: scholars tend to evaluate Ninagawa Shakespeare bitterly at the end of twenty century but welcomed since the twenty-first century. However, it seems that no theory succeeds to define Ninagawa Shakespeare concretely because of the instability and
interculturality of his productions. In other words, to theorise intercultural Shakespeare productions like Ninagawa’s, another perspective that embraces the diversity of the audiences’ receptions is yet to come.

This annotated bibliography records chronologically fifty-four criticisms including academic essays in M.Phil. and Ph.D. dissertations, academic journals, and books since 1985. The Index covers productions, authors and academic journals mentioned in this annotated bibliography. Appendix 1 introduces abbreviations of all productions presented in this bibliography. Appendix 2 illustrates the performance history of Ninagawa Shakespeare at international theatres. This project was made possible by online databases such as MLA International Bibliography, ProQuest, Jstor, Google Scholar and e-theses websites (British Library EthOs and University of Birmingham eTheses Repository), and also by physical materials at Hokkaido University Library and other universities in Japan by requesting Inter-Library Loan. In addition to those resources, I would like to express special thanks to Ryuta Minami for providing an abstract of his unpublished essay (#5).

Thanks to those resources and generous support from Ryuta Minami, this bibliography can introduce fifty-four articles in total, written by both Japanese scholars (9) and foreign scholars (31).
Appendix1:

List of Abbreviation

AC Anthony and Cleopatra
Cy Cymbeline
Co Coriolanus
H Hamlet
KL King Lear
MND A Midsummer Night’s Dream
NM/ M Ninagawa Macbeth/ Macbeth
NTN Ninagawa Twelfth Night
O Othello
P Pericles
RJ Romeo and Juliet
T Tempest: A Rehearsal on a Noh
Stage in Sado Island
TA Titus and Andronicus
GS General Statement
Appendix 2:

Performance History of Ninagawa Shakespeare in Foreign Theatres:

Year, Name of Work, Place and Features (when needed)

This Performance History of Ninagawa Shakespeare is completed with the following sources. For the features (settings, aesthetic theme, etc.) of each production, this appendix mainly relies on Akishima’s book (Akishima, Yuriko. Yukio Ninagawa and Shakespeare. Kadokawa, 2015.). She describes them in detail alongside the interview with Ninagawa and writes them in Japanese.

For chronological information, this appendix relies on Brokering’s PhD dissertation, Suematsu’s essay and Ninagawa company’s website. Of those three resources, only Brokering’s dissertation is written in English. (Suematsu’s essay is written in Japanese though an English abstract is available.) Brokering’s PhD dissertation covers the performance history of both Ninagawa and Suzuki from 1966 to 2001 in an Appendix, “Chronology of Plays Directed” (pp.322-55) See no.16 (pp.23) for annotation and publication information. Suematsu’s essay covers Ninagawa’s performance history in foreign theatres until 2003. See no.24 (pp.27) for annotation and publication information. Ninagawa company’s website (Ninagawa Company, www.ninagawayukio.com/#works.) covers full chronology of plays performed in both domestic and international theatres.

-1985-

Name of Programme: NINAGAWA Macbeth

Venue: International Theatre Amsterdam (Amsterdam), Royal Lyceum Theatre
Production Feature: Relocating to Azuchi Momoyama period Japan (16-17th century),
Using Buddhist altar and a Cherry Blossom as central aesthetic motives

-1987-
Name of Programme: **NINAGAWA Macbeth**
Venue: National Theatre (London)

-1988-
Name of Programme: **The Tempest: A Rehearsal on Sado’s Noh Stage**
Venue: Playhouse Theatre (Edinburgh)
Production Feature: Relocating to Sado island, Performed as a “Noh rehearsal” and
Prospero is on the stage as a director of the troupe

-1990-
Name of Programme: **NINAGAWA Macbeth**
Venue: BAM Opera house (NY), National Arts Centre (Otawa)

-1992-
Name of Programme: **NINAGAWA Macbeth**
Venue: Kallang Theatre (Singapore)

Name of Programme: **The Tempest: A Rehearsal on Sado’s Noh Stage**
Venue: Barbican Theatre (London)
-1995-

Name of Programme: *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*

Venue: Plymouth Pavilions (Plymouth), Newcastle Playhouse (Newcastle)

Production Feature: Performing on the stage inspired by Stone Gerden of Ryoanji-Temple, employing Kyogeki style (Chinese traditional theatre)

-1996-

Name of Programme: *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*

Venue: Mermaid Theatre (London)

-1998-

Name of Programme: *Hamlet*

Venue: Barbican Theatre (London: part of Barbican International Theatre Event)

Production Feature: Locating a huge staircase on the centre of the stage which turns to be a Hinadan when playing *The Murder of Gonzago* (a regicide tale within the play)

-1999-

Name of Production: *King Lear*

Venue: Barbican Theatre (London), Royal Shakespeare Theatre (Stratford-upon-Avon)

Production Feature: Collaboration with Royal Shakespeare Company, Casting English actors except for Hiroyuki Sanada (The Fool), Locating a huge pine tree on the centre of the stage as a motif of the play
-2002-

Name of Production: *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*

Venue: Maison de la culture du Japon à Paris (Paris)

Name of Production: *Macbeth*

Venue: BAM Howard Gilman Opera house (New York)

-2003-

Name of Production: *Pericles*

Venue: National Theatre (London)

Production Feature: Starting the play as the war (bombing, blaring the siren and casts looking exhausted and suffering), *P* was told as a fairly-tale, Incorporating Noh, Bunraku and other Japanese traditional theatre into the play

-2004-

Name of Production: *Hamlet* (UK version)

Venue: Theatre Royal Plymouth Lighthouse, Poole’s center for the Arts (Poole), The Lowry (Salford), Barbican theatre(London), Theatre Royal Nottingham (Nottingham), Theatre Royal Bath (Bath)

Production Feature: English production, Not drowing vivid spectacles compared to previous *H*

-2006-

Name of Production: *Titus Andronicus*
Venue: Royal Shakespeare Theatre (Stratford Upon Avon), Theatre Royal Plymouth (Plymouth)


-2007-

Name of Production: Coriolanus

Venue: Barbican theatre (London)

Production Feature: Relocating from Rome to an imaginary country where Asian cultures are fused, locating a huge mirror for reflecting audience and creating a sense of unity in the theatre

-2009-

Name of Production: NINAGAWA Twelfth Night

Venue: Barbican theatre (London)

Production Feature: Staged through Kabuki style, Casting Kabuki actors for every role, and employing staffs who are dedicated to Kabuki

-2011-

Name of Production: Anthony and Cleopatra

Venue: LG Arts Centre (Seoul)

Production Feature: Putting some statues which represent each city depicted in the play: the wolves (Rome), Sphinx (Egypt) and Zeus (Athens)
-2012-

Name of Production: *Cymbeline*

Venue: Barbican Theatre (London)

Production Feature: A part of London 2012 Festival, Change the cedar to the pine tree, as the pine tree which encouraged Japanese people when the Great East Japan Earthquake occurred, Hang the picture of “appraisal on a rainy night” from Genji-tale on the wall

-2015-

Name of Production: *Hamlet*

Venue: National Theatre and Concert Hall (Taipei), Barbican Theatre (London)

Production Feature: Relocating to the poor household in 19th century Japan when H was imported in Japan

-2017-

Name of Production: *NINAGAWA Macbeth*

Venue: Barbican Theatre (London), Theatre Royal (Plymouth), Esplande Theatres On the Bay (Singapore)

Production Feature: Ninagawa’s memorial tour, Staged by same casts as NM (2015) that toured in Japan

-2018-

Name of Production: *NINAGAWA Macbeth*

Venue: David H. Koch Theater, Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts (NY)
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-1985-
Not found

-1986-
Not found

-1987-
Not found

-1988-


[NM]

Suggests that the nature of NM is thoroughly modern even though it is relocated to 16th century Japan and is inspired by Kabuki style. Kishi argues that NM shared the
same nature with Western realistic and modernist theatre in both aesthetic and performative aspects. Kishi points out that this is affected by the Shakespeare reception in Japan in which Japanese English Literary scholars learnt Shakespeare performance from Victorian staging style that focused on visual images more than the power of words.

-1989-


States that T at Edinburgh Festival was not merely exciting but disappointing. Berkowitz argues that the way Ninagawa fused Western and Japanese elements worked effectively in the play, such as music, acting style (*Noh* and Western realistic style) and characterization. However, Berkowitz suggests that action of Caliban and the two clowns are less impressive in the play as the differences between Western and Japanese in their actions are not striking and their scene seemed monotonous.

-1990-

Not found

-1991-
Appreciates oriental beauty and spectacular direction of Ninagawa’s *Macbeth* staged at Opera House in Brooklyn Academy of Music on the 20th of October in 1990. However, Frank also poses a question about authenticity of Shakespeare in this production, because of being set in sixteenth century of Japan, presence of additional characters, and different interpretation of character’s feeling.

Suggests that Ninagawa succeeded in staging NM, although *Macbeth* is one of the difficult Shakespeare plays to stage successfully as recent audiences tend to dislike Macbeth’s immoral acts, and the play requires popular actors for its title role. Kliman argues the reason why Ninagawa succeeded is that he made NM itself entertaining by enriching the visual image and the sound during the play.
Examines how Ninagawa staged *Macbeth* for Japanese audiences who are not familiar with Shakespeare’s rhetoric in the play. Minami argues that Ninagawa expressed Shakespeare’s rhetoric by spectacles that are created based on his “cultural interpretation” for Japanese audiences. As he is faithful to the text except for cultural translation, many theatre critics admired *NM* staged at Edinburgh Festival especially in terms of its spectacles. However, Minami also poses the question about how to evaluate Ninagawa’s cultural interpretation. (Unofficial Japanese abstract by Ryuta Minami received on 08/07/2019)


Examines Shozo Sato, who staged Shakespeare, Euripides and Homer’s *Iliad* through *Kabuki* to encourage western audiences to understand *Kabuki* easily, and his contribution to recent intercultural theatre. He discusses Ninagawa’s Shakespeare productions as one of the examples of the variety of contemporary intercultural Shakespeare’s directions. (ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I, search-proquest-com.ezoris.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/docview/303977356?accountid=16200.) (Accessed 09/23/2019)

Explores the complexity of cultural translation of *NM*. Even though *NM* was staged through Japanese theatre tradition and filled with Japanese allusion, according to Mulryne, it also appeals to Western audiences as Ninagawa’s interpretation is based on his experience and it can be shared with even Western audiences. Mulryne also argues that *NM* that imbued with allusions of the contemporary, personal and Japanese culture reflects the complicated process of his interpreting process of Western theatre.

-1993-


Suggests that the different styles of staging Shakespeare in Japan reflect the social circumstances of Japan. He argues that *NM* is “his most important interpretation of Shakespeare to date” whose hybridity represents the dilemma that modern Japan faced between keeping its own tradition and developing by absorbing Western culture.

Argues that Kurosawa’s *Throne of Blood* and Ninagawa’s *NM* are successful adaptations of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, establishing the authenticity of Shakespeare even in a different language and under different cultural conditions. By comparing with other Macbeth productions by Western directors (Orson Welles, Roman Polanski, and Trevor Nunn), Matsuo figures out that Kurosawa and Ninagawa’s *NM* have both similarities and differences with Western productions. He also insists that Non-Japanese audiences should learn cultural background of those plays to avoid misinterpretation and over-evaluation.
Argues that although many Western theatre critics admire the fusion of Japanese and Shakespeare in Ninagawa’s productions, Ninagawa ignores both the contexts of Japanese traditional theatrical styles (Noh and Kabuki) and the principles of Shakespeare. To adopt Shakespeare to Japanese theatrical forms properly, Kishi proposes three possible ways: utilizing the conventions and practices perfectly, casting the well-trained actors of that theatrical style (Noh or Kabuki etc), creating the style resonating with Shakespeare’s theatrical language, and the notion of acting space.


Raises some questions surrounding intercultural performances of Shakespeare, such as whether Shakespearean dramas that deviate from original language or culture can still be regarded as Shakespeare, by referring to Ninagawa’s T. He insists that Ninagawa’s T, which seems quite extraordinary itself to be regarded as Shakespeare, still can be regarded as a Shakespearean play if one sees it in the light of
Shakespearean performance history in Japan.


Insists that Asian theatre styles cannot stage Shakespeare properly, though there are some superficial similarities between them, and many theatre practitioners explore Shakespeare through Asian theatre. Tian argues that Asian directors approach Shakespeare through two ways: incorporating Asian indigenous theatre into Shakespeare partially, and staging Shakespeare in consonance with Asian indigenous theatre. According to him, Ninagawa approached Shakespeare by the former method, in which he incorporated Kabuki techniques into *NM*.

-1999-

Not found

-2000-

Not found

-2001-

Proposes a question about definition of “Japanese” Shakespeare. Anzai argues that NM is not merely a hybrid of Shakespeare and Japanese culture as NM cannot be completed without Ninagawa’s imagination, which incorporates his mind and personal experiences into the play. In this sense, he concludes that we should not label Ninagawa’s production as just “Japanese Shakespeare.”


Describing Ninagawa’s Shakespeare as “incomplete and illusory,” Kennedy understands Ninagawa’s purpose in fusing several theatre modes is to break down the border between them. However, he argues that for directors who fuse different cultures into the play, such as Mnoushkine and Ninagawa, culture is “a matter of aesthetic choice” so that they collage them to sell to global spectators and their fusions lack consistency.

-2002-

Suggests that Ninagawa and Suzuki succeed in staging Western classical plays, including Shakespeare and Euripides, in Japanese indigenous theatrical forms by fixing their forms to adopt to contemporary intercultural theatre with accurate understanding of both Japanese and Western theatricality. Brokering argues that their productions attract not only Japanese but also Western theatre practitioners who are encouraged to improve realistic theatre practice.


Explores the anxiety arising from intercultural Shakespeare productions. Dawson argues that postmodern theatre directors such as Ninagawa, who combines intercultural elements within a play, tend to be criticized for ignoring the meaning of traditional theatre elements when creating their own original Shakespeare plays by using several theatre styles.

Argues that Shakespeare’s acceptance varies among Asian countries (Japan, China and India) by reflecting their different experiences. Borrowing from Brandon’s three clarifications of Shakespeare acceptance process, authors explore how Shakespeare has been staged in Japan and mentions “inter-Asian productions” in the first six pages of this essay. According to authors, Ninagawa used the imitation of both Kabuki and Noh rather than those authentic theatres.


Suggests that Macbeth has all the elements representing Ninagawa’s style, such as spectacular settings and combination of ancient and modern images, but does not evoke the emotion that appeals to audiences inherently in comparison with NM. Though Kliman appreciates Ninagawa’s unique interpretation of M, he suggests that Ninagawa’s direction in sound effects lack coherent between each song.

-2003-

Reviews Warner’s *Medea* and Ninagawa’s *M* staged at the BAM (Brooklyn Academy of Music) New Wave Festival. Walsh argues that even though both plays are gorgeous spectacles, they lack a connection to the plays’ contents. He also suggests that those directors define “theatricality” as spectacle only: they do not use “theatricality” to tackle the problems and difficulties those plays raise.

---


Suggests that amongst many *Macbeth* performances staged through Japanese traditional theatre modes, *NM* is outstanding, as Ninagawa fused both Japanese and Western theatre elements effectively in *NM*. Harvey and Kliman argue that most theatre critics appreciated the stage design, but they did not understand it in depth, such as the connotations of his theatrical representation and the principle of Ninagawa’s direction that interweaves his personal and Japanese symbolism.

Describes Ninagawa as a “scenic writer” who illustrates Prospero’s magic effectively by stressing colours, sound and gestures. Horowitz also argues that although he changes the play to make Japanese audiences understand Shakespeare’s T easily by relocating the setting to Sado island in Japan and incorporating Noh, Kabuki and Kyogen into the play, Ninagawa is still faithful to Shakespeare’s original text. As Ninagawa’s interpretation successfully fits into the play, it is still easy to follow the play for Non-Japanese audiences even though it was staged in Japanese.


Argues that despite the popularity among theatregoers and critics, Ninagawa’s Shakespeare productions are often regarded as “unscrupulous orientalism” that caters to western audiences. However, Im insists that Ninagawa’s success does not result from such orientalism, but rather from similarities with Victorian theatre: traditional interpretation, rich spectacles, star-performers, and populist commercialism.

Examines the reviews of Western theatre critics on Ninagawa’s four Shakespeare productions and considers the factors of his success in foreign theatres. Suematsu points out that although Ninagawa received positive reviews on the spectacles, most negative reviews also came from his excessive dependence on spectacles and light and sound effects. Especially, *KL* was criticised by most theatre critics for the dissonance between Japanese direction and Western actors.

-2005-


Argues that the universality of Shakespeare is transmissible even in different theatrical forms although form plays a significant role in theatre. Im claims that while there are similarities between Western and Eastern intercultural Shakespeare productions, they are differentiated from each other in the way of arranging and signifying both cultures and chronotopes. Ninagawa’s productions are discussed to point out the features of Eastern Shakespeare theatre. (*ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I*, search-proquest-com.ezoris.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/docview/301712254?accountid=16200.) (Accessed 09/23/2019)
Suggests that Ninagawa’s approaches to Shakespeare’s plays depends so much on spectacles that he tends to ignore the allusion or character’s insight that cannot be expressed visually. Also he does not pay attention to Shakespeare’s dependence on words. Kishi and Bradshaw also point out that English theatre critics admired Ninagawa’s productions acted in Japanese because they could not understand what the actors said and could concentrate on Ninagawa’s spectacular scenography and sound effects; however, they disliked Ninagawa’s production in English because they could understand perfectly.

Examines several approaches to the same Shakespeare plays and considers the ambiguity that Shakespeare’s plays embrace by observing multiple *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Macbeth*, and *Measure for Measure*. Tatspaugh mentions that only Ninagawa uses the setting which alludes to “Denmark’s prison” explicitly, while the three directors (Michael Boyd, Trevor Nunn and Yukio Ninagawa) use the settings having the same structure as prison (high imprisoning wall and numerous doors).

Suggests that Ninagawa’s *T* draws “the international trade route of Shakespeare” between England and Japan: his *T* reflected how Shakespeare has been performed in Japan, and conversely it exported to England and attracted Western audiences. According to Young, Ninagawa succeeded in moving audiences between “familiar relation” and “strangeness and remoteness,” and “identification and alienation” by employing several Japanese theatre forms (*Noh, Kabuki* and *Shingeki*) with Shakespeare. For the problem about authenticity arising from intercultural Shakespeare performances, Young insists that Shakespeare’s authenticity is still transmissible to other theatrical forms due to his universality.

-2006-


Suggests that *P* is staged in three ways: staging as a romantic production, emphasizing political meaning and exaggerating the deficiencies of the play.
Amongst those staging methods, Gossett finds that Ninagawa incorporated both political and romantic themes into the play. She argues that the opening scene may allude to the Iraq war that started at almost the same time as the play started performance at the National Theatre. As a romantic element, Ninagawa’s $P$ represents “the romance themes of loss and restoration.”

-2007-


Examines how Ninagawa succeeded in fusing Japanism into Shakespeare’s Hamlet. Brokering admires Ninagawa’s challenge to mitigate the artificiality of Japanese actors/actresses mimicking western theatre by starting the play by showcasing the backstage where they prepared for the play. He also admires Ninagawa’s use of Hinadan (doll tiers), which anticipates the fateful of characters, aristocratic hierarchy and the stairways of the castle of Elsinore. However, he still suggests that extravagance in Ninagawa’s direction and “uncontrolled intensity” in acting cause inconsistency within the play.

Insists on the importance of researching localities of Shakespeare, for it broadens the dimension of Shakespeare studies as it reflects shifting histories and localities. Huang argues that recent intercultural Shakespeare, including Ninagawa’s productions, illustrate that staging Shakespeare represents the transition process between the “locality” described in the original text and the “locality” that directors, performers, and audiences represent.


Explores the previous discussions about intercultural Shakespeare performances and figures out factors that attract international theatre directors to Shakespeare. Im argues that though intercultural Shakespeare risks the danger of being regarded as a new mode of orientalism, it attracts many international directors due to the universality his text conveys, and that the label of Shakespeare can attract Western audiences. Im argues that Ninagawa is an example of a director who was accused of creating his intercultural Shakespeare productions to attract Western audiences.
Explores Ninagawa’s spirits throughout his career as a playwright. Kawai suggests that Ninagawa’s emphasis in direction has gradually changed from spectacles to performance of actors throughout his career. His motto in directing Shakespearean plays remain the same: to popularize Shakespeare in Japan, to reveal Shakespeare’s features (vulgar, subversive, lofty and poetic) fully and to be faithful to Shakespeare’s intensity.

-2009-


Compares Ninagawa’s *MND* with Yang Jung-ung’s *Yohangza* (Voyagers) company’s one which is one of the popular productions in Korea. Gallimore points out that portraying the fairies is challenging through Japanese and Korean indigenous theatrical style as they do not have any equivalent motives in their own cultures.

-2010-

Categorizes staging styles of Shakespeare in Asia into three forms: “Canonical Shakespeare,” “Indigenous Shakespeare” and “Intercultural Shakespeare.” Brandon introduces Ninagawa’s productions as successful examples of “Intercultural Shakespeare” in which directors stage Shakespeare through indigenous theatrical style while keeping authenticity of original Shakespearean text. According to Brandon, intercultural Shakespeare raises the matter of “tradition” that misleads audiences to believe the plays are merely products of culture or society, while in fact those plays are created by directors’ imagination and creativity.


Suggests the need to redefine “foreign” when we call “foreign Shakespeare.” Minami argues that, by comparing Ninagawa’s *NTN* and Shakespeare’s original *TN*, revising and renewing are inevitable to perform Shakespeare in Japan. However, Minami also insists that we need to consider the approach to localization and intercultural Shakespeare performances. (DBpia, dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE0160679.) (Accessed 23/09/2019)

Argues that Shakespeare has been staged repeatedly in modern Japan responding to the shifting needs. In *NTN*, Ninagawa tried to revive the popularity of *Kabuki* as contemporary theatre. Minami suggests that *NTN* is a successful example of *Kabuki* styled Shakespeare as Ninagawa succeeded in balancing both values of Shakespeare and *Kabuki*. Minami also finds out that Ninagawa’s attempt to stage both *Kabuki* and Shakespeare’s *TN* represents Ninagawa’s attitude to conquer the anxiety of not belonging to either Japanese tradition or Western tradition.


Suggests that Ninagawa initiated the new style of staging Shakespeare replacing *Shingeki* and the new trend of “Japanized Shakespeare.” Suematsu argues that although Ninagawa insists that his Japanized Shakespeare is for Japanese audiences, not for Western, he knows the oriental and exotic Shakespeare is more appealing to Western audiences as he increased “a Japanese favour” when staging in Britain.
Suggests that although Ninagawa has developed a considerable reputation for his Western and Japanese fused style of Shakespeare, his intercultural Shakespeare has received many criticisms that regard Ninagawa’s works as neither Shakespeare nor truly Japanese style. Borlik, however, argues that Ninagawa’s adaptations, including Shakespeare and Cristopher Marlowe, are worth being discussed as they reflect “the quandaries of international theatre.”

Explores how contemporary Asian directors approach violence Shakespeare depicts in his plays by analysing several TA directed by Asian theatre directors. Choy argues that Ninagawa staged TA as “the art of victim” derived from the use of colour and music. He also points out that from Non-Japanese Asian perspective, the act of redemption seems to allude to Japan as a victim of WWII that realized their guilt for
starting the war and killing people in neighbouring countries.


Points out that Ninagawa succeeded in staging Shakespeare’s play for Japanese audience—he refers to *T, KL, H* and *TN* here—by creating vivid visual images that utilize Japanese common understanding. Ruperti also suggests that Ninagawa’s scenography is valuable to Western audience as well, because it gives them new interpretation and perspective of Shakespeare’s play.

-2012-


Points out “the subordination of language” in Ninagawa’s *MND*. Gallimore notices that Ninagawa uses the music for his purpose—to illustrate and underline the dramatic action—in directing Shakespeare. However, he suggests that Ninagawa’s use of music and other kinds of sound effects outweigh the role of voice as they lead audiences to focus on listening to the music rather than the words of actors.
Suggests that Ninagawa succeeded in fusing Shakespeare and Kabuki. Furuya argues that both Shakespeare and Kabuki elements do not compromise each other, but rather each enriches the other in NTN. According to Furuya, Ninagawa developed Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night by employing modern comic elements, Kabuki style costumes and other visual effects.

Insists that critics and scholars should evaluate Ninagawa’s productions for the double impacts of “Shakespeare on Ninagawa” and of “Ninagawa on Japanese and Worldwide appreciation of Shakespeare,” not for authenticity of Shakespeare in his plays nor the Western versus East dichotomy. Huang analyses aesthetic features of Ninagawa’s production according to four categories: the use of visual images, sound, Japanese theatrical elements, and mirrors, and he argues that Ninagawa’s oriental Shakespeare results from Japanese cultural restoration after World War II when
Japanese citizens tried to modernize their own country by borrowing Western culture.


Insists on the significance of Asian Shakespeare in theatre studies as it can broaden the field to the global context. Huang explores the difficulties and benefits of Asian Shakespeare productions on international tours through the analysis of Asian Shakespeare’s reception in Britain. As a difficulty of Asian Shakespeare, Huang shows the low accessibility of cultural symbolism, suggesting *NM* as a play that can be confusing depending on the level of audience’s knowledge of Japanese symbolism.


Explores several T performances directed by Japanese directors to examine how
Shakespeare is staged through Japanese traditional theatre forms. Osashima analyses the visual allusion in Ninagawa’s *Tempest* alongside the history of the setting on Sado island and explanation of Japanese art traditions (*Noh, Kabuki, prose* etc). He asserts that Ninagawa succeeded in fusing different Japanese traditional theatrical elements with Shakespeare’s play in staging *The Tempest*.


Argues that *Kabuki* is one of the approaches to stage Shakespeare that prevents a Euro-centric notion spreading in Shakespeare theatre, opening up Shakespeare’s theatricality that realism cannot express. Pronko claims that Mnouchkine’s *Richard II* and Ninagawa’s *Macbeth* exemplify successful Shakespeare productions fusing with *Kabuki*. Although both productions use *Kabuki* theatricality in staging Shakespeare, he found several differences in the use of spectacles, acting styles, music and costumes.

-2014-

Not found

-2015-


Suggests that *Kabuki* and *Kyogen* discover Shakespeare by transforming those traditional styles. Kawai states that *NTN* is the first *Kabuki* adaptation of a Shakespeare play performed since 1936. Also, he mentions that *NTN* is different from other *Kabuki* Shakespeare as Ninagawa staged Shakespeare’s *TN* through authentic *Kabuki* acting style while keeping faithful to the Shakespearean original text.


Introduces the two *Tempest* plays staged by Japanese directors. Yukio Ninagawa and Minoru Fujita describe the challenges and benefits of intercultural Shakespeare productions. Vaughan suggests that Ninagawa’s *T*, in which Traditional Japanese, Shakespearean and contemporary acting styles are fused, can create a kind of “alienation effect” for both Japanese and Non-Japanese audiences.

-2016-

Introduces Ninagawa as one of the influential directors of *Macbeth* in comparison to Akira Kurosawa and Roman Polanski. Braunmuller refers to Ninagawa’s Japanese cultural orientation within *Macbeth* as a key to his production’s success in Western theatre and finds that Ninagawa’s *Macbeth*, especially in terms of thematizing cherry blossoms in the play, contains both Akira Kurosawa emphasis on fatality in his cinematic production based on *Macbeth* and Polanski’s emphasis on repetition.


Argues that *NM* is significant not only as the milestone for Ninagawa’s career, but also because it represents the improvement of Japanese Shakespeare and it led to the spreading of Japanese culture. Gallimore suggests that *NM*’s success results from Ninagawa’s bold direction, performers’ articulate acting, its stage design and the interpretation of Shakespeare’s original text.

Argues that Shakespeare has affected Japanese writers and directors since his plays first arrived in Japan in the Meiji period. Kawachi suggests that Ninagawa and Suzuki are examples of directors who pioneered staging Shakespeare in a cross-cultural style, but they approached Shakespeare differently: Ninagawa’s productions are gorgeous and beautiful, while Suzuki’s are rather simple and stoic.


Indicates that Ninagawa incorporates new techniques and interpretations into *Hamlet*. Kawai argues that in addition to Japanese elements employed in Ninagawa’s previous Hamlet, such as *Hina*-doll exhibition, *Furi-otoshi* (a Kabuki technique that drops off a huge curtain), and *mizugori* (cold-water ablutions), which represent Japanese way of regret, were added. He points out that Ophelia (Hikari Michishima) also incorporates her curiosity about Hamlet’s feeling into the previous interpretation of her character (obedient and submissive).
Analyses R II especially in terms of the mixture of different generations in the play. Shevtsova points out that Ninagawa’s direction, which thematizes the whole constituent elements of human-beings, such as youth and age, ability and disability, social and physical power, and whose loss, life and death, reflected his poor health condition at that moment, and that is also a shared notion with Shakespeare’s Richard II.

-2017-

Not found

-2018-


Examines contemporary Shakespeare performances in Japan in the social and political context. Fielding suggests the intercultural Shakespeare performances in contemporary Japan reflect the relationship between Japanese and British theatre, and
audience respond to Shakespeare productions differently depending on those situations. Ninagawa Shakespeare productions in the latter part of his career are discussed to explore how his Shakespeare productions respond to social difficulties younger generations struggle with. (University of Birmingham eTheses Repository, etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8656/) (Accessed 09/23/2019)
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