

Local Shakespeares, Shakespearean Locales

Judy Celine Ick

This essay interrogates the discrepant geographies of the American colonial enterprise in the Philippines. Orthodox versions of colonialism posit a center/capital from which it emanates; the record of Shakespearean performances in the Philippines, however, proves the opposite true. While Manila was unquestionably the center of colonial bureaucracy and its institutions, colonial dramatic culture, particularly Shakespearean drama, seems to have taken a trip to the peripheries of Negros Oriental. The cross-cultural costuming employed in Shakespearean performances in colonial Negros, however, opens up a potential, albeit subtle, site of subversion. The essay examines costumes, an intrinsic feature of drama, in the context of its locations, and exposes this aesthetic tool as a potential site of colonial counter-exotization and resistance.

THE FINAL FRAMES OF THE OSCAR AWARD-WINNING FILM, *Shakespeare in Love*, feature Shakespeare's supposed lover, Viola, walking the expansive seashores of the New World. Through this character, the film suggests that the essence of Shakespeare crosses the Atlantic and settles in the Virginia colony. After all, in the logic of the film, only when Shakespeare falls magically in love with this Viola does he come into his own. Before he meets her, he is suffering from debilitating writer's block and is in the process of trying to write a play rather unpromisingly entitled *Romeo and Ethel, the Pirate's Daughter*. It is when he falls in love with Viola that he 'becomes' Shakespeare—the intense romantic who wrote *Romeo and Juliet* and creates what is (at least in this version of things) the greatest love story ever told. In effect, this Viola who later migrates to the vast shores of America really creates Shakespeare in the first place.

JUDY CELINE ICK obtained her PhD in English from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. She teaches at the Department of English Studies and Comparative Literature, University of the Philippines.

In an ingenious conflation of mythologies, the final scene of the film blends the seashores of Illyria—that land of magical possibilities recalled in the cross-dressing lover, Viola, and her namesake in *Twelfth Night* who is shipwrecked on the coast of Illyria—into the shores of America. Like Illyria, America too is this romantic land of magical possibilities. Furthermore, the film powerfully merges the migration of Shakespeare's soul with the colonialist enterprise. What this final landscape affirms is the complicity of the cultural icon, 'Shakespeare', in the creation of America itself. Shakespeare, along with Virginia tobacco, is planted firmly on American soil.¹

A quick consideration of another idealized landscape, albeit a more real piece of quintessentially American soil, illustrates the deep-seated imagination of Shakespeare as a rightfully American institution. In Washington DC, amidst the buildings housing the institutions of federal government, stands a peculiar shrine. The Folger Shakespeare Library, located one block from the Capitol and across the street from the Supreme Court building and behind the Library of Congress, solidly situates Shakespeare among these other institutions that legitimize the nation. No other author—American or otherwise—is thus enshrined in this nation's capital.

The history of the American appropriation of Shakespeare is long and complicated and need not concern us in detail here.² The setting up of the Folger Library is a significant highlight of this process only as it was historically simultaneous with yet another American process enshrining Shakespeare elsewhere. As Henry Clay Folger was scouring the great manors of Britain, buying off the libraries of its faded aristocracy with his spanking new American capital, an American controlled educational system in the Philippines was busy spreading Shakespeare in schoolrooms across the colony. Just as Shakespeare was used to validate New World, American culture, it was also used to 'create' culture in new American worlds.³ By the time the Folger Library was inaugurated in its present location in 1932, Shakespeare had already oc-

Just as Shakespeare was used to validate New World, American culture, it was also used to 'create' culture in new American worlds.

cupied a solid place in the Philippine educational system. The geographic landscape of Washington DC has been imaginatively reproduced in the cultural landscape created in America's colony in the Philippines.

LANDSCAPES: ACADEMIC AND DRAMATIC

THAT cultural landscape is created largely through the colonial educational apparatus. As early as 1904, Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* and *Julius Caesar* had been securely established in the secondary school curricula of all public schools in the islands through the *Courses of Instruction* prescribed by the General Superintendent of Education, David Barrows (Bureau of Education 1904). These plays are two of only four literary works specifically cited by this landmark text that will shape educational policy for decades to come.⁴ When the Americans brought all the other institutions of Washington to the Philippines, they also brought Shakespeare along with them.

For practical reasons, Barrows explains in this document, the colonial educational system is unable to provide instruction in classical languages. Instead, the civilizing goals of classical education are to be transferred on to English Literature and, by implication, Shakespeare.

While in the United States, we depend, in our training of the youth, upon Latin and Greek for giving breadth of mind and depth of intellectual and moral insight, here in the Philippines we must depend upon English literature for these same purposes. It is believed that English is adequate to impart these essentials of education, both in disciplinary and spiritual aspects.⁵ (Bureau of Education 1904)

Curiously, English literature, presumably meaning literature written in English by either British or American authors (following the specific examples given by Barrows himself) is unproblematically endowed with the same qualities as classical literatures. The cultural specificities of Greek or Latin or British or American literatures matter little. Neither does the thousand or so years of world history between these literary traditions. The relevance of these literatures to the Filipino schoolchild at the beginning of this century was of no consequence. The category

of the literary is magically invested with universal qualities that remain the same across cultures, even languages, anyway.

This universalizing tendency is a familiar enough strategy of the colonial educational process. Flattening out all conflict to a personal and common humanity, colonial literary education succeeds in erasing the threat of specific recognition. 'The focus...upon character and interiority', Martin Orkin (1991) reasons in *Drama and the South African State*, 'encourages in students a particular view of the subject and attitudes of withdrawal and submission to existing hierarchies.'

By 1933, the Bureau of Education's deep-seated faith in the aims of literary education and Shakespeare's pivotal role in furthering those aims has become clearly evident in the *Course of Study in Literature for Secondary Schools* it released that year. Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* is firmly entrenched in the secondary curriculum and the *Course of Study* contains elaborate discussions on how the play is to be taught so that students may 'enjoy Shakespeare through a realization of the human qualities of his characters and their universal appeal' (Bureau of Education 1933). Even further, it demonstrates that the assumption of literature's 'universality' has taken firm root in the literary education of the colony. In talking about the aims of teaching literature in general, it specifically uses Shakespeare to illustrate those goals:

Are you teaching *The Merchant of Venice*? How keenly do your pupils actually realize all that Shylock must have felt during the trial? Or what Bassanio must have felt, after his success in winning Portia, upon the arrival of the messenger with the news that his friend's life must be the price of that success? (Bureau of Education 1933)

Apparently, reading Shakespeare in the colonial classroom was enough to produce an affective identification with his characters regardless of the historical and cultural specificities of the text and its readers.

This affective identification was further encouraged by the staging of Shakespearean plays in schools. The performance history of Shakespeare in the Philippines is a concrete measure of the Bard's popularity in its educational institutions. In 1910, *As You Like It* was performed by students of the Philippine Normal School (Jamias 1962). In the same year, students at the Ateneo De Manila staged *The Mer-*

chant of Venice (Bernad 1977). In 1911, the Pyramus and Thisbe scene from Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and excerpts from *Julius Caesar* were staged by students at the Silliman Institute in Dumaguete (Carson 1965).⁶ In the following year, the students at Silliman

The performance history of Shakespeare in the Philippines is a concrete measure of the Bard's popularity in its educational institutions.

staged a full-length version of *The Merchant of Venice* (Carson 1965 & 1913). The same play was also performed by an all-female cast at St Theresa's College in Manila in 1924 (Bernad 1977). The Ateneo de Manila presented a number of Shakespearean plays through the colonial years: *Richard III* in 1917, *Julius Caesar* in 1921 and 1930, *Macbeth* in 1923, and

King Lear in 1933 (Bernad 1977). In Dumaguete, the Silliman Institute had an even more spectacular record of Shakespearean performance. In the second decade of colonial rule alone, Silliman produced versions of *Merchant of Venice* in 1912, *Julius Caesar* in 1911 and 1916, *Macbeth* in 1914, *Othello* in 1915, and *Hamlet* in 1918.⁷ Writing in 1955 on the performance history of Shakespeare in the islands, Jean Edades observed that 'the Philippines is the only country in the world which may be termed English-speaking which has never enjoyed a production of a Shakespeare play outside the walls of a school.'⁸

Curiously absent from the list is the University of the Philippines (UP). Supposedly the flagship institution of American colonial education, the scarcity of Shakespearean performances in the State University is rather puzzling. In terms of its deployment of Shakespeare in enhancing and creating its academic and cultural landscape, UP suffers in comparison with Silliman, another decidedly American institution.⁹ Furthermore, the disparities in Shakespearean performances between these institutions point to the fact that the enactment of colonial education policies produced uneven results. There is greater variety in the cultural landscape than simplistic versions of the colonial process allow. Interestingly, the supposedly universal Shakespeare apparently has very specific local applications.

SHAKESPEAREAN LANDSCAPES: STAGE AND PAGE

SHAKESPEARE was not entirely absent from the UP. It was (and is) clearly a pedagogical presence. The course on Shakespeare—English 13—has been in existence in the University Catalogues from 1912 onwards. It is the only single author course listed in the University Catalogues throughout the period.¹⁰ The rhetoric of Shakespeare certainly permeated UP life. For instance, the editorial of the maiden issue of the *College Folio* (1910), the University's first student-generated publication, championed the English language as its medium and defended the choice by citing Shakespeare:

Altho sweetness and grace, harmony and cadence, clearness and ease are not especial inherent characteristics of the English language, yet they are there, and English is possessed of a literature—a literature not the third, not the second, but the first in rank, achievement, and importance in the history of the world. The English race possesses Westminster Abbey and all that that means, and Stratford-on-Avon, the birthplace of the world's greatest dramatist, whose works can perish only with the destruction of the universe.

Editions of the *Philippinensian* in the first decade or so of the University's existence provide examples of the ways in which Shakespearean rhetoric was incorporated into university life. In 1915, for instance, the College of Law's Musical Club admonished against non-musical personalities through lines from Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* (*Philippinensian* 1915). The 1920 edition featured an amusing class history from the College of Law suffused with lines, metaphors and characters from the same play:

...but whenever the erudite Professor (now our Dean) raised his hand, and, like "a new Daniel come to judgment", gave his verdict "a bon droit" in the ominous shape of a cross, you must be sure, dear reader, that the fatal sign bore in the hearts of many a Shylock all the earmarks of a catastrophe descending from the wrath of God! But we were adamant in our desire to win the "Golden Fleece"; so that with determined heart but timorous brain we met a ferocious monster, called "Semester Exams", which snatched away from us many a valiant hero.... (*Philippinensian* 1920a)

But if UP was in fact the showcase of the American public educational system in the colony, why is Shakespeare, an important cultural marker, then effectively banished from its stage?

One answer is already hinted at by Shakespeare's primary function as a pedagogical tool. This may partially explain Shakespeare's specific confinement to the UP classroom and/or its written products. In his analysis of American colonial theater, Isagani Cruz (1971) argues that drama was used essentially as a 'teaching aid' to train Filipinos in the English language. Being a linguistic exercise, the literary values of plays mattered more than their stage-worthiness or even their actual performance (Cruz 1971). The yearly drama competitions at the State University to encourage original work by its students and their mostly forgettable products lend credence to Cruz's contention.¹¹ The 1920 edition of the *Philippinensian* provides useful insights into the perceived functions of drama in UP at that time. Drama served as a means of perfecting language skills at the same time as it provided a training ground for writers whose task it was to create plays that presented, and therefore helped define, 'Filipino life':

In four years' time, she (The UP Dramatic Club) has given training in Pronunciation, Enunciation, Accentuation, and Interpretation of Dramatic Roles to more than fifty students from different colleges of the University.

In four years' time she has discovered several budding playwrights in the University by opening up a contest in drama writing.... With a view to encouraging farther [sic] Filipino drama in English, the Club has endeavored to present good plays depicting truthfully Filipino life. Three plays, "The Twelfth Commandment", "The Recruiter", and "The Neighbor's Creed" by Professor George St Clair, the organizer and director of the Club, have been staged with telling results upon our young dramatists in the University. Professor St Clair's plays being great Filipino dramas.... (Philippinensian 1920b)

The predilection for original drama, the imperative to depict Filipino life 'truthfully', and the celebration of 'great Filipino dramas' (even if authored by an American teacher!) also hint at another possible reason behind Shakespeare's exclusion from the UP stage. Calling for the

institution of a Dramatic Club as early as 1912, the editorial of *The College Folio* outlined the envisioned role of such an organization in the fledgling university:

A Dramatic Club would surely be a club worth starting, since it would benefit not only the members but the dramatic field in the Philippines. A Dramatic Club should have for one of its purposes the elevating of the character of the Filipino drama. The members should aim to write dramas which could be presented on the stage. Present well-known dramatists might be invited to become honorary members, thus giving credit to the club, and honor to our dramatists. Now and then plays might be given, the plays being original, written by the members and acted by them.... Then the club might take up a more serious work by making a collection of all Filipino dramas. (College Folio 1912)

Interestingly, when the Dramatic Club was finally organized in 1917, it staged Moliere's *The Miser* and defended this choice, in writing, over Shakespeare (Philippinensian 1917). In the years following, the Club also staged Moliere's *The School For Husbands* and *The Doctor In Spite of Himself*, Sheridan's *The School For Scandal*, Thomas' *The Witching Hour* but, significantly, no Shakespeare (Philippinensian 1920b).

This vision of the role that drama was to play in the University of the Philippines and the contiguity of that role with the cultural life of the nation point toward emergent forms of nationalism that may have steered the University's dramatic concerns away from Shakespeare—an author clearly important to American colonial education. While a sustained study of emergent nationalism in the University of the Philippines remains to be written, a survey of its student publications arguably point toward the conclusion that the University played a pivotal role in the development of nationalism. Student texts adamantly championed an independent Philippines. Much of the work of the early writers in *The College Folio* worked toward a recuperation of indigenous or traditional arts and cultural practices. It is as if UP students at the time were deeply involved in what Manuel Quezon described as the ideal role of the State University: 'the national task of preserving, developing, and invigorating Philippine patriotism amongst our youth'.¹²

COLONIAL LANDSCAPES: CENTERS AND PERIPHERIES

IN bucolic Dumaguete, however, the cultural landscape evinced through Shakespearean performance history is radically different. This Visayan port city was seemingly Bard-crazy. The initial Shakespearean performances were wildly successful, spurring authorities at the Silliman Institute to integrate Shakespearean performances in its yearly Commencement rituals. Not only were the Silliman students actively involved in these productions but they appear to have attracted members of the community at large as well (Silliman Annual 1913, The Portal 1918):

The Annual Shakespearean Drama is always an attractive feature of the closing week. As an attest of the popularity of the former attractions Silliman Hall was packed to overflowing on Monday evening to witness the presentation of Julius Caesar (Silliman Truth 1918).

The class of 1918 presented in their Junior Year Shakespeare's Tragedy of *Hamlet*. As in other years the play was given twice in order to give the Silliman boys and Dumaguete and the neighboring friends an opportunity to see and enjoy it. In these evenings the Assembly Hall of Silliman was overcrowded (The Portal 1918).

Apparently, the Silliman Institute was ground-zero of colonial dramatic culture.

Significant events in Negros history might serve to explain why this is so. The island of Negros came under American rule in a particular and peculiar manner. On 27 November 1898, the Negros elite, comprised of sugar planters hoping to secure their estates, created the *Gobierno Republicano Federal de Canton de Ysla de Negros* and voluntarily put itself under the 'protection' of the United States two weeks later (Aguilar 1998). This 'Negros Republic' that effectively separated itself from other revolutionary movements in the rest of the colony was later deemed by the American government as 'the wedge by which the American Government has been enabled to split open the resistance of Filipino insurgents' (Aguilar 1998).

Unlike other locales that resisted the coming of the Americans, Dumaguete and its environs *seem* to have openly welcomed American rule.¹⁴ Meliton Larena, *presidente* of Dumaguete, exhorted his fellow

presidentes to raise American flags in a 'demonstration of friendship' toward the Americans (then anchored off the coast of Dumaguete in May of 1899) who have come 'expressly to watch us and protect the tranquility of the good Filipino citizens of this island who have accepted the sovereignty of the American nation' (Rodriguez 1983). That the Americans were well received by at least some constituents is evinced by this account of the entry into the nearby town of Tanjay:

From the mouths of women who are still living today, are praises of the good behavior of the Americans. Some of them say that they managed to put on their very beautiful dresses in order to make themselves look beautiful when they greeted the invaders. The women claim that they enjoyed looking at white soldiers. There was general rejoicing in the town as the soldiers marched from the banks of the river (because they came wading through the water from Bais) to the convent. There were several days of festivities to mark the arrival of the Americans in Tanjay. (Rodriguez 1983)

The Silliman Institute's founder, David Hibbard, later on admitted that the warmth of his reception at Dumaguete (by the same Meliton Larena and his brother Demetrio), was a significant factor in the decision to establish Silliman in Dumaguete instead of Iloilo, Jolo, or Cebu (Kwantes 1989).

The speed of the adoption of the English language provides further proof of the 'enthusiasm' the people of Dumaguete had for the Americans. The English language spread rapidly in Negros Oriental owing perhaps in part to the early founding of Silliman itself and the quick deployment of American schoolteachers in the area. By 1902, almost all the towns in Negros Oriental had an American teacher (Rodriguez 1989). By 1907, a visiting correspondent for the *Manila Daily Bulletin*, Joseph Travis, observed that the English language was more prevalent among the people of Dumaguete than anywhere else in the colony (Rodriguez 1989). Presbyterian missionary Robert Carter echoed this observation in 1909, claiming that 'in proportion to the town population, English was spoken by a greater number of people than anywhere else in the Philippines' (Kwantes 1989).

Moreover, the religious nature of Silliman education had much to do with its propagation of Shakespeare. Over and over again in the

histories of colonial education, critics and historians of the process have cited the ways in which literature, especially Shakespeare, was used as a surrogate Bible. Prevented by official state policies declaring the separation of Church and State, colonial literary education often picked up

the task of 'civilizing' the colonized people through the same Christian values contained in literary texts.¹⁵ In the case of Silliman, where the Bible was in fact part of the educational process, the use of literary pieces like Shakespearean plays only served to further reinforce its Christian teaching.

These reasons coupled with a rich theatrical tradition on the island (Rodriguez 1989) may help account for Shake-

speare's popularity in Dumaguete and its environs in the early colonial period. The specific history of the island of Negros also brings to light the discrepant geographies of the colonial enterprise. One cannot simply assume a pervasiveness of colonial influence as it was received differently in different parts of the country. Orthodox versions of colonialism posit a center/capital from which it emanates; the record of Shakespearean performances in the Philippines, however, proves the opposite true. Juxtaposing political and cultural landscapes produces a more complexly textured version of colonialism's geographic paradigms. The cultural landscape exposes colonialism's metaphorical landscape as less than absolute. While Manila was unquestionably the center of colonial bureaucracy and its institutions, colonial dramatic culture seems to have taken a trip to the peripheries.

THE EMPIRE'S NEW CLOTHES

AND it wore the Empire's new clothes when it got there.

The discussion of colonialism's landscapes thus far seems to affirm the idea that frequent performances of the work of a colonial playwright is symptomatic of a predisposition to colonialism, or the 'colonial mentality', of its recipient culture. This conclusion, however, is only arrived at if one fails to account for the aesthetic as an informing cat-

In the histories of colonial education, critics and historians of the process have cited the ways in which literature, especially Shakespeare, was used as a surrogate Bible.

egory of cultural phenomena like plays. The fact of performance does not constitute the complete picture. Performance, after all, is a highly complex and unstable amalgamation of various modes of signification capable of containing layers of meaning. Aside from the performed text, elements like music, lighting, costumes, non-verbal acting, or even the manner in which lines from the text are delivered (or not) come together in various and specific ways each time a play is performed. Each of these components contributes to the meanings produced and varies with each performance.

Furthermore, as eminent promoter and theorist of postcolonial intercultural theatre, Rustom Bharucha (1993), has demonstrated, it is important to confront what he calls 'the politics of location' each time a play is performed across cultures. Where a play is performed matters as much as its origins. In each intercultural encounter, there are wider scopes and deeper implications to performance than are involved in indigenous theater. Simply put, there is more here than meets the eye. And that 'more', in a sense, is that which meets the eye.

A striking characteristic of the accounts of Shakespearean performances at Silliman in the early colonial years is the inordinate amount of attention accorded to costumes. That costumes were a significant part of these performances' appeal can be gleaned from the frequent mention they get in contemporary reviews:

The Merchant of Venice given complete during the Commencement Exercises of the year 1911-1912 was the culmination of the stage-acting by the students.... The play was completely and historically costumed and staged. Money was not spared to furnish the old-time costumes of the sixteenth century. (Silliman Annual 1913)

Tuesday afternoon the board of trustees held their annual meeting and Tuesday evening was given to the presentation of *Macbeth* by the students. It would be difficult to speak in too much praise of this production which reflected great credit both upon those who had long and faithfully trained the various characters and upon the students who took the parts. The scenery prepared by Mr Holmes and Mr Glunz was very adequate and the costumes made entirely in Dumaguete under the direction of Mr Carlos Smith were

all that could be desired. It seemed hardly possible that costumes so suggestive of Scotland could be thus produced. But they were. (Silliman Truth 1914)

The reproduction of 16th century Venice or Scotland in Dumaguete, however, is not as unproblematic as these reviews make it seem. While costumes are used to evoke a specific time and culture, their existence

No matter how 'authentic' the [Shakespearean] costumes may be, their being on 'little, brown' bodies call attention to their strangeness.

onstage on bodies from another time and culture creates an instant rupture in the naturalness of the scene. No matter how 'authentic' the costumes may be, their being on 'little, brown' bodies calls attention to their strangeness. The bodies onstage, native schoolchildren clad in Scottish or Venetian garb, were objects of discrepant display and agents of sartorial

subversion. What is highlighted in performance is distance, not universality, as the goals of colonial pedagogy would otherwise insist.

Costumes, moreover, provide the means for natives to 'counter-exoticize' colonial culture. It offers the audience a chance to hold the foreign culture, explicitly denoted through its dress, subject to its gaze. In a reversal of the crucial colonial strategy of display or laying bare, manifested through apparatuses such as the census or colonial photography, it affords the natives the mastery of the gaze (see Vergara 1995, Rafael 1993). In short, it gives them the right to stare. And with staring comes the power to subject colonial culture to critical evaluation.

In *Post-Colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics*, Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins (1996) explain 'the paradox of costume's simultaneous specificity *and* versatility' that 'makes it an unstable sign/site of power':

How and what the performing body signifies are closely related to the ways in which it is framed for the viewer's consumption. The most obvious framing, costume, is particularly resonant since it can (mis)identify race, gender, class, and creed, and make visible the status associated with such markers of difference.... The destabilizing force of costume is even more obvious when the colonized subject wears the costume of the colonizer, particularly when the former dresses "up" or chooses a garment that exceeds his/her as-

signed status within the colonial hierarchy. Cultural cross-dressing and dressing “up” enact the dressing down of sartorial and cultural limitations by fabricating self-conscious strategies for resisting the power inherent even in the colonizer’s dress codes.

The instability of signification produced by cross-cultural costuming opens up a potential, albeit subtle, site of subversion. But this potential resonates more clearly when seen in terms of the ‘politics of location’. The disruptive possibilities of costume on the Silliman stage hearken to the strange uses to which costumes have been put in historical subversion in the island of Negros.

In *Clash of Spirits: The History of Power and Sugar Planter Hegemony on a Visayan Island*, Filomeno Aguilar Jr (1998) describes the revolutionary appropriation of costumes in the anticolonial struggles of certain segments of its population:

By 1897 various shamanic groups in Negros were in open rebellion, armed with spears, daggers, machetes, and bows and arrows. They came to be known, among other names, as *Civil-Civil* because they wore striped clothing patterned after the uniform of the *Guardia Civil*. From the *babaylans*’ emulation of the friars at the onset of colonial rule in the sixteenth century, they had graduated to imitation of the colonial army by the close of the nineteenth.... The *babaylans* punished natives who wore their shirts outside their trousers, a symbol of subservience to the dress code imposed by the colonial state following its categories of race and status. The shamans had formed the conviction that natives, as a mark of equality, had as much right to tuck in their shirts as Spaniards did. Thus the *Civil-Civil* were dressed in the same manner as the Civil Guards.¹⁷

In Negros Island, the Empire’s new clothes were used and construed by the local populations as signs of dissent. The appropriation of Western-style costumes on the Silliman stage by native actors, then, necessarily carried traces of this dissidence. In addition to the destabilizing tendency inherent in cross-cultural dressing onstage, to the disjunction created by Western dress on non-Western bodies, the spectral presence of real dissent embodied in the practice makes it difficult to dismiss Dumaguete’s apparent bardolatry as ‘colonial mentality’ pure and

simple. In appropriating the colonial playwright and visually highlighting the fact of appropriation (as opposed to its more congruent reproduction) in discordant dress, Silliman Shakespeare escapes absolute colonial control. Wearing the Empire's new clothes does not necessarily mean its unequivocal adoption.

In Negros Island, the Empire's new clothes were used and construed by the local populations as signs of dissent.

Similarly, it would be naïve to assume that Shakespeare's absence from the UP stage translates into a blatant rejection of colonialism. The playwright's persistent pedagogical and curricular presence provides proof to the contrary. In refusing to stage Shakespeare, the State University might have even forfeited a valuable site of dissidence. As Silliman shows us, there is much to be learned from colonialism's so-called peripheries as there is much to be learned from its uneven cultural landscapes. It is unwise to dismiss the peripheral. After all, when Shakespearean performance debuted in the State University in 1920, it did so at the College of Agriculture in Los Baños (Philippinensian 1920c).

NOTES

The author would like to acknowledge Mrs Gemma Plasabas, the curator of the Sillimania collection at the Silliman University, and the Diazes of Dumaguete—Franco, Florita, and Miguelito—for facilitating her research.

1. The 'Americanizing' of Shakespeare, one may argue, is implicit in the entire movie. This is, after all, an American-produced movie about the British playwright, awarded Hollywood's highest accolade. Even further, Shakespeare is played by a British actor reared in the finest traditions of the Royal Shakespeare Company (Joseph Fiennes) while his soul/essence/creator is played by Gwyneth Paltrow, a true daughter of Hollywood.

2. Numerous books have been written on the subject. Of use to me in writing this paper were Bristol (1990), Taylor (1989), Marder (1964), and Sinfield (1992).

3. For a fuller discussion of the intimate ties between Shakespeare and colonialism and a powerful exposition of how Shakespearean criti-

cism and colonial education were mutually determining practices, see Viswanathan (1989) and Loomba (1993).

4. Irving's *Alhambra* and Longfellow's *Evangeline* complete this list.

5. Terry Eagleton (1983) traces a similar shift to English Literature from using the Classics for the purposes of popular, mass education.

6. A photograph of the cast of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and accounts of both productions are also featured in the *Silliman Annual* of 1913. Tiburcio Tumbagahan (1948) also makes mention of the *Midsummer* performance.

7. Data on the performance history of Shakespearean plays at the Silliman Institute are culled from Carson (1965), *Silliman Annual* (1913), *The Portal* (1918), *Silliman Truth* (1914, 1915 & 1916), and Hibbard (1926). In addition to its impressive record of Shakespearean performances, the Silliman Institute was the first educational institution in the country to have women play women's parts on stage.

8. This has since changed, of course, but significantly it remained true for the first half of this century.

9. The Silliman Institute, later University, was founded as a Presbyterian mission school in 1901 on an endowment from Horace Silliman. Several histories of the institution were consulted in the writing of this essay. These were: Carson (1965), Tiempo et al. (1977), Hibbard (1926), and Kwantes (1989).

10. It is still in existence today—renumbered as English 23—as the only single author course in the English curriculum.

11. While a comprehensive theater history for the University of the Philippines remains to be written, useful information on the theatrical life in UP in the colonial period can be found in Edades & Fosdick (1956), Leonardia (1995), and Legasto (1998).

12. Address of Manuel Quezon on the Inauguration of Ignacio Villamor as first Filipino President of the University of the Philippines, 12 August 1915 (*Philippinensian* 1916).

13. These events are also relayed by Rodriguez (1989) but she cites January 1899 as the date for the establishment of the Negros Republic.

14. I emphasize 'seeming' here as Aguilar (1998) cogently argues in his book that this move was, in all likelihood, a strategic gamble on the part of the Negros elite to preserve their control over their sugar plantations.

15. See, for example, Viswanathan (1989), Jyotsna (1996), Loomba (1993), Altbach & Kelly (1978), and Bhabha (1985).

16. The colonialist mimicry employed by the revolutionary *babaylans* is discussed in further detail in Echaz (1978).

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, F Jr. 1998. *Clash of Spirits: The History of Power and Sugar Planter Hegemony on a Visayan Island*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Altbach, P & G Kelly. 1978. *Education and Colonialism*. New York: Longman.
- Bernad, M. 1977. *Dramatics at the Ateneo de Manila: A History of Three Decades, 1921-1952*. Manila: Ateneo Alumni Association.
- Bhabha, H. 1985. Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority Under a Tree Outside Delhi. *Critical Inquiry* 12(1): 144-165.
- Bharucha, R. 1993. *Theater and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bristol, M. 1990. *Shakespeare's America, America's Shakespeare*. New York: Routledge.
- Bureau of Education. 1933. *Course of Study in Literature for Secondary Schools*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Bureau of Education. 1904. *Courses of Instruction for the Public Schools of the Philippine Islands*. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.
- Carson, A. 1965. *Silliman University, 1901-1959*. Taiwan: University Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia.
- College Folio*. 1912. Editorial: Liberal Arts Needs Societies. 3(1): 25.
- College Folio*. 1910. Editorial. 1(1): 17-18.
- Cruz, I. 1971. *A Short History of Theater in the Philippines*. Manila: Cultural Center of the Philippines.
- Eagleton, T. 1983. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Echaz, R. 1978. *Apuntes de la Isla de Negros (Manila, 1894)*. DV Hart (trans). Ohio: Ohio University Center for International Studies.
- Edades, J & C Fosdick. 1956. *Drama of the East and West*. Manila: Bookman Inc. 1956.
- Edades, J. 1955. Old Favorite in a New Scene. *Sunday Times Magazine*. 6 February, p. 14.
- Gilbert, H & J Tompkins. 1996. *Post-Colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Hibbard, DS. 1926. *The First Quarter: A Brief History of Silliman Institute during the First Twenty Five Years of its Existence*. Manila: Philippine Education Company.
- Jamias, C. 1962. The University of the Philippines: The First Half Century. In *Diliman Review UP Golden Jubilee Special Supplement*. Quezon City: UP Press.
- Jyotsna Singh. 1996. *Colonial Narratives/Cultural Dialogues: 'Discoveries' of India in the Language of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kwantes, A. 1989. *Presbyterian Missionaries in the Philippines: Conduits of Social Change (1989-1910)*. Quezon City: New Day Publishers.
- Legasto, P. 1998. The Impact of American Colonial Rule on Philippine Theater. In *The Filipiniana Reader*, pp. 44-61. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

- Leonardia, A. 1995. History and Growth of Theater Education in UP. *Masks and Voices* 3(1): 21-40.
- Loomba, A. 1993. *Hamlet* in Mizoram. In M Novy (ed). *Cross-Cultural Performances: Differences in Women's Re-visions of Shakespeare*, pp. 227-250. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Marder, L. 1964. *His Exits and His Entrances: The Story of Shakespeare's Reputation*. London: John Murray Publishers.
- Orkin, M. 1991. *Drama and the South African State*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Philippinensian*. 1920a. History of the 1920 Laws, pp. 98-99.
- Philippinensian*. 1920b. The University Dramatic Club.
- Philippinensian*. 1920c. The Class of 1920 (History), p. 239.
- Philippinensian*. 1917. The University Dramatic Club, p. 343.
- Philippinensian*. 1915. College of Law Musical Club, p. 239.
- The Portal* (Silliman Annual). 1918. Silliman University.
- Rafael, V. 1993. White Love: Surveillance and Nationalist Resistance in the U.S. Colonization of the Philippines. In A Kaplan & D Pease (eds). *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, pp. 185-218. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Rodriguez, C. 1983. *Negros Oriental and the Philippine Revolution*. Dumaguete: The Provincial Government of Negros Oriental.
- Rodriguez, C. 1989. *Negros Oriental from American Rule to the Present: A History, Volume 2 (Part I: The American Period)*. Tokyo: The Toyota Foundation.
- Silliman Annual*. 1913. Silliman University.
- Silliman Truth*. 1916. 15(5).
- Silliman Truth*. 1915. Commencement Program. 14(3).
- Silliman Truth*. 1914. Commencement. 13(5 & 6).
- Sinfield, A. 1992. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissent Reading*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Taylor, G. 1989. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tiempo, E; C Maslog & V Sitoy. 1977. *Silliman University, 1901-1976*. Dumaguete: Silliman University Press.
- Tumbagahan, T. 1948. The First Forty Years: A History of Silliman University from 1901-1941. PhD dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University.
- Vergara, B Jr. 1995. *Displaying Filipinos: Photography and Colonialism in Early 20th Century Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Viswanathan, G. 1989. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. New York: Columbia University Press.