Multicultural Shakespeare:
Translation, Appropriation and Performance vol. 30 (45), 2024
https://doi.org/10.18778/2083-8530.30.07

Poonam Trivedi*

Indian Supplements to Shakespeare: *The Hungry* and *We That Are Young*

Abstract: While there is no longer any debate about Shakespeare's position as a global author, the rapidly expanding worldwide archive of the versioning of his works continues to pose a critical challenge. Questions like how far and to what extent can this be seen as Shakespeare or not Shakespeare are raised. Estimation of value is vexed, too: does it reside mainly in the local, or can it also extrapolate meaning globally? Methodologies, too, are debated: is archiving the starting or the endpoint of reception? Or is the construction of networks of analyses around and between them the mode towards negotiating appreciation?

Taking a leaf out of Derrida's "That Dangerous Supplement," this paper will propose a critical perspective of *supplementarity* as an intervention in the debate on the proliferating versioning of Shakespeare. This sees the traffic in Shakespeare as both a surplus, a plenitude enriching another plenitude and also a substitute filling a void. It considers translation, adaptation, appropriation, and even performance of Shakespeare as additions which enhance and complete making good an insufficiency. It will locate this discussion on two much-acclaimed adaptations to emerge out of India: the film *The Hungry* (2017), directed by Bornila Chatterjee, of *Titus Andronicus*, and the novel *We That Are Young* (2017) by Preti Taneja, based on *King Lear*.

Keywords: global, local, versioning, supplement, substitute, surplus.

While there is no longer any debate about Shakespeare's position as a global author, the rapidly expanding worldwide archive of renditions and redactions of his works on page, stage and screen does continue to pose a critical challenge. Intercultural versions especially (I am using "versions" as a shorthand for full-scale translations, performances, and re-writings that attempt to re-present the works of Shakespeare), while being welcomed at the performative centres like the Globe London, have disturbed the status quo: questions like how far and to

* Retired, University of Delhi. poonamtrivedi2@gmail.com

what extent can these be seen as Shakespeare or not Shakespeare are raised frequently. Estimation of their value too is vexed: does it reside mainly in the local, or can it also extrapolate meaning globally? Or, as is sometimes held, has the intercultural become "glocal," especially with regard to the Shakespeare film from different parts of the world, where the local is seen as collapsed into the "global"? Issues of the accessibility, transportability and vulnerability of cross-cultural Shakespeare have been voiced, foregrounding seemingly apologetic constructs like the "uninformed spectator" or the "dis-orientated spectator," which the cross-cultural Shakespeare regularly throws up. The major critical issues today, it seems, are neither exposure nor experience *per se*, particularly after the Globe 2 Globe festival of 2012, where 37 plays were performed in 37 languages, and before that, the World Shakespeare Festival at the Globe (2001) and at RSC too (2006), but the critical processing, the estimation and the pleasure in the cross-cultural Shakespeare. That is, "professing" the inter/cross-cultural.

There is no doubt that among the intercultural, "Asian Shakespeares" have played the premier role in the generation of traffic towards expanding the worldwide network of Global Shakespeare. The buzz around the experimental and creative productions of Suzuki Tadashi, Yukio Ninagawa, Wu Hsing Kuo and Ong Ken Sen, the Annette Leday Kathakali *King Lear*, to mention a few of the outstanding directors, from the late 1970s onwards, turned the critical spotlight on the potencies of Asian performativity. The publication of several collections of essays, both country-based or pan-Asian in their ambit, established a new and vibrant area of investigation. The setting up of archives in Singapore and MIT provided the visual, digital and live backup for many of these famed performances. And now films on Shakespeare have been the icing on the cake: Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Taiwanese, Thai, and even Tibetan cinemas have turned out films which have been drawing audiences and winning plaudits. Yet Asian Shakespeare remains on the periphery: it did not command either a plenary or a panel at the World Shakespeare Congress of 2016 and only one related seminar with just 7 participants. At the Shakespeare Association of America 2018 annual conference, it was little or no better. Are we Asian Shakespeareans in danger of self-ventriloquising? Have we been providing merely a sprinkling of exotic colouration tolerated for the "internationalism" it garners? Or is there an active engagement with the Asian / global scene? Where is the frisson?[1]

[1] For the Asian "Global" see my essay, "Making Meaning between the Local and the Global: Performing Shakespeare in India Today" in *Asian Interventions in Global Shakespeare: 'All the World's his Stage'*, eds. Poonam Trivedi, Paromita Chakravarti and Ted Motohashi, New York: Routledge, 2021. 15-32.

On the other hand, Shakespeare's iconic place in Western, even British, culture and curriculum is not quite so solidly confirmed as it is usually assumed. Questions challenging the suitability and desirability of his continuance in the curriculum and the nature of the pedagogy deployed for promoting his works have become more insistent in recent times. Here, I would like to share with you an event I was involved in at Queen Mary's College, University of London, in late March 2018. An open debate titled "Kill Bill" or "This house proposes that the inclusion of Shakespeare in the higher education curriculum and theatre and arts programming obstructs decolonisation" was organised jointly by the English and Drama departments. Many, 12-15 students and faculty, spoke for and against the motion—I was also a speaker—and at the final vote, by secret ballot, there were as many as 16 votes or 38% for the motion, i.e. for killing Bill, as against 23 or 55% opposing it, with 7% abstentions. Shakespeare's position in the canon, in the curriculum, was being seriously contested and even sought to be subverted from within. Many reasons for the dissatisfaction and disaffection with Shakespeare were voiced: his popular identification with the elite and the nerdy was one, but the most repeated refrain was that his works are cumbersome—"Take too long and too much effort to get to grips with"—a time which could be better utilised, and finally the works do not provide the immediate answers the young of today are looking for. "He is boring," said a particularly angry young man. It reminded me of what, at another level, Jonathan Bate had said at the International Shakespeare Association plenary in 2010, warning the eminent audience that perhaps in a hundred years' time, Shakespeare will be remembered only for his quotations and *mot juste*, wise sayings and appropriate words, because few will have the patience to read his language.

I narrate this experience to argue for a long look at the state of English studies, the place and function of Shakespeare studies in it and the part played by international and Asian inputs in it. When the validity and valency of Shakespeare is being challenged on home ground, it will not be an over-statement to assert that the cross-cultural and inter-medial versioning of Shakespeare is neither a peripheral product of special pleading nor only a postcolonial "writing back" out to subvert or demolish the citadel of Shakespeare Studies. But instead, it is proving itself essential not only to the spread but also to the very survival of Shakespeare. The Shakespeare film, particularly, is fast becoming the first point of contact with the bard for the young today, and it plays a decisive role in determining future academic involvement.

This article will glance at some concepts put forward by Jacques Derrida in his essay "That Dangerous Supplement" to suggest a means of accounting for and estimating the worldwide growth of Shakespeares. Adaptation theory has evolved in response to this proliferation but is largely concerned with

categorisations and differentiations. Derrida's views on speech and writing, on supplements, on plenitude and différance provide clues to the inevitable upsurge of adaptation, change and growth in literary texts. For Derrida, writing is a supplement to speech, a mediated representation of thought. Supplement is that which adds, comes to the aid of, is itself a surplus, a plenitude enriching another plenitude, a proposition which seems to approximate the global traffic in Shakespeare and provide us with a critical perspective of *supplementarity* as an intervention in the debate on the proliferating versioning of Shakespeare. The supplement is also, according to Derrida, "the fullest measure of presence. It cumulates and accumulates presence" (Attridge 83)… an observation which further seems to elucidate the processes of globalising Shakespeare. With this perspective, translation, adaptation, appropriation, even performance, of Shakespeare may be considered as additions or supplements, which, just as when writing supplements or adds to speech, rewritings of a classic author enhance and complete making good an implied insufficiency in how the plays speak to the moment of the day. Since the supplement simultaneously signifies and fills a void, it adds to replace (like writing on speech) and by so substituting and strengthening may supplant meanings, hence termed "dangerous supplements" (Attridge 83). We have to recall the fate of *King Lear*, which was almost cast into oblivion for over a hundred years by the popular adaptation of Nahum Tate.

The Derridian concept of "différance" which refers to the deferred meaning of the sign within the signifier and the signified, positing the possibility of the emergence of different and new meanings, may also help us to account for and frame the unending flow of new meanings and interpretations of Shakespeare which continue to proliferate.

Hence, it follows that redaction/versioning of Shakespeare from all over the world, including Asia, is performing a vital function: bringing him up to date for the modern audience, filling in gaps perceived by them, and to stretch the analogy, like health supplements, give him a shot in the arm to keep his audience and popularity going.

The essay locates this discussion on two much-acclaimed adaptations to emerge out of India and, by extrapolation, out of Asia: a film *The Hungry* (2017) directed by Bornila Chatterjee, based on *Titus Andronicus*, and the novel *We That Are Young* (2017) by Preti Taneja reprising *King Lear*. These two versions from India more than fulfil this function of supplementarity; they both add to the plenitude of Shakespeare and, by their relocations in a new time and space, make his works and ideas come alive and resonate with the young, like those who were protesting against the inclusion of Shakespeare in the curriculum debate.

Though produced independently and at some distance from each other, both *The Hungry* and *We That Are Young* show significant similarities. Both are by third-generation postcolonial authors, of Asian origins but based in

Western locations, young and female who have produced bold, out-of-the-box adaptations taking Shakespeare to another level of being, not merely to tell their own stories but also to re-formulate and distil the meanings and the essence of the plays for today in a manner which goes beyond the obviously national/native and ethnic. Both have won accolades in film festivals and literary fests around the world. They both reveal confidence and skill in their respective mediums of film and fiction to respond to and build on Shakespeare in their own very contemporary and strong, politically inflected terms, something not seen in Indian versions before. The non-Indian working base of both the authors influences the treatment of their re-locations, which, while being distinctly immersed in an Indian-ness, is also simultaneously abstracted from it, enabling a critically imbued distance creating a non-nationalised perspective.

Both redactions locate *Titus* and *Lear* in modern, urban India, largely in the capital, Delhi, focussing on what they see as the chief problem in Indian society: of corruption in business, politics and patriarchy, all woven together. Both Titus and Lear are re-imagined as ruthless patriarchs heading vast business empires, controlling inordinate amounts of wealth, land and people, whose power goes to their heads, leading them into horrendous acts of inhumanity. Both are thus a searing expose of the depravity the lust for money and power can lead to. These Shakespearean themes are dovetailed effortlessly into the contemporary Indian scenario and extended, particularly in their control and abuse of female sexuality. Topical themes of climate change and ecology are also woven in, but all the while maintaining strong and intricate parallels with the original Shakespearean text.

The female authorship of both these versions has engendered significant "feministic" re-tellings: *The Hungry* is more Tamora (Tulsi)'s film than Titus (Tathagat)'s; it recasts the whole story from her perspective, her need to revenge the uncalled-for murder of her elder son, Ankur. *We That Are Young* paints intense but sympathetic portraits of the three daughters, filling in their backstories in extensive detail, underlining and exposing the oppression, manipulation, control, use and abuse of them at home and at work by the patriarch father. Again, this infusion of feminism, stimulated by the academic feminist revisionism of these two plays, is not only a radical critique of the entrenched patriarchy of Indian society but also simultaneously aligns these versions to the internationalism of the "me-too" and other such movements. The links between the two plays: headstrong Titus as an early template for the irascible Lear, the sacrifice of the daughter, the violence and the venality, etc. have been noted variously in criticism; these two new versions by their relocation in a similar milieu, strengthen and expand these originary connections.

Power Hungry

Turning to examine these two versions individually is to track their differences which are also significant: *The Hungry*, directed by Bornila Chatterjee, was commissioned through a contest on adapting Shakespeare for the 400th anniversary held by the British Council in 2016. It was released at the Toronto Film Festival in October 2017 and later shown at the London and the Dharamsala Film Festivals. It was then released strategically on Amazon Prime Videos for public viewing because it may not have got past the Indian censor board. It skilfully edits Shakespeare's rough and rambling play into a suspenseful, dark thriller, filling in the turns and counter-turns of the narrative through flashbacks. It tells the story of two super-rich business families in Delhi, the Joshis and Ahujas, and their rivalries. It opens at the moment of a proposed amalgamation of the two businesses, by the wedding of the widow of Joshi–Tulsi (Tamora) with the only, much younger son of Tathagat Ahuja (Titus), the controlling patriarch. During the New Year's party, where this is announced amidst the popping of corks, Tamora's elder son is quietly put away for having disagreed with Tathagat on the corrupt methods of a business deal: openly bribing the politician who is to open the doors for them. The rest is a stealthy plot for revenge by Tulsi, doubly complicated by the fact that she is performing both as bride and butcher. All the key events of the play, the gratuitous killings, the ruthless counter-revenges, the mutilation of Lavinia, the banquet and the climax of feasting off kindred flesh are all deftly worked into the background of the wedding. Needless to add, the relocations resonate very strongly with the known machinations of several of the ultra-rich in north India, uncannily reflecting the then murderous decimation between the liquor and real estate barons Monty and Ponty Chadha. These relocations make Shakespeare's stomach-churning gruesome play palatable: by casting it into a noir horror film, haunting and full of edginess, the Roman play becomes believable to the contemporary imagination. As Naseeruddin Shah, the actor in the role of Titus, has observed, this film version of *Titus* "lets in the realities which most films in India, at least, shy away from" (Bhandari). Re-writings exploit and utilise the "deferred" meanings, creating a "supplement" which "intervenes or insinuates itself in the place"… (Attridge 83).

More significantly, *Titus*, which has seen only one film version to date, has long been held as the black sheep of the canon, a "not Shakespeare," consigned to the bottom rung of the works. When questioned about why she chose to adapt *Titus*, Shakespeare's most disturbing play, Bornila Chatterjee, the director, said that it is most relevant in today's society—exposing the irrepressible greed for power and the subsequent futility of revenge. The very names of the protagonists, "Tulsi," meaning sacred plant and "Tathagat," the enlightened one—one of the names of the Buddha—signal the inversions which are sought to be effected. The film adopts a quiet tone, working through visual

symbolism for its effect: the opening and closing shots, for instance, are of a bunch of goats hungrily nibbling at scraps on the trash mountain and then later invading the devastated wedding feast, humans and animals, both shown as victims of the power-hungry. Shot on location in Delhi, the wintry fog added to the mystery and murkiness. The challenge was "figuring out how to translate […] the beauty of the written language, […] cinematically, be it through costumes, or the set or music," said Bornila Chatterjee (244). With a smooth, silky subtlety, *The Hungry* persuasively restores and rehabilitates the play, endowing it with esteem and critical possibilities. The critical estimation of *Titus* has never been high: from being called "a heap of rubbish" (Ravenscroft 1687), a "Senecal exercise… quite unfelt… and cool" (M. C. Bradbrook 1935) to be seen as a "promising" early play (J. C. Maxwell 1961) and now a "daring experiment" (Katharine Eisaman Maus 1977).

The film also furthers the feminist revisioning of the play, as noted earlier, by a quiet foregrounding of the injustice done to Tamora (Tulsi); she carries her son's enforced suicide note, which he was made to write at the point of a gun, with her always. She is made less culpable of villainy, she does not order the cutting off of Lavinia's tongue or her rape, which just happens as a consequence of a fierce drunken squabble between Deepak, her younger son and Loveleen (Lavinia), and Tulsi is shown as horrified and grieved at the outcome. In an inadvertent giveaway irony, Tulsi lights the lamp = *deepak* (Hindi, also the name of Tulsi's son) in Loveleen (Lavinia)'s room, which forms a clue to Tathagat (Titus), indicating who committed the outrage on her. This remodelling of Tamora through the lead actress, Tisca Chopra's beauteous persona with a soft and subtilised voice, seems to ameliorate her lust for revenge so that the film becomes Tamora's tragedy and Titus, the unredeemable villain. So much so that Shakespeare's arch-female villain becomes the survivor, a kind of heroine, which resulted in the film being nominated for the Gender Equality Award.

The film's feminist feel and polemic goes further. Productions of *Titus* are challenged in their staging of Lavinia's rape and dismemberment: they have, on occasion, been critiqued for catering to sensationalism and voyeurism in the audience. *The Hungry* handles this sequence sensitively and suggestively: Lavinia is not "lopp'd and hew'd," and there is no "crimson river of warm blood… bubbling" (2.4.16, 22-23)[2] all over her. Instead, the muting is suggested by her dupatta/wrap, usually worn round the neck, now besmirched with blood and stuffed in her mouth. The Shakespearean overflow of verse on this occasion (often read as prolix and rhetorical) is transposed into telling cinematic imagery and visuality. In the play, Lavinia is found by Marcus, "fleeing… straying in the park, / Seeking to hide herself, as doth a deer / That hath receiv'd some recurring

[2] Citations from *Titus Andronicus* ed. J. C. Maxwell, the Arden Shakespeare, London: Methuen, 1968.

wound" (3.1.87-90). In the film, Loveleen runs and stumbles to bury herself in the huge trash mountain which borders the family's palatial estate. In fact, the film opens with a lingering shot of this same trash mountain with vultures flying overhead (evidence of Delhi's inability to manage its daily waste), an image of the actual and symbolic detritus of society—"a byproduct of greed" (Chatterji 258). Loveleen, with her tongue pulled out, is signalled as turned to trash, without human words and speechless and finds refuge and comfort in the garbage, a cinematic re-imaging which does not undermine the horror but rather sharpens the poignancy of the happenings.

However, there is yet more feminist redaction: the film interpolates a wife for Titus, old, bedridden, paralysed and muted with an oxygen mask strapped on her face, but who observes all and speaks with her eyes. Interestingly, Yamanote Jijosha's stage production of *Titus* (2009) also interpolates a wife for Titus, a gap felt by more than one creative producer. Here, she is a ghostly figure, unremarked by the other characters, but who occupies centre stage and conducts simple domestic actions, like folding laundry and making tea, functioning as a bridge figure between the past and the present. In the film, Titus' wife, too, acts as an observer registering and reacting to the happenings: at the climax, she is present at the family banquet, and the film ends with a closeup of her shocked eyes welling with tears when Tathagat (Titus), suddenly falls dead shot by Tulsi (Tamora), when he proposes to her immediately after he has stabbed his own son at the banquet. Tulsi survives but under the watchful gaze of Tathagat's wife, a mute female witness to the pointless carnage. The tears of the wife as the final image surprise one but supplement, though with ambiguity, the obligatory shedding of tears at the end of the play for Titus by his remaining son, grandson and brother. While the tears in the film seem gratuitous, they signal a touch of the tragic even though the final mood is sceptical of the 'tragic' asserting the pointlessness of the revenge with Tulsi staring stunned at the gun in her hand.

As is perhaps clear, *The Hungry* is not the typical Bollywood masala film. Much shorter in length, its controlled cinematography and aesthetics, combining beauty and horror, lift the film into the transnationalism of art cinema. Localised Indian cinema now incorporates shades of the global.

Power Brokers / Broken by Power

The novel *We That Are Young* by Preti Taneja was first published in the UK by the Galley Beggar Press, a small publisher of unusual writing, in 2017. It has received rave reviews, especially in the Western press. It was re-issued in seven editions, including one by Penguin Random House in India and one released in August 2018 in the US. It won the Desmond Elliot Prize, the UK's most

prestigious one for debut novelists and was short-listed for several others. It's a weighty tome, 553 pages long, epical and ambitious in its sweep: taking all India, its spiritualism, its history from the feudal past to independence and modernity, its growing economy, consumerism and corruption, its poverty, to its unremitting patriarchy and burgeoning ultra-nationalism. All this is interwoven into the story of King Lear with close equivalents of events and characters. It narrates the life of Devraj, or Bapuji, former minor royalty, now the founding father of The Company, a huge conglomerate of businesses that manage almost everything from construction, cars, apparel, hotels, real estate—you name it. It shows how he rises to eminence by shrewdly working the system, subverting laws and bribing politicians and other corporates. Suddenly, like Lear, one day, he decides to give up his untold millions to his three daughters, distributing them according to their declaration of love for him. Predictably, the youngest, Sita, his favourite, educated in the UK, refuses to play along and absconds. The rest of the story tracks the chaos that ensues when Devraj finds he cannot really stop controlling or interfering in the businesses. It is built up through multiple perspectives of the different main characters, including that of the sons, legitimate and bastard, of Devraj's right-hand man, Ranjit, the Gloucester figure. All the main characters, even the Fool (Nanu), Devraj's mother, grandmother to the daughters and Oswald, are worked in.

The novel is distinguished by its form and style, which is unlike much of the fast-growing Indian writing in English. Its experimental multiple narratives and flashbacks ventriloquise the back stories of the Shakespearean characters while the density and vividness of the descriptions and the inventiveness of the incidents make for a compelling and absorbing read, which takes even the Shakespeare-schooled reader by surprise. Its use of the English language, embossed with Hindi/Urdu slang and colloquialisms—not translated or glossed—ranges fluently over different registers of Indian English and pucca English accents, creating a mood both intensely localised, but since written in English, with an ironic distancing too. "I had to make many intricate decisions about register, tone, linguistic style and voice at the sentence level of my writing," says Taneja (254).

However, while the novel *We That Are Young* is a discomforting truth-teller, its vision is dystopic and pessimistic without any redeeming features expected from a Shakespearean tragedy spin-off. Devraj does not learn from his travails; unlike Lear, in the end, he is not the remorseful, fond and foolish old man but remains a venal egotist, reactionary and misogynist. The tragic frame it is structured on is almost stood on its head: "Bapuji" was the popular appellation for Mahatma Gandhi, also known as the Father of the Nation. Preti Taneja subtly plays on this word: her father-figure is not called "Babuji," the common word for father in Hindi, but "Bapuji," the honorific used for the Mahatma. Her Lear/Bapuji is the obverse of the Apostle of non-violence, liable to violent rages, frenzied beatings and sexual abuse. He propagates a spiritualism which

camouflages sordid business practices, and instead of an asceticism, he panders to rampant commercialisation. Hence, no tears are shed for him at his death by fire at the end.

If any shred of the Shakespearean "tragic" remains, it is in the accidental and unforeseen deaths of the three daughters: Gargi, the eldest controlling one, Radha, the beauty bartered and manipulated for the Company, and the youngest Sita, the radical who keeps disappearing. They revel in their wealth but are consumed by it too, not immune to the callousness bred in the super-rich. They chafe at the impositions but cannot escape the clutches of patriarchy and misogyny. Like Lear's daughters, they are conflicted, they compete for sexual satisfactions but are not against each other. What is remarkable is that while Preti Taneja, in her recasting, does not let any characters off the hook, including the daughters, exposing their viciousness—she has been called a "bad feminist"—in the narrativization of their backstories, there is a latent sympathy for the daughters, that seeps through in the quiet and controlled tone of the writing, and which prevents their flashes of anger, though presented as scathing irony, apt to be unnoticed.

King Lear is, of course, today seen as the acme of Shakespeare's achievement, and it has been subject to much versioning and re-writing. What is significant about this one is that it homes the play in India and, by implication, Asia, supplementing the Shakespearean traffic in the tropics for the young, by those that are themselves young. And that it is consciously political, as Preti Taneja has stated in an interview (*Indian Express*, April 10, 2018): "My role is to imbue my world with all of the weighted politics of our times and use my tools as sharp as I can." The novel boldly ventures into Kashmir, the hotspot of post-partition India, referencing the disaffections of the people mirrored in the riots in which Devraj's wife is burnt alive in her ancestral home. And where, in the end, in another conflagration, Devraj too dies. But startlingly not before he has strung up Sita, who was hiding with him, looped in her precious hand-embroidered pashmina shawl—one of his many investments in Kashmir. While this layered and intricate novel needs a fuller discussion to do it justice, its complex density precluding singling out any one of the many strands woven in, what is clear is that in Taneja's world as a whole, the possibilities of the Shakespearean tragic heroism are very limited: today's deracinated milieu has hollowed out the humanist possibilities of self-acknowledgement and redemption. The novel probes deeper, instigating discomforting fundamental questions: for instance, how far is Lear implicated in Cordelia's death, despite his loud protestations of grief? Or, how do we reconcile the blatant misogyny, the searing curses on women in the play? Do we continue to see them as the mad ranting of an egotistical old man or introspect for a shift in our reading practices? An adaptation of *Lear* entitled *Lear's Daughters* performed by students at my college (2010), which I happened to have directed, opened with female dancers who were inflicted with a barrage of Lear's curses from the play

flung out sharply, like bullets, at them and who winced and fell at the onslaught provoking the same disturbing questions challenging the critical status quo around the play.[3] The rewriting by the novel, which goes further than most in supplementing Shakespeare's play, becomes, in Derrida's words, "an adjunct, a subaltern instance" (Attridge 83) which threatens to replace or supplant, coming close to becoming a "dangerous supplement."

These two appropriations of Shakespeare, *The Hungry* and *We That Are Young*, have been critiqued by some in India, particularly the novel, for their dark and grim perspectives on Indian society, but together they weave a web of supplementarity, adding to, enriching, completing in an acutely local, but also multi vocal and global manner: the film in its aesthetics, tightness of form, and non-Bollywood features, and the novel, written in English, open to the global market, in its formal and stylistic experimentation, and its reach beyond native informancy. Both of these overturn the classic tragic arc: the film re-gendering it but signalling a sense of waste and the novel jettisoning it for a decidedly dystopic and bleak worldview. In their restructuring and rewriting, they generate and accumulate new meanings, creating a different kind of Shakespeare. The film *The Hungry* rehabilitates the play *Titus*, making good an oft-acknowledged Shakespearean lack and insufficiency, as indicated earlier, thereby adding to Shakespearean resilience. The novel, through its rewriting, unpicks the settled assumptions about the play, extending and complicating the discourse around it.

In conclusion, this discussion, through the adaptation and recasting of *Titus Andronicus* and *King Lear*, attempts to propose a perspective on the process of versioning through an analogy with Derrida's concept of supplementarity as the very condition of language. If writing is a supplement to speech, inevitably accruing other supplements in a chain of signifiers, emerging out of the deferred meanings conceived as différance, may we not see the worldwide proliferation of versions of Shakespeare as an intrinsic condition where supplements of differentiated meanings will necessarily emerge as the condition of writing creating a plenitude enriching another plenitude.

WORKS CITED

Attridge, Derek, ed. *Jaques Derrida, Acts of Literature*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Bhandari, Arpita. "Indian Film based on Titus Andronicus is 'Monsoon Wedding' gone horribly wrong." 24 September 2017. https://scroll.in/reel/851696/indian-film-based-on-titus-andronicus-is-monsoon-wedding-gone-horribly-wrong. Accessed 10 December 2023.

[3] See Preti Taneja, "Lear's Indian Daughters." 28 March 2013, *Blogging Shakespeare*, Shakespeare Birthplace Trust.

Chatterjee, Bornila. “Adapting Shakespeare: Directors and Practitioners in Conversation.” *Women and Indian Shakespeares*. Eds. Thea Buckley, Mark Thornton Burnett, Sangeeta Datta and Rosa Garcia-Periago. London: The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2022. 243-261.

Chatterjee, Bornila, dir. *The Hungry*. BFI. 2017.

Lei, Bi qi Beatrice. “The Fatal Attraction of Empress Americana: *Titus Andronicus* as Japan’s Post-colonial Allegory.” Forthcoming in *Shakespeare in the ‘Post’ Colonies*.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman, ed. “Introduction.” *Titus Andronicus*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard and Katherine Eisaman Maus. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. 1977.

Maxwell, J. C., ed. “Introduction.” *Titus Andronicus*. The Arden Shakespeare, London: Methuen, 1968.

Taneja, Preti. “Adapting Shakespeare: Directors and Practitioners in Conversation.” *Women and Indian Shakespeares*. Eds. Thea Buckley, Mark Thornton Burnett, Sangeeta Datta and Rosa Garcia-Periago. London: The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2022. 243-261.

Taneja, Preti. “Lear’s Indian Daughters.” 28 March 2013, *Blogging Shakespeare*, Shakespeare Birthplace Trust.

Taneja, Preti. *We That Are Young*. Norwich: Galley Beggar Press, 2017.