

THE SHAKESPEAREAN INTERNATIONAL
YEARBOOK

12: SPECIAL SECTION, SHAKESPEARE IN INDIA

© The editors and contributors, 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

The editors and contributors have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work.

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Wey Court East
Union Road
Farnham
Surrey, GU9 7PT
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
Suite 420
101 Cherry Street
Burlington
VT 05401-4405
USA

www.ashgate.com

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

The Shakespearean international yearbook.

Volume 12, Special section. Shakespeare in India.

1. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616—Appreciation—India.

I. Bradshaw, Graham.

822.3'3-dc23

ISBN 9781409451167 (hbk)

ISBN 9781409451174 (ebk – PDF)

ISBN 9781409471080 (ebk – ePUB)

ISSN 1465-5098



Printed and bound in Great Britain by the
MPG Books Group, UK

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	vii
<i>Preface</i>	ix
Part I: Special Section: Shakespeare in India	
1 Introduction: Shakespeare in India <i>Sukanta Chaudhuri</i>	3
2 Impudent Imperialists: Burlesque and the Bard in Nineteenth-Century India <i>Poonam Trivedi</i>	7
3 “Every college student knows by heart”: The Uses of Shakespeare in Colonial Bengal <i>Rangana Banerji</i>	29
4 Shakespeare in Maharashtra, 1892–1927: A Note on a Trend in Marathi Theatre and Theatre Criticism <i>Aniket Jaaware and Urmila Bhardikar</i>	43
5 Story-teller, Poet, Playwright: Three Oriya Translations of Shakespeare (1908–1959) <i>Jatindra K. Nayak</i>	53
6 “We the globe can compass soon”: Tim Supple’s <i>Dream Ananda Lal</i>	65
7 Shakespeare in Indian Cinema: Appropriation, Assimilation, and Engagement <i>Rajiva Verma</i>	83
8 “What bloody man is that?” <i>Macbeth</i> , <i>Maqbool</i> , and Shakespeare in India <i>Supriya Chaudhuri</i>	97

9 Reading Intertextualities in Rituporno Ghosh's *The Last Lear*:
The Politics of Recanonization 115
Paromita Chakravarti

Part II

10 "To what base uses we may return": Deconstruction of *Hamlet* in
Contemporary Drama 133
Aneta Mancewicz

11 Rethinking Shylock 153
Andrew Gurr

Part III

12 The Field in Review: New Biography Studies, Queer Turns in
Theory, and Shakespearean Utility 169
Rebecca Chapman

13 The Field in Review: Textual Studies, Performance Criticism, and
Digital Humanities 195
Niamh J. O'Leary

Bibliography 227
Notes on Contributors 245
Index 249

List of Figures

1 *The Merry Merchant of Venice* (June 1898): the "Mounted
Mashers" chorus with Jessica on the left played by the author F.
J. Fraser. Photo courtesy the ADC, Gaiety Theatre, Simla. 16

2 *The Merry Merchant of Venice* (June 1898): Portia and Bassanio.
Photo courtesy of the ADC, Gaiety theatre, Simla. 19

3 *The Merry Merchant of Venice* (June 1898): Portia in lawyer's
robes. Photo courtesy the ADC, Gaiety Theatre, Simla. 21

4 *The Merry Merchant of Venice* (June 1898): the full cast. Note
Shylock at his shop window (*top right*) and the three brass balls
of the pawnbroker's sign (*top middle*). Photo courtesy ADC,
Gaiety Theatre, Simla. 23

Terris, Owen, Eve-Marie Oesterlen, and Luke McKernan, eds. *Shakespeare on Film, Television and Radio: The Researcher's Guide*. London: British Universities Film & Video Council, 2009.

NOTES

1. The *New York Times* ran a particularly salient article reporting the problematic position of the humanities and liberal arts education in our current climate; see Patricia Cohen, "In Tough Times, the Humanities Must Justify their Worth," *New York Times* C1, 25 February 2009, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/25/books/25human.html>.
2. *Antony and Cleopatra*, 5.2.216; all Shakespeare citations are taken from *The Norton Complete Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katherine Maus, 2nd. ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2008).
3. *Richard II*, 3.2.173.
4. *Coriolanus*, 5.3.35-6.
5. Rumold's article appears in the special issue of *Shakespeare Quarterly*, "Shakespeare and New Media" (Fall 2010).
6. See Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989) and Richard Burt, *Shakespeares after Shakespeare: An Encyclopedia of the Bard in Mass Media and Popular Culture*, 2 vols (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2007).

13 The Field in Review: Textual Studies, Performance Criticism, and Digital Humanities

Niamh J. O'Leary

Undertaking to discuss several of the scholarly monographs and edited collections published about Shakespeare in the last year has been a fascinating and inspiring experience. While this essay will focus on five specific subject areas, it is clear that scholarship is flourishing in many different directions and that a recounting like this can only reveal the tip of the iceberg, both in terms of any particular argument, and of the field as a whole. From Shakespeare's poetry, to his plays in performance and adaptation across the world, to textual history, to online databases, this essay will provide brief discussions of fourteen books and four digital archives.

As I state in the conclusion, having reviewed this body of work, it seems evident that the liveliest vein of scholarship in the last year is that which examines Shakespeare in a global context. Manfred Pfister and Juergen Gutsch's anthology presents translations of the Sonnets in seventy-three different languages. Three of the four digital archives represented below are devoted to examining Shakespeare's afterlives in non-European locations, among them Canada, China, and New Zealand. One whole section of this review essay focuses on monographs and edited collections published about Shakespeare around the globe, and particularly, Shakespeare in Asia. For the most part, scholarship in this area attends to performance traditions and adaptation, rather than, say, a particular Chinese tradition of Shakespeare scholarship. And yet, this criticism is by no means narrowly focused. Rather, it embraces a myriad of critical approaches, dealing with Shakespeare's poetry, questions of

gender and politics, performance and pedagogy, textuality and transmission. As I will discuss below, this new and growing field both encompasses and expands known scholarly approaches, and throws open many new doors for Shakespearean scholarship. It demands interdisciplinarity and technological awareness, and it urges us to embrace less familiar narratives of Shakespearean tradition, becoming globally-aware scholars in a global profession.

SHAKESPEARE'S POETRY

Within the last year, two new volumes were released that focus on Shakespeare's poetry: a creative new anthology, and a companion. In *William Shakespeare's Sonnets for the First Time Globally Reprinted: A Quartercentenary Anthology*, editors Manfred Pfister and Juergen Gutsch, along with the aid of seventy-five contributors, present Shakespeare's Sonnets in seventy-three different languages, including Pennsylvania Dutch, Sign Language, Maori, and Klingon. The sheer immensity of the project is impressive. Each individual chapter includes a brief introductory essay discussing the history of Shakespeare's Sonnets, the sonnet form, and translation in each particular culture, while offering brief biographies of the translators and discussions of critical response to the translations. The introductions are followed by sample translations, and in many cases, multiple translations of the same sonnet. In addition to literal translations, the anthology contains "translations or transpositions into other genres of literature and other media" (12). These transpositions are available on the included DVD's "multimedial archive" (13).

The Sonnets, which were not internationally popular until the nineteenth century, are now translated all over the world, though in many international cultures, they were translated as much as a century after the plays (14). Some issues that come to the forefront in tracing translations of the Sonnets in different cultural contexts include the potentially subversive sexual aspect of the poetry; the question of whether or not "to render the Sonnets as closely as possible to their original aesthetic form"; whether or not to burden/enhance translations with extensive commentary and editorial apparatus; and the extent to which various translators "take liberties" with the Sonnets, rewriting them rather than translating them (16–19). Because translations were often "second hand"—that is, translated from French or German into Icelandic or Maori, rather than from English—the translated Sonnets are in a "double dialogue ... with both the original English text and with the extant target language translations past or present" (21). In addition, translations by poets engage in a third strand

of dialogue—with that particular poet's own body of work (22). Pfister and Gutsch also note that these translations were frequently completed by men and women who were imprisoned or exiled. They tie this to the unique prevalence of Sonnet 66 in translations which, the editors argue, spoke particularly to "a continental Europe suffering under Nazism or Stalinism" because it focuses on "the political abuses of the times" (26).

The accompanying DVD provides a wealth of information. Here I have chosen to focus on two of its most useful applications. First, in terms of pedagogy, the many sound recordings of recitations of the Sonnets, both in English and by native speakers of every language represented in the anthology, provide a plethora of auditory experiences. There are also recordings of the Sonnets set to music in a variety of languages, films of the Sonnets being performed, and image files of book jackets advertising the Sonnets in different languages. Any of these materials could be used to provoke classroom discussion. Secondly, the DVD contains an extensive archive of images both of the Sonnets and of sonnet-related artwork. Pfister comments on the dearth of scholarship attending to the graphic afterlives of the Sonnets, and as scholarship increasingly becomes interested in the graphic afterlives of the plays, I imagine this collection will provide an excellent starting point for any who wish to engage the Sonnets in this way.

Michael Schoenfeldt's *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Poetry* is a helpful companion text for Shakespeare's nondramatic poems. Schoenfeldt contends that, aside from the Sonnets, Shakespeare's poems "have been almost completely ignored outside the academy" (2). The introductory chapter situates the poems in relation to Shakespeare's dramatic oeuvre as well as the poetic traditions of early modern England. He aligns himself with Patrick Cheney's characterization of Shakespeare as poet-playwright and connects what Shakespeare does in his non-dramatic poetry to what he does in the plays. For example, he comments that Shakespeare "possesses a remarkable capacity to unfold and then overturn a position, either in the couplet or in the next poem," continuing to observe that "this ability to imagine various perspectives" may have contributed to his success as a playwright (7–8).

Schoenfeldt's enthusiastic admiration of the poems coupled with his rigorous close readings evokes an equal enthusiasm in his readers. Commenting on how much of Shakespeare's dramatic language has passed into common usage, Schoenfeldt suggests that "our comparative ignorance of the poems can be an asset, allowing us to hear them with fresh ears" (4). This is a good argument for beginning a Shakespeare course with the less-familiar poetry, helping our students to hear Shakespeare for the first time again, before turning

to the well-trod ground of the plays. While devoting whole chapters each to *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, and a single chapter to both *A Lover's Complaint* and "The Phoenix and the Turtle," Schoenfeldt addresses the Sonnets in three separate chapters, focusing respectively on the questions of textual mysteries, the thematic representations of time, and the thematic representations of desire. The textual mysteries chapter discusses in detail the publication history of the Sonnets, considering the dedication and the debate about the dedicatee, the debates surrounding the ordering of the Sonnets, and the mysteries surrounding the identity of the young man and the Dark Lady. Concluding his chapter on the Sonnets' interest in time, Schoenfeldt summarizes aptly "the poems propose the partial compensations of poetry, progeny, and memory against time's relentless and pervasive devastation" (87). He redirects our attention away from *who* Shakespeare was writing to and toward *what* he wrote about: that is, "the matrix of complex and conflicted emotions aroused by another person" (87). This leads into his chapter focusing on the Sonnets' interest in desire, a chapter that is, in part, an answer to the question, "why should we still read the poems?" Schoenfeldt comments both that "much of our current iconography and vocabulary of erotic experience derives from the love poetry that emerged in Shakespeare's lifetime" and that we are better equipped to read and appreciate the poems now because "the specific subjects of Shakespeare's poetry—ideas of race and color, the relation between same-sex and opposite-sex desire, connections between sex and death, the sexual power of women—have recently become intellectually and socially central to contemporary life in a way that they were not before" (18).

His closing chapter considers the question of why we are still so curious about who wrote Shakespeare. Schoenfeldt provides a two-page digestion and dismissal of authorship "conspiracy theories" that some may find useful in the classroom once the 2011 Roland Emmerich film *Anonymous* hits theaters. The rest of the chapter considers the early modern "fantasy of Shakespearean authorship"—a desire to locate new poems by Shakespeare—and the history of the textual scholarship required to recognize the illegitimacy of various such claims.

Schoenfeldt concludes that, even if Shakespeare's poems had been his only surviving works, he "would still be one of the greatest English writers, a poet who disturbed and advanced every genre he deployed, and who helped create the vocabulary and syntax with which we will still talk about love" (143). The book works to prove this through making clear and interesting discussions of the poems available to a general audience, and ultimately, such a volume would be incredibly useful in the classroom.

TEXTUALITIES

In this broadly-defined subject area, two new books deal with more traditional questions of textual history, and one takes up related questions about the intersections of text and genre. I will discuss the latter first. Catherine M. S. Alexander's edited collection, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Last Plays*, consists of two halves, the first of which focuses on how we have thus far conceived of Shakespeare's late plays and how we need to think of them differently, particularly focusing on historicizing them in the less-familiar Jacobean period. The second half of the collection features essays that look at the afterlives of these late plays.

I focus here on two excellent representative essays from the volume. First, in "What Is a 'Late' Play?," Gordon McMullan proposes two "thought-experiments" in order to rectify what he sees as an incomplete approach to the plays. The first is to consider Shakespeare's *last* plays, rather than his late plays. This category, according to McMullan, includes the ten plays written between 1607 and 1613, as dated by the Oxford Edition.¹ These plays share, if not "the traditional centrality of the *father/daughter* binary," then certainly a "gender-unspecific *parent/child*" concern (15–16). Secondly, they all hinge on "the issue of *return*," in terms of the romance genre's interest in journey and reunion; in the plays' "rehearsing, reshaping and reinventing past concerns in new contexts"; and in the sense of revision, as evident in the revised *Lear* and the reworking of the Theseus tale from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (16–17). McMullan's second "thought-experiment" requires imagining the last plays in relation to other plays performed by the King's Men during the years 1607–13, and by competing companies, attending to "the place of the play in the commercial structures of the theatre" (21). This is an effort to decentralize the author, and a well-argued one. McMullan is convinced that "treating Shakespeare as the interpretive hub of the plays in question" is "to miss a certain amount (or even a great deal) of the point, to take a view which is at best partial" (24).

Another outstanding contribution to the volume is Russ McDonald's essay, "'You speak a language that I understand not': Listening to the Last Plays," in which he describes and analyzes the distinctive style of the last plays, a poetic style he calls "audacious, irregular, ostentatious, playful, and difficult" (91). He catalogues and provides examples of an impressive number of stylistic characteristics, glossing them with such clarity that this essay will be extremely useful in teaching the last plays. Turning to analysis, McDonald argues that Shakespeare's altered poetic style in the last plays is indicative of

“imaginative recuperation of the female and a concentration on the redemptive associations of femininity” (104). He claims that Shakespeare’s investment in increased ornamentation marks a return to an older style “left behind” by Jacobean playwrights and denigrated by anti-theatrical and anti-Catholic sentiment, which viewed the ornamentations of elaborate rhetoric as of a piece with cosmetics, idolatry, and other offensive worldly interests. According to McDonald, this stylistic renaissance is “consistent with [Shakespeare’s] passage from tragedy to romance”—whereas excessive ornamentation and rhetorical fireworks often indicated subterfuge and danger in the tragedies, in the last plays, they provide “consolation and creativity” (105–6). However, he notes that the verbal flourishes could also be “a stylistic manifestation of the ambivalence Shakespeare encourages his audience to consider and to relish” (109).

Other excellent essays include Suzanne Gossett’s exploration of co-authorship in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Henry VIII*, and Virginia Mason Vaughan’s discussion of the afterlife of *The Tempest* in various literary appropriations and adaptations. On the whole, the volume brings together an impressive set of critical approaches to these last plays.

In the preface to *Shakespeare’s Errant Texts*, Lene B. Petersen sets out to answer the increasingly complex question, “how indeed do we define what constitutes a ‘Shakespearean text?’” (xi). She sets up her book as a response to Laurie Maguire’s *Shakespearean Suspect Texts* (1996) and Brian Vickers’ *Shakespeare, Co-Author* (2002),² seeing her major contribution as an attention to “the many formal and stylistic synergies, interchanges and reciprocities between oral/memorial and authorial composition,” focusing on “the site of interaction between actorly and authorial input” (xi). To accomplish this goal, Petersen brings in theories borrowed from folklore studies and devises a “series of stylo-statistical tests” that are designed to help elucidate authorship. Petersen sees herself following both theatre historians in her attentiveness to the practices of performance in Renaissance theatre, and scholars like Tiffany Stern and Simon Palfrey in their assertion that the playtexts we have today are a “composite product.” Thus, she seeks to combine an understanding and study of Renaissance theatre practices with a more textually-driven study of “the playwright’s stylistic imprint” (xvi).

Petersen’s book begins with a history of the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre, focusing in particular on what she identifies as its “oral-memorial dimensions,” and combining this with methodologies derived from folklore study. She then applies this knowledge, along with formalist analysis and “computer-facilitated quantitative linguistics” to *Romeo and Juliet* and

Hamlet. She argues that “memorial retention in, and oral reproduction from, the minds of actors are significant factors in the morphology of the early modern playtext” (xvii). She insists that, when studying omissions in early modern playtexts, we must attend to “the idiosyncrasy of the matter omitted,” stating that idiosyncratic, stylistic complexity could only be ensured through “repeat performance *and* print distribution over time,” which she calls “tradition” (140). In addition, as “oral delivery and memorial retention operated as key formative factors in early modern play composition,” Peterson feels we must bring together folklore studies of “the transmission of folktales and traditional ballads” with our study of the textual history of Shakespeare’s plays (141).

In the second half of her book, Petersen turns to careful analysis of authorial style and linguistics, locating authorial fingerprint and tracing its disappearance over time as the text was revised through collaborative interference. She argues that it is not merely the author who contributed “stylistic components” to the plays, but rather, that the plays were affected by “oral contamination” among a host of other “extra-authorial influences” (237). Petersen introduces and demonstrates particular “stylo-statistical methods” of analysis which are helpful in “question[ing] certain *a priori* assumptions of textual categorization,” such as the three categories of good quarto, bad quarto, and folio texts. In particular, Petersen applies these methods and metrics to demonstrate that *Romeo and Juliet* is not immediately separable into these three categories (237).

Clearly one of Peterson’s main goals and greatest contributions is to introduce methodologies that will be useful in future studies of the “multi-text plays”. Furthermore, Petersen’s insistence on attending to oral/memorial traditions through lenses borrowed from folklore studies will certainly make an impression upon the field. It seems that the world of textual scholarship will soon have to answer to her call to action and “learn to map” tradition in order to understand its stylistic impact on developing play texts (241).

Gabriel Egan’s *The Struggle for Shakespeare’s Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice* provides a history of the twentieth-century struggle to make sense of the many early editions of Shakespeare’s works. Egan’s history is not impartial; he argues “that authors are the most dominant agents in the constellation of forces (personal, cultural, political, and institutional) that come together in the publication of books” (3). Egan proposes to offer a different sort of history of editorial controversies by focusing on “how they seemed to the people who were making the arguments at the time” (9). He feels this kind of historically-located perspective, one that does not attempt “to discern [the theorists’] unconscious motives” will provide

a clearer explanation of the controversy (10). Egan expresses frustration with scholarship that offers psychological interpretation of various editorial practices and promises that, while “a certain kind of historiography would read arguments about Shakespeare editions as symptomatic of other, wider conflicts ... this book pays its subjects the compliment of taking them at their word and it deals with their overt differences of opinion without trying to discern their unconscious motives” (9–10).

The body of the book consists of a chronological presentation of the rise of New Bibliography and the conflicts it encountered. Egan separates from this narrative a brief essay on “the rise and fall of the theory of memorial reconstruction,” a theory that he argues “is not integral to the New Bibliography” (11). The book also contains three appendices. The first, “How early modern books were made: a brief guide” is exactly what it claims to be. The second provides a table of editions of Shakespeare prior to the 1623 First Folio, listing also who produced the editions and whether or not there were subsequent editions. The third, “Editorial principles of the major twentieth-century Shakespeare editions,” lists “significant Shakespeare editions since 1899 with descriptions of their editorial approaches, cross-referenced to discussions of the editions or their ideas in the main body of [the] book” (240). Egan includes in this appendix only those editions that “stimulated debate about what editors should do or that helped establish Shakespeare’s texts” (241–71).³ Each edition is accompanied by an explanation of the editorial theory it deployed, and this contextual and comparative information is perhaps one of the book’s most useful contributions as it provides a clear introduction to understanding how editorial theory has impacted our study of Shakespeare directly through the texts we choose to read and teach. Interestingly, Egan observes in this appendix “how seldom people at the heart of the [development of theory] were engaged” in the “practice” of editing Shakespeare’s texts (240).

A brief conclusion examines the current state of editorial theory and practice, focusing on the influence of New Textualism, with its insistence that each edition “has its own integrity,” and how editorial theory might respond to Lukas Erne’s argument that Shakespeare was a professional writer, “concerned with his growing readership” as well as a man of the theatre (207–10). Egan’s observations on editorial theory’s need to respond to Erne are quite compelling and point the way for continuing advancements in editorial theory and practice. According to Egan, Erne’s focus on Shakespeare as a man of the page provides a valuable corrective to the “stage-centered ‘new’ New Bibliography” (221). Egan also calls for editorial theory to turn more fully to the pressing concerns of co-authorship.

SHAKESPEARE IN PERFORMANCE

Several books in the last year have turned to the well-trod and extremely rich area of performance studies. In *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*, Margaret Jane Kidnie argues “that a play, for all that it carries the rhetorical and ideological force of an enduring stability, is not an object at all, but rather a dynamic *process* that evolves over time in response to the needs and sensibilities of its users” (2). Kidnie asks what differentiates adaptation from production and is particularly interested in the way critics insist on being able to distinguish between what is and what is not Shakespearean adaptation. Kidnie’s book “challenges sometimes unspoken assumptions that adaptation is synonymous with performance, or that performance is somehow more vulnerable than text to adaptive practices” (5–6). One of her chief contributions is the conception of “work as process,” something which “continually takes shape as a *consequence* of production,” and which Kidnie argues will make available “alternative critical practices” that consider the “politics of reception” (6–7).

In the first chapter, Kidnie expands on her definition of adaptation. Importantly, she recognizes that drama will always be a troubling genre because of the equal importance of text and performance. Like Petersen, she works to bring together histories of performance and text in order to understand the full richness of a work. She points to all the problems critics encounter when they operate under the assumption that there is a single correct “text,” and offers the following important corrective: “textual production is subject to its own interventionist conventions” (23). So, the authenticity or legitimacy of a work is “continually produced among communities of users through assertion and dissension” (31). These “communities of users” are comprised of readers and spectators.

In the second chapter, she examines two Royal Shakespeare Company productions—the Warchus *Hamlet* (1997) and Doran *All’s Well that Ends Well* (2003)—pointing out the “potentially temporary and limited currency” of any production that we call authentically Shakespearean today (9). The third chapter turns to the politics of Shakespearean adaptation, especially in terms of the “conception of the work” and the difficulties of sustaining a permeable category of “the work”. Kidnie’s third chapter, about “the politics of production,” looks at “cases that openly declare an adaptive distance from Shakespeare’s works,” stating that they “disrupt Shakespearean production by making the works seem at once recognizable and strange” (65). Here, she focuses on Djanet Sears’ *Harlem Duet* and Robert Lepage’s *Elsinore*. She

claims that, despite their outspoken claims of difference, these adaptations must and do “enter into a sustained interaction with the dominant theatrical-critical legacies of *Othello* and *Hamlet*” and that their “disruptive potential” arises from “the way they assert yet at the same time display as flexible and porous the boundaries separating a work from its adaptation” (70). In Chapter Four, Kidnie turns to Shakespeare on television, focusing on the BBC’s *Shakespeare Re-Told* series (2005). This chapter looks at how new technologies can shape our ability to recognize Shakespeare’s work. This seems a timely concern to pursue, as online Shakespeare archives such as those discussed below, continue to proliferate.

In the introduction to their collection of essays, *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons*, editors Paul Yachnin and Jessica Slights argue “character has made a comeback,” suggesting that for characters such as Desdemona, Hamlet, and Shylock, character-driven criticism is relevant, even essential (1). Yachnin and Slights claim that it is now time to return to this mode of scholarship because it is both “the organizing formal feature of Shakespeare’s drama” and “the heart of audience engagement with his plays” (12). While this volume may at first seem misplaced among other scholarly contributions to the field of performance studies, Yachnin and Slights assert that “much greater attention needs to be paid to the contributions made by the theater and the performance environment as we attempt to re-articulate a notion of character in the twenty-first century” (3). Thus, the book deals at least in part with issues of performance.

Yachnin and Slights provide a history of character criticism. Interest in Shakespeare’s characters migrated away from the concept that they “were best understood as mimetic representations of imagined persons,” to the idea that we should “[explore] human nature through an analysis of Shakespearean character” (2). This approach reached its apex in A. C. Bradley’s *Shakespearean Tragedy* (1904), which Yachnin and Slights call “the grand finale of nineteenth-century Shakespeare criticism” and “the definitive synthesis of this long tradition of celebrating Shakespeare’s ability to portray psychological depth” (2). Character criticism was eclipsed by the critical movements of the twentieth century, including New Criticism, New Historicism, and Poststructuralism. But Yachnin and Slights feel that it is time to return to this mode of scholarship, based on their assertion “that character is the organizing principle of Shakespeare’s plays ... [and] character is the principal bridge over which the emotional, cognitive, and political transactions of theater and literature pass between actors and playgoers or between written texts and readers” (7).

The essays in the book are divided into four separate sections. The first examines the basic questions of character criticism, and the second considers the Renaissance approach to Shakespeare’s characters. The third looks at character in terms of performance, and the fourth examines specific characters from *Timon of Athens*, *King John*, and *King Lear*. The many essays provide a rich assortment of approaches to character criticism. Among the most intriguing are those by Michael Bristol, James Berg, and Leanore Lieblein.

Bristol’s essay, “Confusing Shakespeare’s Characters with Real People: Reflections on Reading in Four Questions,” suggests that it is alright to think of Shakespeare’s characters as real people. Considering Lear, Rosalind, and Viola, Bristol finds that Shakespeare’s concept of human nature is one of “vulnerability to harm.” He continues to argue that “authority” is more important to Shakespearean character than interiority, and “personhood” is comprised of “singularity and aloneness” in Shakespeare’s plays (23–4, 29–30). He closes by reflecting on the fact that “character” as a verb means “to write,” as well as to construe the contents of another’s character, and that Shakespeare’s characters spend a great deal of time attempting to understand one another, which is an essential aspect of human experience. In fact, as he points out, “[w]e learn about our own complex human nature by thinking about and coming to respect Shakespeare’s characters” (38). In his chapter on “The Properties of Character in *King Lear*,” James Berg takes a material history approach to Shakespeare’s character, arguing that in *King Lear*, “all character is property, where property represents not just what persons seem to own, but the things that properly belong with them. And all property is character, symbolic reading material” (99). Berg states, “feebleness at the core of formidable persons is ... the play’s central theme” (99), as all persons can be reduced to what they possess.

Leanore Lieblein’s essay, “Embodied Intersubjectivity and the Creation of Early Modern Character,” returns to the issue of performance, considering Shakespearean character as created out of an interaction between the actor’s “own embodied subjectivity” and his experience of “the emotions and thoughts” of the “person personated” (127). Referencing Thomas Heywood’s *Apology for Actors* (1612), Lieblein argues that “[r]hetorical theory of the early modern period suggests that the process of personation is understood as an intersubjective relationship between embodied subjects in what today are phenomenological terms” (127). Whether or not one agrees that character needs to “make a comeback,” as Yachnin and Slights suggest, the essays in this volume provide many new and thought-provoking readings of Shakespeare’s most-loved and most complex characters.

Like Lieblein, Erica Sheen looks to seventeenth-century rhetorical and theatrical theory. Sheen's *Shakespeare and the Institution of Theatre: The Best in this Kind* sets out to rectify what she sees as a critical failure to properly theorize the theatre as an institution and apply that theory to further readings of the plays. Sheen feels that the existing American theories of the institution of theater in the Renaissance are "[correlated with] the contemporary transition from Cold War to global market (and back again)" and that "the way this correlation is back-projected onto early modern and Shakespearean theatre ... might be doing both Shakespeare and contemporary Shakespeare studies a disservice" (11).⁴ She turns instead to Anthony Giddens' "theory of structuration ... in an effort to review and renew the application of the concept of the institution to the study of Shakespearean theatre" (11). This theory emphasizes "agency rather than discourse," a mode that Sheen considers especially relevant to a study of Renaissance theatre, particularly because "it encourages us to recognize institutionalization as fundamentally a creative process" (12). Central to the book is what Sheen identifies as "the notion of a theatrical agency free from political accountability" (14).

Sheen applies her theory of the institution of theatre to readings of nine different plays, spanning from *The Taming of the Shrew* to *The Tempest*. She considers the transition in the 1590s away from theatrical dependence upon patronage to what she calls "financially induced autonomy," which can be read in the plays: "Shakespeare's plays in the 1590s chart the transformation of prestigious but unsupportive patronage into profitable popularity" (13–14). For example, Sheen compares the relative positions of the mechanicals in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595–96), performing a specially prepared play expressly for a court occasion; and the players of *Hamlet* (1600), who belong to an autonomous group that arrives at the court by coincidence and remains "resolutely aloof" from the court politics that motivate Hamlet's request for their specific performance.

Sheen notes that, while Theseus's position as evaluator of the mechanicals' performative efforts may suggest that their success rests entirely on his patronage, the play undermines that notion. Not only does it offer clear statements of each player's individual motivation, but also, it contrasts Theseus's "obviously limited insight into the action" with Hippolyta's—who Sheen likens to the intelligent spectator, Elizabeth (99). Turning to *Hamlet*, Sheen argues that the leading player's speech in 2.2 demonstrates "that Shakespeare saw literary readership as a structural element ... of theatre at its best" (105). Sheen notes Hamlet's excellent memory of the speech, despite having never seen the play performed: "In strong contrast to Theseus, the

skills he brings to the selection of this speech for performance, particularly in his emphasis on style, are those of a reader, not a prince or courtier" (105). She also points out the "chain of spectatorships" in this scene: Hecuba looking at Priam, the Player "looking" at them and narrating the scene, Hamlet watching the player, and us watching Hamlet. These layers only further enrich a much more complex narrative of "the exchange that takes place between the disparate positions of interest mapped out by this collective public gaze" (107). Moving then to a sharp reading of Elizabeth I's 1601 claim "I am Richard II. Know ye not that?", Sheen suggests that the queen "articulates the iterative nature of a habit of spectatorship now naturalized as a general form of social competence" and that "by 1601, [Shakespearean theatre] was above political accountability" (109).

As she explores various plays, Sheen considers the playhouse as property and the changing needs and demands of the theatrical traditions, spanning from the early 1590s when Shakespeare operated quasi-independently in the London theatre scene; to the mid-1590s, when the Chamberlain's Men had residence at the Theatre; to the late 1590s, as they moved to the Globe and began to anticipate Elizabeth's death; to the early 1600s, as Shakespeare responded to the altered expectations of a new monarch and the potential for change that the Blackfriars offered.

John Astington's *Actors and Acting in Shakespeare's Time: The Art of Stage Playing*, provides a very helpful and insightful history of the profession of actors and the habits of acting during the Renaissance. He identifies "the lack [of acting schools] in England before the later seventeenth century" and "the player's role as an instructor" as two of his major concentrations (1). He begins with the assertion that the theatre was a rapidly growing and changing profession in Renaissance England. Astington estimates there were 150–200 actors in London in the early seventeenth century. In addition to these professional actors, he also mentions "a vigorous amateur theatre" both in schools and universities and among communities as varied as "apprentices, sailors, lawyers, and aristocratic families" (8–9).

Astington's first chapter, about the vocabulary of the theatre in Renaissance England, is perhaps the most immediately compelling. First, he examines the "dismissive" language used by some of Shakespeare's characters to describe acting, such as "counterfeit," "in jest," and "shadows." He looks in particular at Theseus in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and Hamlet speaking to the players. Using this evidence to contrive a historical vocabulary of acting, Astington argues that early modern performance focused on "action" and "accent" as the "central terms in whatever we might tentatively call a theory of acting in the

Shakespearean period" (20). These terms, Astington claims, are a Renaissance revision of Quintilian's and Cicero's emphasis on voice, facial expression, and animation (or *vox*, *vultus*, and *vita*) (23). He also considers the Renaissance emphasis on the term "presentation" rather than "representation" to refer to stage performances, commenting that it both evokes a sense of "the current living moment," and contrasts the artifice and "rigidity" that Shakespeare mocks in the mechanicals' presentation of Wall and Moon (30).

In later chapters, Astington addresses the relationship between theatre and education and the professional lives of actors. The third chapter provides a fascinating history of how professional actors made use of the traditions of apprenticeship: actors like John Hemminges would be registered apprentices and eventually practitioners in "legitimate" trades, such as grocery. These actors would use the apprenticeship to become official "citizens of London [and] freemen of London companies" (77–8). They would go on to take on apprentices of their own, nominally as apprentice grocers, but would actually train the boys in the ways of the theatre.

At the end of the book, Astington provides an amazing appendix. Totalling 36 pages, this lists principal actors known to have performed in 1558–1660 and includes a brief paragraph biography of each. On the whole, Astington's book provides a helpful history and would be a good intro text to assign chapters from for classes on early modern drama.

Lina Perkins Wilder's *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character* traces the way that "the materials of theatre are, for Shakespeare, the materials of memory" (1). Wilder argues that props, the physical space of the theatre, and the actors "become the materials for a mnemonic dramaturgy that shapes language, character, and plot" (1–2). Props and actors appeared in multiple productions, and thus the memory of other performances and other stages that existed outside the experience of a single performance was important—a memory the viewer brought to each play he witnessed, and one frequently invoked by the actors and characters onstage. Wilder claims that "a means of staging something like subjectivity begins to develop in the disjunction between the audience's recollection of the fictional and theatrical 'past' surrounding the play and the character's" (12). In addition, Wilder theorizes the power of "absent objects" to evoke memories, such as Lady Macbeth's child and Prospero's books. Ultimately, she argues, "Shakespeare's memory theatre consists of props that are not there ..., contained physical spaces located elsewhere than on the stage ..., and props whose physical presence evokes physical absence" (2).⁵

Wilder considers the gendered aspects of memory, pointing out the distinction between the rhetorical understanding of recollection and memory. The former was characterized as "wandering" and thus, feminine, and must be "controlled through skills gendered male" (4). She sees these competing notions of male-gendered, orderly memory or recounting, and female-gendered, disorderly recollection, reflected in Shakespeare's plays: "As male bodily discipline breaks down in Shakespeare's memory theatre, accurate and orderly reporting of offstage events gives way to the rhetorical circulation of *dilatatio*. The result is that in Shakespeare's plays women teach educated men how to think" (8).⁶

The first chapter provides a history of the memory arts and their intersection and conflict with theatrical memory practices in early modern England, looking in particular at embodied memory and uses of the body and physical space in creating and maintaining memory. Wilder then turns to readings of seven plays chosen because each "evokes a past vexed by war, by vendetta, or by usurpation, a past which makes socially stabilizing memory difficult to maintain" (19). The chapters include readings of Romeo's remembrance of the Apothecary's shop and the Nurse's remembrance of weaning Juliet; Falstaff as a memory figure in the *Henry IV* plays and *Henry V*; Desdemona and Lady Macbeth as figures of false or fractured memory; and the "absent mnemonics made present" in *The Tempest's* daughters and wives and Prospero's cell and books. Altogether, these readings:

[explore] a tragic mode informed by history and particularly by the role of women and other outsiders from history. ... Constructing a past from theatrical materials, such figures align themselves with the social and professional world of the theatre as much as, if not more than, with the fictional world of the plays in which they take shape. (19)

Perhaps the book's most promising chapter, Wilder's treatment of the *Henry IV* plays and *Henry V* identifies both Falstaff and the Hostess as figures of memory. In particular, the audience is challenged by Falstaff's conspicuous absence to attempt an impossible act of forgetting; one of many that the three plays demand. Wilder argues that the audience must "put aside" many "inconvenient memor[ies]" of Richard II's death and Henry IV's path to the throne and, most importantly for this argument, Falstaff himself, "with whom the future Henry V engages in conflict over the contents of the audience's memories" (39).

In her conclusion, Wilder notes, "staged remembering makes social business even of the supposed interior of the mind" (204). On the whole,

Wilder's book is wildly provocative and rigorously documented. Dealing in particular with rhetorical treatises and an intimate understanding of stagecraft and the materials of theatre, she offers many suggestive new readings of the plays, shedding new light on such old issues as Lady Macbeth's absent children and Prospero's books. Thickly written and densely theoretical, it can be a tough, but certainly rewarding, read.

GLOBAL SHAKESPEARES

It is only in recent years that American scholars have begun to pursue questions of Global Shakespeares, both in terms of how Shakespeare and his contemporaries conceived of the globe, and of how the globe has conceived of Shakespeare over the last four hundred years. Taking up the former vein of inquiry, Carole Levin and John Watkins undertake one of Hercules' endeavors in *Shakespeare's Foreign Worlds*: to undo the disciplinary boundaries that have kept historians and literary scholars from fully acknowledging their similarities. They begin by asking, "what would happen if we threw out the pretension of disciplinary divergence altogether and began to question the Elizabethan past, not as professors of literature and history but simply as early modernists?" (3). They lament that, while conferences and co-edited volumes propose to bring together historians and literary scholars, there is still a great deal of "institutional pretense" about the separation between the two approaches, and one sign of that is the lack of co-authored monographs. This book is their response.

While the question of disciplinary boundaries is interesting, Levin and Watkins' greatest accomplishment is their choice to apply this endeavor to an examination of Elizabethan nationhood. Combining Levin's interest in "Shakespeare's responses to marginalized sectors of English society" with Watkins's interest in "the context of broadly European historical movements," the volume argues that "the emergence of the 'foreign' as a portable category that might be applied both to 'strangers' from other countries and to native-born English men and women, such as religious dissidents, who resisted conformity to an increasingly narrow sense of English identity" is "an ideological development fundamental to the conception of English nationhood" (8). Focusing on the 1590s—prior to major colonial expansion and yet concurrent with great population growth and internal, European migration—the authors argue, "Shakespeare's England comes about by reducing an almost infinite number of groups and individuals to the general category of the foreign" (14).

According to Watkins and Levin, Englishness was defined by "coherence" within England, and "distinctiveness" from other European cultures. Each of these descriptors is, of course, problematic, and it is in these contradictions and problems that Shakespeare creates his richest drama. The authors chose to write about *1 Henry VI*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *The Taming of the Shrew*, claiming that "Shakespeare's evocation of foreign and domestic settings ... creates the sense of an English identity continually threatened by a nebulous foreignness" (14). The book is structured in three sets of paired chapters, each set addressing one of the three plays. Each set of chapters is preceded by a brief introduction, and each set includes one chapter by Levin and one by Watkins. They collectively see *1 Henry VI* as Shakespeare's "earliest and most complex response to the Reformation's impact on English constructions of the foreign" (23). They both take up Joan of Arc in the play, locating gender "as a particularly charged site in the emergence of the foreign as a category of opprobrium defining the English nation" (23). Turning to *The Merchant of Venice*, Levin examines Jessica's conversion in the context of similar historical conversions, arguing that it "expose[s] the persistence of a fundamental Jewishness that could never fully assimilate to English society" (83). Watkins reads the play's fixation on the deteriorating economic state of Venice as reflective of English anxiety about similar economic collapse. And in the last paired chapter set, the authors consider *The Taming of the Shrew*, looking at how "new ways of thinking ... might be domesticated as fundamentally English, repudiated as alien and subversive, or occupy a controversial position somewhere in between" (141). Considering the effects of Reformation theology and Italian humanism, each author argues that the play raises interesting questions about these schools of thought through Katherine: "Shakespeare seems to have been less interested in theological and philosophical differences than in the effect that humanist and Protestant pedagogical traditions might have on the place of women within the home and, by implication, on English society at large" (142).

Levin and Watkins are right to remind us that "relatively few of Shakespeare's characters are English" (8). Their choice to focus on Shakespeare, "a notoriously unreliable historian," pays off well (6). Their readings of Shakespeare's foreign characters inject new life into the discourse of nationhood in scholarship, and their concerted effort to enter this discourse in a cross-disciplinary way is particularly refreshing.

While Levin and Watkins' text takes up Global Shakespeare on Shakespeare's own terms, Alexander Huang, Dennis Kennedy and Yong Li Lan, and Poonam Trivedi and Minami Ryuta pursue Global Shakespeare on

the globe's terms. Alexander Huang's *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange* hinges on plurals. It is about Chinese Shakespeares, and not Shakespeare in China; performance idioms, rather than a single tradition; and localities, rather than a single site or cultural identity. The critical history offered in this book is incredibly rich. Huang begins by drawing a compelling connection between the narratives of Shakespeare's supremacy and those about "China's rise in global stature," pointing out that "few are aware that for almost two centuries, East Asian writers, film-makers, and theater directors have also engaged Shakespeare in their works in a wide range of contexts" (2). Huang argues that, in our cultural moment, we *ought* to be learning more about China, in all contexts (25). The book includes a select chronology, a ten-page timeline that runs from 1596 to 2008 and lists events in three parallel columns: historical events, worldwide Shakespeares, and Chinese Shakespeares (listing significant performances and publications). This chronology is helpful for those who know less about China and its history, for putting the material of the book in the context of more familiar Shakespeare chronologies, and for demonstrating the growth over time of Chinese interaction with Shakespeare's canon.

Huang makes a clear distinction between Shakespeare in China and Chinese Shakespeares. The former "obscures the dialectics of exchange between different cultures and implies the imposition of one culture upon the other, investing certain texts with a transhistorical status," whereas the latter suggests that "encounters of Shakespeare and China [are] a transformative process" in which both Shakespeare and China are effected (39). He identifies "three coexisting modes to engage ideas of China and Shakespeare." The first is "a trend to universalize rather than localize Shakespeare" by performing classically Anglo versions of the plays; the second "localize(s) the plot, setting, and meanings of a play"; and the third "has prompted artists to truncate and rewrite Shakespeare's plays so as to relate them to images of China" (16–17).

In order to analyze these traditions, Huang argues that we need an "in-depth critical history" of the local performances, and that is precisely what his book provides. He acknowledges the difficulty of "the ephemeral nature of live theater" and seeks to rectify this problem by offering thorough recounting specific performances (35). Structured as a series of case studies, the book first provides necessary history and theory background, spanning a period from 1839 until the present day, and then moves chronologically through various stages of Chinese engagement with Shakespeare, in each instance focusing on a handful of significant performances and films. Huang points out that, while Shakespeare was seen as a symbol of the West, and thus "both reviled

and admired," Chinese approaches to Shakespeare are not burdened with the same post-colonial concerns as those of other nations. In this respect, his engagement with these performances is rich and varied, rather than focused on issues of colonial identity (26–7). The book endeavors to provide the critical engagement with these productions that has been lacking from prior discussion, which tends toward the descriptive, rather than analytical. This "overflow of 'reports' without theoretical reflection," Huang argues, is symptomatic of a failure to note the significance of performance and adaptation as critical engagements with a text (36). Overall, the book asks and seeks to answer the following questions: "what does 'Shakespeare' *do* in Chinese literary and performance culture?" and "how do imaginations about China function in Shakespearean performances, and what ideological work do they undertake?" (3). Of his book, Huang promises that "Much of this work will undermine the fantasies of cultural exclusivity of both 'Shakespeare' and 'China,' attending to the fact that even though every reading is a rewriting, more rewritings of a canonical text do not always translate into more radical rethinking of normative assumptions" (5).

In one chapter, Huang takes on silent film and early theater and examines how Shakespeare was adapted and reinvented during the 1930s and '40s through performances that emphasized "cosmopolitanism" and "the new woman." He discusses a silent-film version of *The Merchant of Venice* entitled *The Woman Lawyer* (1927), which highlighted "female agency throughout the story" (114–15). In the epilogue, he takes up two recent Chinese Shakespeares—the film adaptation of *Hamlet* directed by Feng Xiaogang, *The Banquet* (2006), and a stage production of *Richard III* (2001). In his analysis of the former, Huang points out the ways in which reception fixated largely on debating whether the film was Shakespeare or Chinese cinema, demonstrating at the close of the study what he stated at the start: that we must rethink our approaches to understanding and analyzing cross-cultural adaptations, and that we indeed need a capacious theory of intercultural engagement. Huang's extensive accounts and critiques of significant productions should provide ample basis for such a theory's development. Clearly, this has been recognized by the academy at large, as *Chinese Shakespeares* won the 2010 Aldo and Jeanne Scaglione Prize for Comparative Literary Studies.

Dennis Kennedy and Yong Li Lan's *Shakespeare in Asia* takes on a much broader geographical area than Huang's exploration of specifically Chinese Shakespeares. As an edited volume rather than a monograph, it also has less coherence, though this is not necessarily a weakness of the collection. Like Huang, Kennedy and Yong cite Patrice Pavis's 1991 claim that "it was

too early to expect a formulated theory of intercultural performance." They respond that:

the real difficulty in theorizing interculturalism lies in trying to identify what happens to spectators ... [as] inherent in the intercultural engagement of Shakespeare is the divergence of perspectives, defined by the position of the spectator within a community whose boundaries are redrawn and renegotiated as part of the heuristic of the performance ... Yet discursive terms that make productive use of a culturally relative position, or of the plurality and variability of reception, remain largely underdeveloped, in comparison to the settled critical idiom of objectivity which tends to totalize a single cultural standpoint. (12)

This issue grows more complex when Kennedy and Yong insist that "Asian intercultural performance has developed self-reflexive and self-conscious modes of treating its Asian-ness and its plurality of performance cultures, and demands a corresponding level of self-reflexivity from any spectator" (14).

In their volume, editors Kennedy and Yong look at "contemporary Shakespeare performance in Asia from theoretical and historical perspectives" in the last two decades, acknowledging that there is no "unified approach to Shakespeare" in Asia, nor does Asia "comprise a single market of competing regions" (1, 6). They note the expansion in Asian Shakespeare production and, resisting an Anglo-centric approach to the Shakespearean text, they argue, "whatever the linguistic losses that accompany translation, for theatre and film there have been significant gains" (6).

They define three ways in which Asian cultures came into contact with Shakespeare: "nationalist appropriation, colonial instigation, and intercultural revision" (7). Using Japan as an example of nationalist appropriation, Kennedy and Yong comment that Shakespeare's "introduction was part of the reform movement, allied with industry and open markets as an exemplary 'contemporary' writer, driven by the national project of modernization" (8). As an example of colonial instigation, they turn to India, where Shakespeare was "part of a general project of edification" and stood to symbolize "a conduit of the stability of the conqueror's mental landscape" (9). Intercultural revision, they claim, is "the most innovative type of contemporary Asian Shakespeare" and it "attempts to move away from political applications into more self-consciously aesthetic realms." This process of interaction leads to the creation of "a new text" (10). Kennedy and Yong comment that, as Asian performance styles privilege the visual and embodied performance over the verbal text, "Asian Shakespeare performances are collectively distinguished

from Shakespeare produced in other areas of the world by the force of their visual, aural, and corporeal strategies for adapting the play, a shift of emphasis that gives Shakespeare an unfamiliar, powerful, but problematic, sensory force" (17).

The volume is divided into four parts. The first, called "Voice and Body," contains three chapters that engage with "the radical shift in meaning and effect that is brought by the self-conscious application of alien methods to Shakespeare or, ..., the application of alien Shakespeare to indigenous methods" (26). One of the strengths of the volume is that it includes several essays by people closely associated with or involved in performance, such as Fei Chunfang and Sun Huizhu, whose essay deals with adapting *Othello* into Beijing Opera. The second part of the volume, "Shakespeare in Asian Popular Cultures," looks at popular modes of performance and contemporary Asian audiences, examining their "significance ... within the arc of development of their particular social changes and performance movements" (71-2). The third section, "Transacting Cultures," proves how rich the field of Shakespeare in Asia/Asian Shakespeares is for criticism. Focusing on the suggestion that "the use of Shakespeare in Asian performance is founded on the desire to renegotiate the notion of cultural identity," the four essays in this section constitute two pairs of essays on the same production (153). The first two look at Wu Hsing-Kuo's *King Lear* and the second two at Ong Keng Sen's *Desdemona*. In each case, the two essays approach the production from different critical angles and come to very different conclusions. Clearly, there is much to mine here. The fourth and final section of essays, "Intercultural politics," takes up "the terms on which Shakespeare and Asian performance are brought together in contemporary productions." The essays ask how Shakespeare and Asian theatre "are mutually useful to each other," examining the "ideological, theoretical, and political implications" of combining the two traditions (217).

Poonam Trivedi and Minami Ryuta's edited collection, *Re-Playing Shakespeare in Asia*, is the most expansive of the three engagements with Asian Shakespeare(s). Trivedi and Ryuta state that the volume's sixteen essays discuss "over forty productions of thirteen plays in eight Asian countries" (3). Like Kennedy and Yong, they make no claim to universal understanding, but rather to unveiling the tip of the iceberg. Like Huang and Kennedy and Yong, they note that our present time is an era of what they call "Asian resurgence," and thus it is imperative that we direct our scholarly attention eastward, claiming "the recognition, circulation, and approbation of Asian versions of Shakespeare in the last few decades mark a shift in intellectual property relations" (2).

Also like Huang and Kennedy and Yong, they cite Patrice Pavis's call for a theory of intercultural performance, and seek to explain the reasons why we need one and why we don't yet have one:

discussion of intercultural Shakespeare remains caught in a cleft stick of authenticity versus difference, of the universal versus the hybrid, and of the global versus the local, resulting in an unresolved tension between these polarities ... Fully intercultural, that is, non-European, Shakespeare is routinely put down as impenetrably different and foreign and is thus rejected as "inauthentic" by the metropolis. ... The purpose of this book is precisely to expose and revoke this persisting "orientalism" and to show the multiple ways in which Shakespeare "fits" in Asia, and how versions of Asian Shakespeare "make fit" beyond the confines of Asia. (5-6)

Trivedi and Ryuta agree with Kennedy and Yong about the richness translation can impart to a text: "foreign Shakespeare is certainly not a Shakespeare emptied of words. On the contrary, it is one with added languages and additional resonances, both linguistic and performative ... Translation, which is linguistic, performative, and cultural, instead expands, not narrows, the range of reference for Shakespeare" (15). And this stand can be likened to Huang's claim that Shakespeare is changed by Chinese interaction with it.

The book is divided into four sections, dealing with intercultural, textual, post-colonial, and gender/genre issues. The first section takes on "larger issues of intercultural Shakespeare and its development in Asia" (6). These four essays provide a very good opening to the collection, beginning with James Brandon's broad introduction to Shakespeare in Asia. The other three essays consider Ariane Mnouchkine's early 1980s series of Asian-inflected Western stagings of plays, Indian Shakespeare, and Japanese theatre. The second set of essays considers the "place of the text in performed Shakespeares, the ways his words are to be conjoined to and embodied with 'other' theatrical languages, and the nature and extent of the malleability of texts required" (8). The most intriguing in this section is Li Ruru's essay on "Six People in Search of 'To be or not to be ...'" Li examines six Chinese productions of *Hamlet* for how the famous soliloquy is translated. Her analysis is motivated by the fact that there is no direct Chinese translation for "to be," and thus, "all the Chinese translations have to make it more concrete and definite, and consequently limit the imagination or connection that readers or audiences might have when they read/listen to the original English" (119). Some sample translations include "to live, or not to live" and "existence, or destruction." Other essays in this section of the book look at Japanese pop Shakespeare

and Bengali Shakespeare. The group of essays focusing on post-colonial questions offers a much-needed re-evaluation of knee-jerk understandings of post-colonial Asia. Trivedi and Ryuta state a desire to focus on "the place of smaller imperialisms and occupations in Asia." Thus, Part III examines how Shakespeare "was twinned with imperial authority either in an assertion or in a resistance to it" in the Philippines, Malaysia, Korea, Taiwan, and localized Chinese productions (in an essay by Alexander Huang) (10). The final section of the book looks at how intercultural performances effect genre and gender transformations, examining traditions of dance in particular.

While Trivedi and Ryuta express distress that "critical discourse does not seem to have the space for the new ways of seeing, hearing, and knowing that Asian Shakespeares have come to demand," the publication evidence seems to oppose this (15). With two edited collections and a monograph all centered on Asian Shakespeares just out in the last year, we may safely say that critical discourse is turning its eye and its mind Eastward.

DIGITAL RESOURCES

As scholarly interest in global Shakespeare expands, online digital archives are becoming increasingly useful and important. Considering this, I will review four major websites—archives and research tools that are pedagogically useful and ever-expanding. While the websites discussed below are not necessarily new in the last year, because their content is consistently growing and changing, they remain fairly current.

The *Internet Shakespeare Editions Incorporated* is a non-profit organization affiliated with the University of Victoria. The website contains three major categories of content: online editions of Shakespeare's works and contemporary or source texts; relevant historical materials in a section called "Shakespeare's Life and Times," and a "Theater" section that includes reviews and records of hundreds of performances and films. In the website's "Annex" section, one can find many online editions of Shakespeare's plays and poetry, as well as plays attributed to Shakespeare in the Third Folio, and other related works, such as Lyly's *Euphues* and Lodge's *Rosalind*. The texts are very useful, but most have not yet been peer-reviewed or annotated. Of the Shakespeare texts, only the Sonnets have online annotations. Once the annotations are available for all the plays, the site will become a good supplement or alternative to traditional classroom texts. Perhaps its greatest utility is its presentation of so much related source material. In addition, many plays are accompanied by

helpful introductory essays. Again, once this is uniform throughout the site's holdings, it will be an incredibly rich resource.

In the "Shakespeare's Life and Times" section of the website, there is a wealth of informative pages covering Shakespeare's biography; early modern society; the history of England (with specific pages on Henry VIII, Elizabeth I, and James I); various ideas about education, gender, and family; a brief history of drama and a discussion of other early modern literature; a whole book on the stage; and a helpful reference section with a chronology.⁷ The site claims to have "over 1,000 pages" in this section of its content. There are even embedded audio files of songs from some of the plays.

In the "Performance" section of the site, there is a single video file of King John's death scene from an 1899 performance starring Herbert Beerbohm Tree as King John. There are almost seventy audio clips of various scenes and speeches and songs, twelve interviews with directors and actors, over 2,500 production stills, almost 500 reviews, and much more. All of these are searchable by play. The performance section also links to *The ISE Performance Chronicle*, a journal "devoted to reviews of contemporary Shakespeare theater."⁸

There is a wealth of information here, and quite a lot of time could be spent digging around in it. The historical background materials available in the "Life and Times" segment could make useful supplementary reading in an undergraduate survey course, while the online source texts could be most helpful in graduate seminars or independent research. Once the plays themselves are fully annotated, this site will surely rise to greater prominence in the classroom.

The Canadian Adaptations of Shakespeare Project (CASP) boasts a more finessed and more immediately intuitive and useable website. The CASP is housed out of the University of Guelph's School of English and Theatre Studies and in 2004, director Daniel Fischlin launched the website. In 2007, Version 2 was released. On the website's homepage, the project claims to be "the first research project of its kind devoted to the systematic exploration and documentation of the ways in which Shakespeare has been adapted into a national, multicultural theatrical practice." The Version 2 release "more than double[d] the content."⁹ The Home page features tabs for Canadiana, Shakespeare, and Canadian Theatre. There are also links to the various content areas of the site, including Shakespeare News, which includes an RSS feed, convenient for those who wish to subscribe to news releases from the CASP.

The Online Anthology features "over fifty playscripts with associated multimedia, research hyperlinks, original introductions, database information"

and more.¹⁰ These entries span from the nineteenth century to today. One of the strengths of the site is the way that the information in one division—such as the anthology—links immediately and easily to related resources in another—such as multimedia. It is perhaps best to explain the site's holdings by pursuing a single source through its many content areas. For example, if one were to click on the Anthology entry for Allison McWood's 2006 play, *It was Kit: The TRUE Story of Christopher Marlowe*, one would find a general introduction to McWood's three stage adaptations and links to the PDF playtext, the original cast, an image gallery, and to the anthology entries for McWood's two other plays. The database link leads to the database entry for this adaptation. In that entry, a considerable amount of information is presented in extremely well-organized visual chart, including the performance history, a brief biography of the author, the original cast and production staff, the date and location of the first production, and links to reviews of the performance. (The Database content area holds this sort of information for "over 530 plays [CASP has] identified as Canadian Adaptations of Shakespeare."¹¹) If one were to follow the link to the image gallery, one would find images associated with all of McWood's adaptations, including production stills, publicity photos, and posters.

The "Spotlight" content area features three themed content groups—Canadian Aboriginal Adaptations of Shakespeare; a spotlight on *Slings & Arrows*, the Canadian television show about a Shakespeare theatre troupe; and a spotlight in development about Shakespeare and French Canadian Theatre. Particularly intriguing is the motivating question "Pourquoi pas Molière?"¹² A quick glance at the spotlight on Aboriginal Adaptations of Shakespeare shows that this feature provides a brief introduction to the larger topic and then aggregates information throughout the archives related to Aboriginal productions.

The Multimedia section has three parts: image gallery, streaming audio, and streaming video. The video section contains all sorts of goodies, including a *South Park* episode in which the characters travel to see a Canadian Shakespeare Festival; Canadian comedy troupes' send-ups of various plays; excerpts from Paul Almond's noteworthy 1961 *Macbeth*, which starred Sean Connery; and selections from the 1983 Rick Moranis film *Strange Brew*. The audio section has musical performances as well as interviews and audio from productions.

The Learning Commons contains helpful pedagogical materials. The first section, designed for secondary school teachers, features five "courses," complete with teachers' guides, student instructions, worksheets, and other

materials. These range from trivia, to history, to production design, to performance. The second section, designed for post-secondary school, contains sample syllabi from McGill University and The University of Guelph. The interactive folio and study guide is a flash-animated tool that claims to be "quite simply the most interactive and sophisticated version of *Romeo and Juliet* ever created."¹³ As you click on the text, highlighted passages can reveal images, gloss, video, or audio. It is also fully navigable via act, scene, and page.

The site also includes a comprehensive bibliography of all the references in the archive, as well as a general reference bibliography, and a spotlight bibliography (relevant to the current "Spotlight" feature). The Essays section features many essays about Shakespeare theatre in Canada. There are also two youth games: 'Speare and Chronos. And there is a "virtual exhibit" based on "the *Shakespeare—Made in Canada* exhibition hosted by the Macdonald Stewart Art Centre from January to June 2007."¹⁴

Global Shakespeares is an open-access digital video archive that features content from productions around the world. Co-founded and co-edited by Peter Donaldson and Alexander Huang, the project features an impressive international list of scholarly contributors and an elegant design. A "collaborative project providing online access to performances of Shakespeare from many parts of the world as well as essays and metadata provided by scholars and educators," the archive (at the time of writing) contained "more than 296 productions, 75 video clips, and online videos of over 30 full productions."¹⁵ It is a truly amazing resource for educators and scholars.

The content is allotted into five separate geographic areas: East and Southeast Asia, India, Brazil, the Arab World, and the United Kingdom and America. A click on one of these geographic titles summons an introductory essay and a set of video clips relevant to that particular region. The "All Productions" page contains an excellent searchable archive, organized according to Shakespeare play, and listing the title, director, year, company, language, and country of each production. Clicking on any title will bring you to a new page that provides any video material for that production, as well as links to interviews, performance reviews, scholarship, and "behind-the-scenes" information. You can limit the archive to only those with video available, which may be helpful for classroom use. For those with video, the embedded video streams easily. One can watch clips of "Sonho de uma noite de Verão," a Portuguese children's theatre *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and compare it with an animated Czech film based on the same play, *Sen noci svatojánské*, available in its entirety.

The resources page links to lists of production scripts, essays and interviews, theater companies, a relevant bibliography, and suggested external links. There is an option to follow an RSS Feed of website updates and project news, as well. This site is more streamlined and focused—in the sense that it is geared entirely toward providing videos of productions—than the CASP. As scholarship seeks to answer the call for further theorization of intercultural performance, as evidenced in Huang's book and Kennedy and Yong's and Trivedi and Ryuta's collections, certainly archives like this will be infinitely valuable. They will also give us the ability to more immediately implement these ideas in our classrooms, where students can be invited to look at how five different regions of the world reinvent Shakespeare.

The first phase of the *Global Shakespeares* project, *Shakespeare Performance in Asia* (SPIA) is another open-access digital archive of performances. Another project of Alexander Huang and Peter Donaldson, the site features 25 full videos, 22 clips, and an archive of 248 titles, and promises to "launch an innovative workspace with a suite of advanced research tools that allow users to make virtual clips of performances for replay within the system, to tag videos, to make and store annotations to visual and textual materials, and to compose multimedia essays."¹⁶ Like *Global Shakespeares*, SPIA is directed and edited by Peter Donaldson and Alexander Huang and housed out of MIT. It is linked with a larger effort, the Asian Shakespeare Intercultural Archive (ASIA). This additional research archive makes available even more digital records of productions.

SPIA's easily searchable database of video records includes a helpful "search by play" menu, with director, genre, city, and country filters. The very high-quality videos play in Quicktime and range in production date from 1994 to 2007. The much larger catalogue of productions, "includes films, stage productions, TV series, and cartoons produced on the Indian Subcontinent, in South Asia, Southeast Asia, East Asia, Pacific Islands, New Zealand (in Maori), Europe, and in the US." The catalogue lists productions with "distinctive Shakespearean and Asian elements or references regardless of geo-cultural origins of the performances."¹⁷ In the commentary section of the website, three essays address issues of Asian Shakespeare, and there are excerpts of interviews with directors, brief biographies of ten major artists and seven theatre companies, a helpful glossary of important terms relating to Asian performances, and a broad bibliography of fifty print sources.

The contents of this particular database provide a preview of what we can expect as the *Global Shakespeares* project expands. The availability of digital video archives will enhance our ability to research Shakespeare's

contemporary presence around the world. These archives will also enable us to share, teach, and cite these productions in a way we never could before, and in a way similar to how we share, teach, and cite text resources. This is one of the main motivations behind the creation of these archives, according to Huang: to simultaneously expand awareness of Global Shakespeare and to provide a way for us to implement that awareness pedagogically and critically.¹⁸

CONCLUSION

The books coming out from major academic presses around the world in the last few years indicate that Global Shakespeares is the fastest-growing vein of Shakespeare scholarship, and for good reason. The work done by Alexander Huang, Dennis Kennedy, Poonam Trivedi, and others, proves that not only can we no longer ignore the rich traditions of Shakespearean performance and scholarship arising from other parts of the world, but also that we have much to learn and many new avenues to explore. It seems to me that Global Shakespeares is the most important new vogue in Shakespeare scholarship, and a welcome one: one that allows us to dissolve disciplinary boundaries in the way that Carole Levin and John Watkins challenge us to. Global Shakespeares invites us, not merely to bridge the separations between habits of literary scholarship and historians, but also comparative literature departments, modern language departments, political science departments, and more. This new vein of scholarship is the melting pot in which so many individual interests—poetry, textual history, Shakespeare in performance, digital archives—suddenly grow richer and expand into new territories. Surely the handful of books reviewed here are only the tip of the iceberg, and what is to follow will include rich textual histories of international Shakespeares, advanced performance theories, a new disciplinary interest in Shakespearean poetry in other languages, and a sincere investment in how to expand accessibility to these international, cross-cultural concerns via digital archives.

As Bollywood knocks on the doors of major American cinemas, and as YouTube and other websites traffic international film with increasing speed, it will soon become irresponsible not to teach and study Shakespeare in an international, performative, adaptive context.

NOTES

1. These plays are *All's Well That Ends Well*, *Pericles*, *Coriolanus*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tragedy of King Lear*, *Cymbeline*, *The Tempest*, *Cardenio*, *Henry VIII*, and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.
2. Laurie Maguire, *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The "Bad" Quartos and Their Contexts* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Brian Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
3. This list includes each of the three Arden Shakespeare series, Peter Alexander's *Complete Works* (1951), Fredson Bowers' *Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* (1966–96), G. Blakemore Evans' *Riverside Shakespeare* (1974), Stanley Wells' *Oxford Shakespeare Works* (1982–), and Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino's *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (2007), among others.
4. The existing theories Sheen critiques include those offered by Greenblatt, Agnew, Bruster, Barroll, and Yachin and Dawson.
5. An example of this last category would be Yorick's skull.
6. Wilder follows this claim with a brilliant reading of *Richard III* 4.4, in which first Margaret teaches Elizabeth and the Duchess of York the best way to remember and mourn their losses, and then Elizabeth finds herself in the position of educating Richard about memory, under the guise of teaching him how to woo her daughter.
7. This section of the website was written by Michael Best and last updated in November 2010. Michael Best, "Shakespeare's Life and Times," *Internet Shakespeare Editions*, 25 May 2011, at <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Library/SLT/index.html>.
8. *ISE Performance Chronicle*, 25 May 2011, at <http://isechronicle.uvic.ca/>.
9. Daniel Fischlin, *Canadian Adaptations of Shakespeare Project*, 2 June 2011, at <http://www.uoguelph.ca/shakespeare/>.
10. Fischlin, "Online Anthology," *CASP*, 2 June 2011, at <http://www.canadianshakespeares.ca/anthology.cfm>.
11. Fischlin, "Database," *CASP*, 2 June 2011, at http://www.canadianshakespeares.ca/Production_Shakespeare/SearchPublic.cfm.
12. Fischlin, "CASP Spotlights," *CASP*, 2 June 2011, at http://www.canadianshakespeares.ca/spotlight_main.cfm.
13. Fischlin, "Interactive Folio and Study Guide: Romeo and Juliet," *CASP*, 2 June 2011, at <http://www.canadianshakespeares.ca/rjfolio.cfm>.
14. Fischlin, "Shakespeare Made in Canada," *CASP*, 2 June 2011, <http://vsmic.canadianshakespeares.ca/>.
15. Peter Donaldson and Alexander Huang, "About," *Global Shakespeares*, 2 June 2011, at <http://globalshakespeares.org/about>.
16. Alexander Huang, "About Shakespeare Performance in Asia," *Shakespeare Performance in Asia*, 2 June 2011, at <http://web.mit.edu/shakespeare/asia/about/>.
17. Huang, "Catalogue of Productions," *Shakespeare Performance in Asia*, 2 June 2011, at <http://web.mit.edu/shakespeare/asia/collections/catalogue.html>.
18. Alexander Huang, "Global Shakespeare 2.0 and the Task of the Performance Archive," *Shakespeare Survey* 64 (2011): 38–51.

WORKS REVIEWED

- Alexander, Catherine M. S., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Last Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Astington, John. *Actors and Acting in Shakespeare's Time: The Art of Stage Playing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Donaldson, Peter, and Alexander Huang, eds. *Global Shakespeares*. 2 June 2011. <http://globalshakespeares.org/>.
- Egan, Gabriel. *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text: Twentieth-Century Editorial Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Fischlin, Daniel, ed. *Canadian Adaptations of Shakespeare Project*. 2 June 2011. <http://www.uoguelph.ca/shakespeare/>.
- Huang, Alexander C. Y. *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- . "Global Shakespeare 2.0 and the Task of the Performance Archive." *Shakespeare Survey* 64 (2011), 38–51.
- , ed. *Shakespeare Performance in Asia*. 2 June 2011. <http://web.mit.edu/shakespeare/asia/about/>.
- Internet Shakespeare Editions Incorporated*. 25 May 2011. <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/>.
- Kennedy, Dennis and Yong Li Lan, eds. *Shakespeare in Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Kidnie, Margaret Jane. *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Levin, Carole and John Watkins. *Shakespeare's Foreign Worlds*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- Petersen, Lene B. *Shakespeare's Errant Texts: Textual Form and Linguistic Style in Shakespearean "Bad" Quartos and Co-Authored Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, July 2010.
- Pfister, Manfred and Juergen Gutsch, eds. *William Shakespeare's Sonnets for the First Time Globally Reprinted: A Quartercentenary Anthology*. Dozwil, Switzerland: Edition SIGNATHUR, 2009.
- Schoenfeldt, Michael. *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Sheen, Erica. *Shakespeare and the Institution of Theatre: The Best in this Kind*. New York: Palgrave, 2009.
- Trivedi, Poonam and Minami Ryuta, eds. *Re-Playing Shakespeare in Asia*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

- Wilder, Lena Perkins. *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Yachnin, Paul and Jessica Slights, eds. *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance and Theatrical Persons*. New York: Palgrave, 2009.