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

List of Figures vii
Preface ix

Part I: Special Section: Shakespeare in India

1 Introduction: Shakespeare in India 3
Sukanta Chaudhuri

2 Impudent Imperialists: Burlesque and the Bard in Nineteenth-Century India 7
Poonam Trivedi

3 "Every college student knows by heart": The Uses of Shakespeare in Colonial Bengal 29
Rangana Banerji

4 Shakespeare in Maharashtra, 1892–1927: A Note on a Trend in Marathi Theatre and Theatre Criticism 43
Aniket Jaaware and Urmila Bhirdikar

5 Story-teller, Poet, Playwright: Three Oriya Translations of Shakespeare (1908–1959) 53
Jatindra K. Nayak

6 "We the globe can compass soon": Tim Supple's *Dream* 65
Ananda Lal

7 Shakespeare in Indian Cinema: Appropriation, Assimilation, and Engagement 83
Rajiva Verma

8 "What bloody man is that?" *Macbeth*, *Maqbool*, and Shakespeare in India 97
Supriya Chaudhuri

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

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

Rebecca Chapman

Scholarship produced over the past two years in the international field of Shakespeare studies has focused heavily on Shakespeare's constitutive power. From the contested ways in which Shakespearean works entertain, educate, incite, and reflect various historical moments and cultural movements, to the degrees to which those works inflect the foundations upon which we make intellectual and affective sense of ourselves and our world, recent scholarship maintains that Shakespeare's utility matches his longevity. But how much is this utility worth? In the aftermath of harrowing natural disasters around the globe and economic crises that have hit our professions harder than many had imagined, liberal arts education has fallen under scrutiny. With increasing unemployment and decreasing endowments in mind, many have asked what claim the humanities have on dwindling resources.[1] The argument goes something like this: the humanities, by definition, encourages critical, analytical, and speculative thinking skills, by which one might explore what it means to be human, and all that that condition entails. Consequently, educators in the humanities tend to promote personal and civic growth as programmatic endpoints, rather than training students for particular vocations. In lean times, however, practicality and policy command more worth in cultural imaginaries than poetry and pontification. While no doubt many of us would challenge such an easy and unnecessarily Manichean distinction, the present situation poses a valuable opportunity—if not a mandate—in which we might examine what it is we think we are doing when we read and teach Shakespearean works. Recent scholarship in the field provides for us a wide variety of productive models.

It returns us to the time-held biographical tradition in Shakespeare studies, only this time, scholars are less concerned with answering the question of who Shakespeare was, seeking instead to uncover the ways in which our answers to this question reflect new cultural and technological developments and changing systems of value—questions, in other words, that feel particularly timely in the present moment. Performance and media studies continue to fascinate scholars and push archival boundaries. New work in these areas maintains that a nuanced understanding of such present-day *and* early modern English concepts as gender, sexuality, nation, race, and imperialism is needed to address the culturally sensitive issues raised in many Shakespearean works and adaptations. Emergent theoretical and philosophical approaches similarly question archival boundaries, and in the process foreground the educational, social, and political benefits of readdressing our professional activities. Metacriticism reigns, in other words. As we survey trends in the field, then, perhaps the best place to start is with the very signifier "Shakespeare," and our ever-continued desire to sketch its intractable ontological and epistemological contours.

The New Biography Studies

This desire operates as both theme and condition in James Shapiro's *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?* The renewed interest in Shakespeare biography studies is as surprising as it is inevitable. That is, we have become so accustomed to the dull hum of the authorship controversy, we are often startled when it turns into an aggravated buzz, though it has shown itself able to do so every now and then. Many conditions can revitalize the genre: new author candidates, source evidence, recognized historical contexts, ways of imagining the role and life of the artist, approaches to autobiography. For Shapiro, those conditions include both change and constancy. Technological development as well as the unchecked insistence within the field on closeting the authorship question from "serious" academic work has created a socio-intellectual space in which those who would promote some of the likely candidates—Christopher Marlowe, the Earl of Oxford, Francis Bacon, for instance—can share their message. "Those who would deny Shakespeare's authorship, long excluded from publishing their work in academic journals or through university presses," he observes, "are now taking advantage of the level playing field provided by the Web, especially such widely consulted and democratic sites as Wikipedia" (8). Ignoring the question of authorship, in other

words, has not made it disappear; if anything, curiosity about the real life and identity of the Bard has proliferated along with the number of websites, blogs, and podcasts produced on the topic. The recent political thriller *Anonymous* (2012), from director Roland Emmerich, whose credits include the apocalyptic *2012* (2009) and *Independence Day* (1996), supports Shapiro's claim that the controversy has gone mainstream—the film, for instance, advances Edward De Vere, Earl of Oxford as the true author. "The desire to feel the presence, experience a sense of intimacy with Shakespeare" (55), is not going away, nor are the serious questions of how and what we understand as literary genius and the relationship between art and life that attend it. On the contrary, Shapiro's historical examination of the doubters of Shakespeare, such as Helen Keller, Sigmund Freud, Henry James, and Mark Twain, demonstrates how our desire for epistemological certainty has led to the falsification of evidence and a vast web of conspiracy, since "[i]t was easier for critics who shared that desire to make stuff up rather than admit defeat" (55). His treatment of the topic is as generous as it is rigorous, and his is a book that will no doubt interest a wide range of readers.

Perhaps most fascinating, though, the two aims of Shapiro's book weave together a paradoxically performative point: while we may interrogate the desire to answer those unanswerable questions surrounding who Shakespeare was and whether he wrote the complete works, that desire is a compulsive one. Shapiro's first aim, he makes clear, is to provide insight into the debate and trace its history. "My interest," he writes, "is not in what people think—which has been stated again and again in unambiguous terms—so much as why they think it" (8), which concerns the constructions of concepts such as factuality and credibility. David Bevington's recent *Shakespeare and Biography* makes a similar move. It provides a history of biography, which intersects with rather than intervenes in the authorship debate. He surveys the primary and contradictory methodologies of archival and documentary research as well as the fictionalization and artistic license some biographers have taken, especially when confronting the question of whether or not Shakespeare was happy in his marriage. Along with these methods, Bevington explores the central topics of sex, politics, religion, Calvinism, and predestination that fascinate biographers most, and the danger of employing "the standards of twenty-first-century morality" to understand them, which "may well be at variance with those of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries" (14). No doubt, scholars concerned with constructions of cultural value in and surrounding Shakespearean works will find his second chapter useful, which outlines the eighteenth-century conventions by which Shakespeare biography took

shape, with relatively little change today. In conclusion, however, Bevington breaks from his even-handed tone, and assures readers of his own take on the authorship question: "a counterargument can be offered to the Oxfordian position ... if one were to seek today for brilliant reporting of goings-on in 10 Downing Street or the White House or the Élysée Palace, would one choose to hear from some strategically placed cabinet member or from investigative reports like Woodward and Bernstein at the time of Washington Watergate?" (160). He suggests that as an outsider Shakespeare of Stratford "was in better position to see life steady and see it whole" (160) than aristocratic Oxford. Shapiro, too, makes a claim for the Stratfordian case, which he explains as the second aim of his book. He makes a strong case, and reintroduces fascinating but forgotten material like Richard Hunt's copy of William Camden's 1590 Latin edition of *Britannia,* which includes marginalia describing the author knows as Shakespeare as a famed actor. Performing the very practice he interrogates, Shapiro's intervention into the authorship debate raises the question of the stakes in the present moment of affirming that Shakespeare of Stratford did indeed author the plays attributed to his name. What precisely are we afraid of losing? Shapiro confesses in his final chapter, "What I find most disheartening about the claim that Shakespeare of Stratford lacked the life experience to have written the plays is that it diminishes the very thing that makes him so exceptional: his imagination" (277).

The anxiety over misrecognizing Shakespeare's singularity similarly motivates Stephen Greenblatt's newest narrative on the Bard's greatness, *Shakespeare's Freedom*, which maintains that Shakespeare linguistically, rhetorically, and stylistically pushed against the systems of absolutes that structured life in Renaissance England. He bases his argument regarding Shakespeare's personal genius on a series of well-grounded and astute close readings of those numerous moments in which Shakespearean characters negotiate the relationship between self-authorization and self-negation, individuation and prescription. For example, Cleopatra fears to see "Some squeaking Cleopatra boy [her] greatness / I'th' posture of a whore;"[2] King Richard II laments to his friends, "How can you say to me I am a king?;"[3] and Coriolanus insists that he will "but stand / As if a man were author of himself."[4] Greenblatt mines these complicated and rich moments, ultimately finding that "Shakespeare's great innovation is that the magic is, if anything, heightened when he turns, as he does again and again, to forms of beauty that violate the prevailing cultural norms" (41). Greenblatt organizes the book along the "four underlying concepts to which Shakespeare's imagination was drawn consistently and across the multiple genres in which he worked" (4), which include beauty, hatred, authority, and autonomy. He examines the literary and dramatic codification of these tropes alongside their implications for Renaissance systems of aesthetics, and argues that Shakespeare worked with and against social imperatives, "at once embrac[ing] those norms and subvert[ing] them, finding an unexpected, paradoxical beauty in the smudges, marks, strains, scars, and wrinkles that had figured only as signs of ugliness and difference" (15). The radical sense of social questioning Greenblatt finds within Shakespearean characters suggests to him that "[i]n the sphere of his sovereign genius the authority of the playwright and poet seems absolutely free and unconstrained" (5). In fact, he notes, "The only power that does not seem limited in Shakespeare's work is the artist's own" (5).

The easy slide here from poet/playwright to character, however, warrants pause, not the least because it conflates speculative philosophy and textual analysis. Greenblatt's diction implies as much. For instance, he maintains as a central facet of his argument:

> if some form of subjection is the inescapable human condition, Shakespeare may nonetheless have thought that radical freedom was possible for a made object, that is, for a poem or a play. He may have thought too that such freedom was possible for the artist in the act of making those objects. (112)

Greenblatt surveys the obsessive degree to which Shakespearean works meditate on the power of art, and the ways in which artist figures grasped paradoxicality, only to privilege the act of art making as a space of freedom. As he recalls in Shakespeare's Sonnet 63, the speaker claims that the beauty of the young man "shall in these black lines be seen, / And they shall live, and in them still be green" (ll. 13–14). Yet, Greenblatt's diction is symptomatic of his larger point: Shakespeare "may have thought" about the radical freedom of artistry. Lapses into the subjunctive offer productive modes by which to interrogate cultural assumptions, to challenge perceived inevitabilities and historical or moral teleologies. In *Shakespeare's Freedom*, however, the "may have"s point to Greenblatt's desire to turn possibility into historical fact, or to at least pin it down long enough to sustain aesthetic analysis in the guise of biographical criticism. The argument on Shakespeare's will is a secondary one in this book, but it is also the one Greenblatt frames with the most gusto.

Both Shapiro's and Greenblatt's books are largely concerned with Shakespeare's imagination and autonomy, which would suggest that we ought to consider returning to what has perhaps become too rhetorical a question within our field: what is the trouble with intentionality as an analytical rubric?

And why do we seem driven to return to it as a means of approaching and understanding Shakespearean works, even if, as Shapiro maintains, we refuse to acknowledge it?

Queer Turns in Theory

The overwhelming number of emergent and reconsidered theoretical approaches to Shakespeare produced internationally not only suggest that the rumors of the death of theory are spurious ones, but also that we as a field have taken up the question of intentionality and complicated it with considerations of embodiment and social consequence. In the Introduction to her comprehensive and much-anticipated edited volume *Shakesqueer: A Queer Companion to the Complete Works of Shakespeare*, Madhavi Menon surveys the recurrent ways Shakespeare's plays and poetry raise questions of language, identity, and temporality, concepts that today's queer theory continues to work through. "The point of this volume," she explains, "is not to provide queer 'readings' of Shakespeare. It is, instead, to bring queerness into varied engagements with those texts without chronological or conceptual privilege" (25). Bringing together a variety of scholars—including Shakespeare and early modern scholars, to queer theorists, and scholar, who work between these fields—*Shakesqueer* appeals to a range of thinkers, and provides new, fresh ways of framing common cruxes in the plays many of us address in research and in the classroom: uncertainty as socially productive in *Comedy of Errors*, global culture as a form of open secrecy in *Othello*, legitimacy as social contract in *King John*, amnesia as amnesty in *The Tempest*. The volume also includes a bibliography for further reading, which will certainly provide students with a wealth of resources for their research papers. The volume offers essays on every piece attributed to the complete works; but it also includes essays on "nonexistent" plays such as *Cardenio* and *Love's Labour's Won*. Menon groups these under "lost plays," a category that demonstrates the playful, provocative, and rigorous ways in which this collection interrogates the notions of recognizability and identification, as themes we explore in the literature and theory we study and teach, as well as in the practical engagements in our day-to-day professional lives.

Central to the volume is a discussion on the contested use of the term "queer" in academic practices. Many have and continue to liken queer theory as a mode of inquiry with the Ides of March—a foreboding sign of impending doom. Others have been predicting for nearly two decades that it is a fad that

will soon fade into our field's version of the embarrassing teenage hairstyle: it seemed like a good idea at the time, but we can't seem to remember why. Menon goes to great lengths to situate "queer" in her Introduction and for the larger volume. Because queer's efficacy lies, in part, in its transient quality, defining the term has presented notorious problems and incited disagreement among those who practice queer theory. While she leaves the term appropriately capacious, Menon summarizes:

> Queerness is bodily and that which challenges the limits of what we understand as the body. It expands its ambit to include discussions on the universe, animals, and rationality. While sexual desire sometimes lurks in the background or looms in the foreground, it is not always recognizable as desire. (7).

Understanding queer as often related to but not exclusively contingent upon sexuality, sexual orientation, or sexual desire, disjoins it from the synonymous relationship it has had with "homosexual." "Shakesqueer," or bringing together the signifiers "Shakespeare" and "queer," a willfully anachronistic term, then, "ruthlessly destroys the very idea of a singular identity—[Shakespeare's] and our own" (25). As Menon elaborates,

> Hitching queer theory to Shakespeare forces us to consider the posts we currently occupy: if ideas can be brought together over centuries, then what is the locus standi of the centuries themselves? What would we be if we had to dislocate who we are and what we do—if we had to, that is, queer ourselves? (3).

She answers this question in tones that inflect the concerns over the position of the humanities with which I began. "If Shakespeare were to be considered queer, that would change the ways in which we advertise our jobs, undertake our dissertations, theorize queerness, and carve out our identities" (3). If Shakespeare were to be considered queer, would the private, public, and social sectors understand Shakespeare studies in academia as worth more, able to have more of an effect outside the classroom, offer or students more purchasing power when they matriculate? Perhaps it is impossible to say, but it does raise questions as to the ways in which academic uses of "queer" diverge from those outside of academia, and whether those differences would change the scope of Menon's volume. Either way, I believe *Shakesqueer* will be indispensable over the next decade. It takes on the topic of bardolatry and the social in a refreshingly aggressive way and with a fabulous style. For instance, one of Menon's many colorful and cutting turns of phrase: "The conservative

impulse to venerate Shakespeare stems from the same source as the desire to ignore his queerness. Both involve circumscribing him as untouchable: if we mount him, it can only be behind glass" (2).

Bruce Smith also wants to touch Shakespeare, and be queerly touched in return, like Menon, in ways that call attention to understandings of Shakespearean works that certain critical practices have foreclosed. He wonders, in *Phenomenal Shakespeare*, "What's so touching about Shakespeare?" (xvii): that is, he wishes to examine bardolatry as a bodily phenomenon. "In several senses," he explains, the book operates as a "manual for how to do historical phenomenology" (xvii), or a study of historical knowledge as produced through the phenomenon of our five senses and in the present moment. This approach to Shakespeare places emphasis on common experiences of receiving those works such as the creation and feeling of emotion, and the acts of reading, watching, and listening in the theater. Smith acknowledges up front:

> Inner gestures that inspire speech, the kinesthetic knowledge that comes with reading, and the pleasurable twinge of watching and hearing characters suffer on stage are difficult to talk about, not only because bodily sensations do not have a transparent relationship to language but because our keen awareness of cultural differences makes the project of talking about them look presumptuous if not impossible. (xvi)

Conceptualizing Shakespeare as an embodied practice could potentially destabilize Cartesian logic, while also paving the way for new approaches to reading Shakespeare that we have yet to imagine. "When you touch yourself, you trouble the usual distinction between subject (the toucher) and object (the touched)," Smith theorizes, and "[w]hat comes between the toucher and the touched remains a mystery to the rational mind—indeed, it defies the rational mind" (xviii). *Phenomenal Shakespeare* models an innovative way into Shakespeare, and its emphasis on affect and aesthetics, I suspect, will usher in a distinct new trend in the field.

Smith's organization is as clear as his writing. A Prologue briefly introduces the concept of historical phenomenology and explains how Smith will refer to "Shakespeare" through a series of acronyms—WSA (William Shakespeare as Author), THWS (The Historical William Shakespeare), CWWS (Collected Works of William Shakespeare), and WSCI (William Shakespeare as Cultural Icon). The first chapter supplies a survey and interrogation of the goals, assumptions, and working methods of historical phenomenology. Three subsequent chapters provide case studies from different facets of the Shakespearean corpus, focusing on Sonnet 29, *Venus and Adonis*, and *King*

Lear, respectively. For instance, Chapter Two, entitled "How Should One Read a Shakespeare Sonnet?," critiques the limitations of the two primary models of language: the linguistic turn of the 1960s and the influence of the concept of the *langue*, or the structures that make the marking of meaning possible. These models, he contends, foreclose an exploration of the affective connections and queer temporalities opened through the reading experience. Answering the question his title poses, Smith suggests that when we read a Shakespeare Sonnet, "[b]y assuming the subject position of 'one'" (81), we create intersubjective connections with the past and with Shakespeare.

Smith contributes an article to Lowell Gallagher and Shankar Raman's edited volume *Knowing Shakespeare: Senses, Embodiment, and Cognition*, which calls upon historical phenomenology to interrogate the ambivalent results of scholarly attempts to engage with the topic of the body in early modern culture. In their Introduction, Gallagher and Raman identify the primary problem:

> Taking into account gender, ethnicity, sexuality, and class rightfully acknowledges the need to differentiate among societal bodies. But such distinctions still rely on a body—*any* body—as the neutral and elemental unity of analysis, a post-Cartesian stance that privileges dualistic formulations opposing body to mind, soul, world, society, and so on. (3)

The eleven essays in the volume point toward the many ways in which Shakespearean works illuminate and trouble this distinction. Raman's "Hamlet in Motion" argues that the trope of sensory breakdown in *Hamlet* suggests early modern anxiety over the body as merely mechanical and motiveless. Allison Kay Deutermann's fascinating essay examines Samuel Pepys' account of attending his seventh performance of *The Tempest*, to demonstrate the degree to which "Pepys' audition is key to the production of his bodily hexis or disposition, a process through which he creates a coherent sense of himself as a social and embodied subject" (172). Diana E. Henderson examines how representations of the voice of "Shakespeare's Hero moves us to notice the unresolved problems of [*Much Ado about Nothing*], including fraternal murderousness and unabated male jealousy as well as the dilemmas of sense perception" (215). Each article explores to varying degrees problems we as a field have encountered in addressing material and immaterial bodies, with an ultimate suggestion that, "Only a final translation into the realms of the aesthetic can the avowedly conjectural, at the very edge of the known, can hope to communicate what eludes even the senses, however reconfigured" (29).

Smith's answer also takes us to aesthetics, while differentiating it from theory. This differentiation, however, is a tenuous one. As much as Smith's innovative approach will no doubt enrich theoretical engagement in the field, *Phenomenal Shakespeare* ostensibly positions literary theory along with theories of history as mutually "closed systems of thought" (186) that have detracted from our understanding of precisely why Shakespeare continues to resonate so strongly. We have moved from "the thesis of New Criticism [to] the antithesis of post-structuralism" (7), apparently, with little pause. New Historicism's insistence, too, on the "differentness of the early modern past" (23) has obscured the notion that the past and future are merely points on a continuum ever in flux. Menon calls this latter notion queer temporality, as does Carla Freccero's sharp article in *Shakesqueer,* entitled "Romeo and Juliet Love Death" (302–8). Again on the topic of temporality, Smith is careful to explain that his methodology "must inevitably be a *present* phenomenology, but not a *presentist* phenomenology if that means willfully turning one's back on the past" (36). The wide ranging articles in Evelyn Gajowski's recent edition, *Presentism, Gender, and Sexuality in Shakespeare*, go to great lengths to explore and begin to codify presentist approaches to Shakespeare, which, as Gajowski rightfully claims, have been under-theorized, if not un-theorized. The explanation she offers in her Introduction troubles the distinction Smith makes between present-inflected analysis and "Presentism":

> It is true to respond to a Shakespeare text is to enter into a dialogue with the past ... Entering into such a conversation means entering into a dialogue not only with Shakespeare and his contemporaries, I would add, but also with the tradition of theatrical and critical responses to Shakespeare's texts that have accumulated over the past four centuries. And these themselves constitute not merely passive responses but also active constructions of meaning in their own right. (6)

According to Gajowski's collection, then, Presentism tempers analysis of the past with a concern over the multiplicity of archives and modes of knowledge circulating in the present moment. Smith's dismissal of Presentism, while seemingly making a presentist argument, demonstrates the ways in which *Phenomenal Shakespeare* makes sophisticated theoretical points while also questioning the use-value of such theoretical thought.

Stanley Stewart similarly theorizes the futility of theory in *Shakespeare and Philosophy*, which examines how philosophers from Richardson, Kant, Hume, Wittgenstein, Nietzsche, and Dewey have used Shakespeare as a subject of philosophy since the seventeenth century. Using Jean E. Howard's

2001 volume *Marxist Shakespeares* as an extended point of reference and example in his Introduction, Stewart warns, "[s]ometimes credulity takes the place of healthy skepticism" (26)—a dynamic he laments in the present state of the field. He observes that theorists who are "sometimes called 'social constructionists,' would raze to common ground any and all literary works that history's extraordinary praise has elevated above the status toward which...all works of art inevitably move, namely toward that of a lifeless document" (26). Again, we confront the problem of intentionality. Stewart concludes:

> Philosophy has gone a long way towards absorbing Shakespeare into philosophical discourse. As we have seen, thinkers like Bacon, Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke had different ends in view, and so the subject of 'Shakespeare' is as absent as the rhetorical tools one might use to address him and his works as a subject. (196)

Shakespeare's philosophical efficacy, then, empties out the signifier "Shakespeare" as a singular, stable subject of inquiry, but in a way that, apparently, keeps it hovering however slightly above that "common ground" upon which social constructionists would level it. No doubt, the contributors to *Marxist Shakespeares* would have plenty to say on the use of commonness and value in Stewart's thinking. More to the point, though, Stewart's informative and comprehensive account of Shakespeare in philosophy offers a fascinating take on the circulation and mutation of cultural capital conferred upon particular subjects, and the anxiety that the act of questioning the construction of value can bankrupt that value in the process.

After all, to disregard the use-value of literary theory in Shakespeare studies, including or excluding the theories of the social to which Stewart enigmatically refers, is, to a large degree, to disregard Shakespeare's works themselves; in *Shakespeare and Literary Theory*, Jonathan Gil Harris demonstrates the degree to which contemporary literary theory is Shakespearean in provenance. "[W]hen we contemplate Shakespeare's writing—whether by viewing the plays on the stage or by speculating about the texts on the page—we enter into theory," he maintains, "whether or not we know it" (5). Harris continually produces scholarship that is as interesting as it is sophisticated and challenging; this slim volume is no exception. He thematically organizes Shakespearean traces, some more indelible than others, in the formulation of theoretical movements from formalism and structuralism, to queer theory and actor-network theory—all of which combine in a surprising way under what we might call "Shakespearean theory." Twelve chapters constitute three parts, which are organized around the conceptual intersections that preoccupy Shakespearean works and theorists

alike: language and structure, desire and identity, and culture and society. Taken together, the chapters call attention to the ways in which Shakespeare has provided symptomatic focus for literary theory, and "underscore how literary theory is less an external set of ideas imposed on Shakespeare's texts than a mode—or several modes—of critical reflection inspired by, and emerging from, his writing" (3). For instance, René Girard turns to *Troilus and Cressida* to articulate the dangers of mimetic desire; Jacques Derrida calls upon *Romeo and Juliet* to explore the consequences of countertime and the violence of naming; *Hamlet* becomes the reference against which Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan articulate their respective developmental models of the psyche, while it also provides Derrida with a model for what he calls hauntology, and Lee Edelman with a means of sketching out his highly influential theory of queer futurity; Elaine Showalter traces the literary and aesthetic history of Ophelia to question the possibility of a feminist ethics; and *The Tempest* and Aimé Césaire's appropriation *Une Tempête* acts as source material for Edward Said's understanding of orientalism in colonial enterprises. The causal relationships Harris draws across theories, histories, and texts are numerous. In this way, the book provides a productive resource for those who teach Shakespeare with or through theory, or vice versa. Establishing the symbiotic relationship between Shakespeare and theory, Harris explains, might allow us to "enter more self-consciously into theory when reading Shakespeare's plays and poems," (5) which, in turn, would demystify theory from an exotic critical practice to an already quotidian aspect of our professional lives.

Popular Culture

The topic of the "everyday" in our personal lives, however, has inspired slightly different though nonetheless dismissive critical ideologies as to what constitutes academic rigor and viable cultural artifacts. The proliferation of recent work on Shakespeare and popular culture both confronts this tendency and suggests its cessation. Owen Terris, Eve-Marie Oesterlen, and Luke McKernan's edited volume *Shakespeare on Film, Television and Radio: The Researcher's Guide* offers a first of its kind resource of "essays, archive documents, recommendation of notable productions and some essential reference tools to support the study of Shakespeare on film, television and radio" (viii), while paying particular attention to popular cultural artifacts, broadly defined. It is intended as a practical, hands-on tool for researchers, but also offers an introduction of the primary topics that have concerned

studies of Shakespeare in popular media. It is divided into four parts: articles, documents, resources, and a reference guide. The first part offers original critical articles, though few, and its strength lies in its analysis of radio appropriations, a medium still underrepresented in Shakespeare media studies. In particular, Terris's "Shakespeare and British Television," examines "the changes in technology, cultural policies, politics and management" (20) that contributed to the significant decline of Shakespeare-based appropriations in the 1980s, while Oesterlen's article cites 1920s and 1930s British broadcasts to demonstrate how "Shakespeare played a crucial role in the development of radio drama's distinctive characteristics and opportunities, and how the new medium, in turn, helped to shape the contemporary reception of Shakespeare in performance" (51). The documents section includes original sources from the British entertainment industry such as Hitchcock's 1937 retort to critics who claimed Shakespeare films are either poor quality or that Shakespearean works simply could not translate well into film. The reference section will no doubt prove useful for students or scholars newly interested in media Shakespeare studies. It includes a comprehensive list of archives, guidance on their use, and advice on copyright and citation. Also valuable, the last section offers a comprehensive list of archives and libraries for researchers, as well as suggestions for further reading. Published through the British Universities Film and Video Council, the guide will appeal to those working with British popular culture in particular, and may have limited purchase for those working in other cultural registers or on global and international phenomenon.

Linking ideology to practice, Robert Shaughnessy, in his edited volume, *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture*, identifies the multiple and often conflicting ways in which Shakespeare and popular culture have mutually shaped the perception of one another. In his Introduction, Shaughnessy observes that the study of popular culture has transformed from ephemeral and anecdotal to one of increasingly recognized significance. He attributes this shift, in part, to scholarly recognition of the valuable role that popular cultural appropriations play in helping us to address vexed questions of cultural ownership, aesthetic value, and social accesses, among other topics—questions, in other words, Shakespearean texts compulsively explore. Broadening the scope of "popular" beyond "contemporary," it explores "the factors that determine the definitions of and boundaries between the legitimate and illegitimate, the canonical and the authorized, and the subversive, the oppositional, the scandalous, and the inane" (5) to address how "Shakespeare has been consumed and reinvented, allowing for interface between cultural, literary, performance, and cinema studies" (2).

This volume reflects a simultaneously productive and problematically fractured image of Shakespeare. In addition to Shaughnessy's valuable Introduction, it offers twelve discrete articles that address unique case studies. Particularly astute, Emma Smith's article examines the historic precedent of shaping Shakespearean works to fit generic conventions in media other than theater. She focuses on the BBC's serial adaptation of the history cycles, *The Age of Kings* (1960), which melds historical epic with the conventions of soap opera. Smith's attention to generic specificity echoes Susan Greenhalagh's "Shakespeare Overheard: Performances, Adaptations, and Citations on Radio," which examines the simultaneous ubiquity and scholarly occlusion of broadcast transmissions of Shakespeare. Douglas Lanier's "Shakespeare™" spans genres in search of iconicity, Lanier arguing that:

> Like the Shakespearean trademark, fuller pop treatments of Shakespeare the man—in fictional biography, in children's literature, in genre fiction, period costumes, musicals, comic books, TV and film biographies—dwell in the long shadow of nineteenth-century conceptions of Shakespeare, in particular the outsize mythos surrounding Shakespearean authorship which had its roots in the cult of the Romantic genius. (100)

Both Shapiro's and Greenblatt's recent biographical scholarship supports Lanier's claim. Also noteworthy, W. B. Worthen identifies a paradox within digital culture. "[W]hile there's an abundance of Shakespearean imagery and textuality online, there's little Shakespeare performance there" (228), he notes. The Fall 2010 special issue of *Shakespeare Quarterly*, "Shakespeare and New Media" edited by Katherine Rowe, suggests the degree to which performances are indeed abundant online, and the issue "invite[s] us to look not only at familiar literary works but also at some familiar methodological assumptions with fresh eyes" (iii), which may help us to see performance where we least expect it. Shaughnessy's volume offers a new take on what happens when Shakespeare is popularized, and when the popular is Shakespeareanized. Articles in both sketch the remarkable variety of forms that Shakespeare and Shakespearean works take. As Kate Rumold argues in her article, "From 'Access' to 'Creativity': Shakespeare Institutions, New Media, and the Language of Cultural Value,"[5] institutions associated with Shakespeare such as the RSC and the Globe often co-opt the types of popular cultural Shakespeare-related artifacts that Shaughnessy's volume traces. Such institutions, Rumold writes, "present the remediation of their work by other, newer media forms as their own, deliberate appropriation of broadcast technology to extend the physical space of the stage—reclaiming value for the institution" (328).

Shaughnessy's volume is an important first step in disseminating critical work on pop culture Shakespeare, and has now opened the possibility of reading across and among the many registers in which we find Shakespeare. Parsing out discourses on genre, technological change, market, and cultural value in popular culture can make for illuminating case studies, but it threatens, as Rumold suggests, to suture over the process by which institutional imperatives can mask as subversive performances.

Emerging from the rubble of the 1980s hermetic subversion-containment debates, the conceptual power of subversion has returned, perhaps most conspicuously in recent scholarship on present-day, popular-culture live performances of Shakespeare. In part, this metaleptic shift stems from reconsiderations of how to reconceptualize performance and performativity, and Elizabeth Klett's *Cross-gender Shakespeare and English National Identity: Wearing the Codpiece* constructs a uniquely interdisciplinary case in point. She examines women's cross-gendered performances of Shakespeare on the English (primarily London) stage from 1995–2004, while noting its relationship to early modern English staging practices. At once theoretically, historically, theatrically, and politically grounded, she argues, "[t]he original purpose of the codpiece was to shield and emphasize male phallic power. By appropriating the appendage, either literally or figuratively, actresses can expose and dismantle the workings of masculinity, Shakespearean authority, and 'Englishness,' revealing how all three work to create cultural fictions of identity" (3). In the process, Klett prompts us to ask, how transformative is the performative? She works with Judith Butler's well-known understanding of "performativity" as the conditions that make ritualized and reiterable behavior, or "performance," possible. She intervenes, "[y]et defining performance as exclusively reiterable, as merely repeating familiar cultural norms, does not allow for the possibility of transformation of those norms … In this view, re-iteration is not a stale repetition of recognizable forms; instead, it allows for 'insubordination,' and for transformation through the act of re-production" (7). Klett suggests that, when we watch mimetic constructions of staged reality, we might also glimpse moments of misalignment.

Yet Klett interrogates binaristic logics that position the relationship between subversion and containment as oppositional. Perhaps the either/or framework gets in the way; perhaps it's both/and. For instance, she examines the controversial understandings of androgyny as "a transcendent union of opposites, or as a subversively embodied sexuality" (11). This controversy links contemporary women's cross-gendered performance with early modern Puritanical attacks levied against theatrical staging practices. Klett finds

equally hostile reviews in both cases. "Androgyny" works as an analytical framework for cross-dressing theatrical performances, she explains, as long as we understand it as a complex, multiply textured practice. What is at stake for the public in both the present day and the early modern, she suggests, centers on the threat of gender disruption and its social consequences. Today, however, women's cross-dressing also poses a threat to Shakespeare iconicity, which she connects with the fact that "all-female productions at the Globe in 2003 and 2004 have seemingly marked an end, at least for now, of significant interest in women wearing the codpiece on the London stage" (168).

Klett's theoretical sophistication matches Steven Purcell's thoughtfully performative book *Popular Shakespeare: Simulation and Subversion on the Modern Stage*. No less theoretically rigorous, it questions how the multiple perspective at play in "popular theater might provide us with a destabilizing discourse, a means by which our habitually self-contained attitudes towards the texts might be disrupted" (24). Examining the theatrical device of disjunctive anachronism—or modes of theatricality which would call attention to discrepancies between past and present—so ubiquitous in contemporary, post-1990 British stagings of Shakespearean works, Purcell finds self-referentially political performances that bring to the forefront connections between theater and the social. Destabilizing boundaries—between theater and the social, past and present, Shakespeare and not Shakespeare—opens a conceptual space in which we spectators might question and address the myriad global inequalities that affect scholarly work, whether or not we directly address them. His chapter organization illustrates his point. Personal narratives alternate with formal and traditionally "academic" chapters. For instance, the book opens with a personal narrative Purcell entitles "Ambiguous Applause," which questions why he and his fellow audience members at a particular performance of *Titus Andronicus* applauded Aaron's final lines, "If one good deed in all my life I did / I do repent it from my very soul" (5.3.188–9). This personal narrative ushers in the first chapter, which examines the subtextual systems of power that construct the theatrical experience. The organizational structure of Purcell's book implicitly poses to the reader the question of precisely what counts as a body of serious, academic work, and why personal narrative so rarely finds its way explicitly into scholarship. In many ways, this book performs the historical phenomenology Smith promotes.

Purcell's examination of subject positions constitutes both the strength and slight limitation of this book. He offers this caveat early on: "This is ultimately a study of one observer's encounters with a set of cultural phenomena, and another writer in a different cultural context might experience the same

subject very differently" (6). Such a statement calls important attention to the conventions by which spectatorship changes across cultures, nations, and demographics more generally. In this way, it provides a valuable lesson for those who engage in international Shakespeare studies on the importance of acknowledging difference. It also demonstrates the limitations of citing difference as an analytical rubric. The organizational structure of the book embraces the untidiness of discrete boundaries, shifting between the personal and the professional, the local and the global. Its analytical points do not. Framing analysis in terms of the singularity of a subject position can reduce sophisticated and experimental analysis to ineffectual navel-gazing, or alternately, as it threatens to do here, pull the political punch that Purcell swings at the notion of professional decorum and cultural transmission. The book ends with a reiteration of its politics of disturbance, though, and insists to its readers that, "where Shakespeare and popular culture appear most opposed, they might better expose one another: veneration might be undercut by irreverence, mythologising by parody, the impulse towards coherence through fracture" (221).

According to Melissa Croteau and Carolyn Jess-Cooke, a politics of disturbance unites intercultural Shakespeares through prolific visual citations of apocalypse. In their exciting edited volume *Apocalyptic Shakespeare: Essays on Visions of Chaos and Revelation in Recent Film Adaptations*, Croteau and Jess-Cooke call attention in their Introduction to the apocalyptic impulse that runs throughout history, from the eschatological doctrines of Zoroaster in Persia to the newest *Terminator* film. Our love of a well-told end-of-the-world story, however, takes a particularly political inflection when it comes to Shakespeare, in part because Shakespearean works and the discourse of British early modern theatricality link on- and off-stage performance with the threat of social dislocation. The volume delivers on its attempt to "provide a comprehensive examination of the ways in which recent Shakespeare films—in particular a body of predominantly late twentieth century and post-9/11 productions—register cultural concerns toward a global wasteland of literary nothingness, technological alienation, spiritual destruction, and the effects of globalization" (20). Articles sample films such as Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* (1996), Jean-Luc Godard's *King Lear* (1987), Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000), and Alex Cox's *Revengers Tragedy* (2002), all of which adopt spectacularly postmodern cinematic aesthetic. The essays provide us with a panoramic picture, revealing that these films dramatize the simultaneous threat of textual, relational, and material destruction along with the promise of Phoenician rebirth that attends apocalypse.

That Shakespeare occupies a paradoxically timely and timeless cultural position may confirm what many of us already sense when we teach Shakespeare. Students often have the comfortable and sometimes unchecked ability to understand Shakespeare as being able to weave life's secrets into the very words of his works, while also making the claim that his works are too old to be of use today. Recent studies in popular culture have begun to carefully trace these seemingly contradictory functions that Shakespeare plays today. More importantly, though, they illuminate the socio-political benefits and consequences of this paradox.

Emergent Archives

The inquisitive shift from what Shakespeare is to where we find him connects the analytical focus in popular cultural studies with the prolific and proliferating field of media Shakespeare studies; Judith Buchanan finds him in the extensive archive of silent film, and in the process challenges ontological relationship between Shakespeare and language. In *Shakespeare on Silent Film: An Excellent Dumb Discourse*, she explains, "a total of 250 and 300 films adapted from Shakespearean sources were made by the British, American, French, Italian, German, and Danish film industry" during the silent film era (1899–1927). Yet, not since Robert Hamilton Ball's pioneering 1968 work on silent Shakespeare film has a book-length project explored the genre. Buchanan continues Ball's work of sketching the contours of the archive. Beyond her goal "to bring into critical circulation some films not commercially available and so, as yet, scarcely known, if at all" (5), though, she demonstrates the capacity of wordless Shakespeare to defamiliarize central critical ideologies in Shakespeare studies more generally. The translation of Shakespeare's language into the visual semiotics of mise-en-scène and gesture, she argues, calls attention to "the aspiration of the theater and cinema as institutions, the tonal register of performance styles, the status of stars, the priorities of production companies and of national film industries, the history of Shakespeareana performance and even, at times, the nature of the plays themselves" (7). Buchanan organizes her chapters in broad chronological strokes to demonstrate how the industry reacted to its own economic, technological, and historical development. For instance, the historical focus in the first chapter pre-dates the invention of cinema, allowing Buchanan to confront the conventions by which Shakespeare became a suitable subject for cinema and for projection. Most fascinating, her second chapter calls upon Tom Gunning's concept of the

"theater of attractions" to address the ways in which Shakespearean works, characters, and plots, were pictorialized rather than just narrated. "No longer could [cinematic Shakespeare] have functioned as an advertisement for the stage production, or even, more simply, as an 'actuality' celebration of the local" (69), she writes. "The film was thus marketed as being able to offer all that the stage production had done" (69), and thus we see how tensions between media competition and market demand have shaped that which we receive as "Shakespeare" in various cultural registers.

Whereas Buchanan explores the possibilities opened up with wordless Shakespeare, Kendra Preston Leonard capitalizes on sound—music in particular—as a sort of cultural metronome, with which to gage changing attitudes toward Shakespeare's works, the adaptations they inspire, and scholarly reaction to both. In *Shakespeare, Madness, and Music: Scoring Insanity in Cinematic Adaptations*, Leonard traces the condition of madness as a primary early modern trope for confronting anxieties over desire, prescription, politics, and aesthetics—topics we continue to explore. Across historical periods, too, music "was often used as a visible and audible symptom of a victim's disassociation from her—most cases of madness on the early modern stage involve women—surroundings and societal rules and her loss of self-control" (3). Leonard concentrates her analysis on *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear* to trace a disruptive teleology. "As filmmakers have slowly departed from the aesthetic of the 'heritage' Shakespearean film as established by Olivier and the BBC's complete-works productions," she notes, "there has been a slow but undeniable dissolution of the traditional link between inappropriate performative behaviors, primarily singing, and madness" (127). While madness has constituted a general catch-all explanation in critical understandings of non-normative behaviors and representational strategies, Leonard makes a strong case that the musical language of some of the most well-distributed adaptations of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear* resists such reductive moves. Meanings we may stamp onto films, in other words, can fail to read the marginalized language of sound, which frequently presents counter-discourses to a film's visual language. Of course, first we must pay attention to music in Shakespeare screen adaptations. Leonard's study is the first of its kind and an important addition to the changing archives that comprise Shakespeare studies.

Alexander C. Y. Huang and Charles S. Ross's volume *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace* also expands archives in terms of genre as well as geography and technological medium. It brings unlikely discourses into conversation in an attempt to inspire critical reflection on the archives we

work with. The articles collected here examine "a global array of interpretive strategies" (2), which illuminates the surprising ways in which these three traditions have developed in similar ways, or at the very least with similar concerns regarding spectatorship, translation, social effect, and reception. In many respects, this volume is redefining the field of Shakespeare in adaptation. In their Introduction, Huang and Ross note three distinct yet interrelated approaches to media Shakespeare that have developed since its increasing scholarly popularity in the 1990s. The first approach, which has been pioneered by "Michael Bristol, James Bulman, John Joughin, Barbara Hodgdon, Christy Desmet, and W. B. Worthen, among other key critics" (5), calls upon theoretical understandings to interrogate systems of representation adopted by appropriations. A second approach, which Buchanan and Leonard have adopted for their recent work, focuses on case studies to shift the critical attention to less familiar geographical, technological, or generic sites of appropriation. A third approach, they explain, "engages the histories and reception of Shakespeare's images, biographies, and reputation" (5), which Gary Taylor's *Reinventing Shakespeare* and Richard Burt's two-volume encyclopedia *Shakespeare and Shakespeare* both exemplify.[6] We might also consider recent biography studies as a hybrid mode of this last approach. Each approach offers a wealth of value, but the benefits of letting these modes collide and coalesce, Huang and Ross suggest, allows us to ask new questions. The volume shifts from an examination of what Shakespeare means in new contexts, or how these new contexts challenge perceptions of Shakespeare's works, to an interrogation of how "transnational Shakespeares animate and redirect the traffic between different geo-cultural or virtual realities" (1–2). The essays explore a range of case studies and responses, leaving the question productively open-ended.

Each section of the volume frames, as is tradition, the Shakespearean encounter as a mode of cultural translation, but also as one of redefinition. The collection is divided into four parts. The first, "Shakespeare in Hollywood," explores how Asian and Anglo-European modes of representation can and do influence one another, on and off screen, as comparative literature scholars, primarily from Japan and Taiwan, examine Hollywood productions. Mei Zhu finds that "the entire tradition of screwball comedy had its roots in Shakespearean comedies such as *Much Ado about Nothing*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and *Comedy of Errors*" (24). Thus, treating contemporary films such as Kenneth Branagh's *Love's Labour's Lost* (2000) as a pop culture distortion or triviality minimizes cinematic tradition in an attempt to venerate the propriety of the Shakespearean corpus. Charles S. Ross examines the trope of the underwater woman in a cross-cultural context to identify Hollywood tendencies to display and condense onto the female body anxieties over social power. The second part, "Shakespeare in Asia," offers a geographical and historical survey of filmic traditions in Asia. Lei Jin identifies translational strategies by which "Kurosawa recreates that dramatic power of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* conveyed by dialogue" (88) rewritten in auditory conventions such as *noh* music. Also working with *Macbeth*, Huang argues that operatic *Macbeth*s "epitomize a paradigm shift from seeking authenticity to foregrounding artistic subjectivity in modes of cultural production that re-produce global texts" (104). Those interested in Asian Shakespeare will also find useful Huang's edited contribution to *Borrowers and Lenders* (4, no. 2, 2009), "Asian Shakespeares on Screen: Two Films in Perspective" and the open-access *Shakespeare Performance in Asia* (SPIA), a collection of videos of Asian Shakespeare performances. The third section, "Shakespeare in Cyberspace," confronts the effects of digital media on scholarly terminology and practice. Christy Desmet and Sujata Iyengar locate their co-edited print and online journal, *Borrowers and Lenders: A Journal of Shakespeare Adaptation* "between playground and Panopticon," (241), that is, "between new and emergent and old and institutionalized, and the desire for something creative but not creative enough" (241). These tensions suggest the benefits and difficulties of addressing the shifts and at times conflicts in how we as a field communicate with one another. Peter Holland closes the section by calling for a re-examination of our critical assumptions about community and performance, claiming that Shakespeare in cyberspace occupies a conceptual "space between the theater and the web in which new communities can be forged" (261). The final section provides a chronology and a bibliography—both of which would be valuable teaching guides for those of us who teach media Shakespeares. Taken together, the sections foreground the need to reconsider what we imagine as the conditions and consequences of the Shakespearean encounter.

While Huang and Ross illustrate the benefits of working with the tensions between local and global contextualizations, Greg Colón Semenza's volume *The English Renaissance in Popular Culture: An Age of All Time* rethinks Shakespearean universality by dislocating Shakespeare. He rightfully notes the Shakespeare-centric nature of scholarship on screen adaptations and translations, which is not to suggest scholars should exclude Shakespeare from critical examination. Rather, Semenza's collection brings together American and British scholars of Renaissance literature and popular culture to expand the conversation. He explains the scholarly stakes of the volume's intervention:

> Although English Renaissance literary scholars have written extensively on popular historical and political appropriations of Shakespeare—theorizing the cultural capital accrued through contact with the central canonical English author, such work has downplayed the fact that Shakespearean appropriations are merely part of a wider popular cultural interest and investment in the Renaissance as an imagined historical period. (10)

Widening the scope of analysis to music, sound, fairs, popular novels, the web, and media history, this volume concerns itself less with uncovering the past than it does with interrogating our uses of it in the present. In the process, the articles perform a productively complex historiography that illuminates the many ways in which we identify with and against the early modern period. As Semenza pithily remarks, "What happens in the Renaissance stays in the Renaissance. But what happens to the Renaissance in our own time gives the past new meaning," and paying close attention to this process promises to make one "more aware of the potential risks and rewards of doing so, and even experience the thrill and sense of renewal that comes with forgetting your past" (19).

The volume impressively grounds its theoretical developments with practical suggestions. In additional to the scholarly benefit, widening the scope of analysis from Shakespeare to the Renaissance can operate as a pedagogical tool. Examining cinematic artifacts such as *Elizabeth: The Golden Age* (2007) and *V for Vendetta* (2005), for instance, has the "value of making our students conscious of how adaptation operates" as a cultural process, which can likewise help "them to recognize their own historically contingent perspectives as readers of historical texts—and, consequently, of the contingent and contextual nature of historiography" (6). Each of its four sections—which focus on Renaissance icons, fantasies, sounds, and cinema—confront what I found to be a surprising and important binaristic divide. With a few exceptions, which are explored at length, "the sixteenth century, especially the later Elizabethan period, is represented as the English Golden Age, characterized by pageantry, intrigue, and a metaphorical and often literal colorfulness suggesting the vitality and infinite possibility of an England whose future greatness is already clear" (7). Conversely, the "seventeenth century—at least up through the Restoration—is usually depicted as a humorless and apocalyptic age, one clouded especially by the zeal and stereotyped asceticism of the godly" (8). This divide in representations of the Renaissance in popular culture, however implicit at times, structures the ways in which students received Renaissance

texts. Understanding this dynamic offers educators a chance to readdress our own classroom practices accordingly.

Lisa Hopkins responds to a similar impetus to widen analytic scope, but in *Relocating Shakespeare and Austen on Screen* she does so by consolidating her examination to English iconography, placing cinematic adaptations of Shakespeare and Jane Austen side by side. She constructs a unique archive of popular cultural films, such as *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* (1996), *Clueless* (1995), *Hamlet* (2000), *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001), *Shakespeare Wallah* (1965), *Bride and Prejudice* (2004), and *Becoming Jane* (2007). She finds that dislocating these iconographic figures from their traditional historical contexts allows for two primary benefits. First, paying close attention to media forms in which we receive English icons of the past can illuminate for us the larger systems of cultural value attributed to those icons. Second, and more central to Hopkins's theoretical goals of the book, the juxtaposition of Shakespeare and Austen, past and present, causes us to question "what 'Englishness' itself means, particularly in relation to two countries whose identities Britain helped to shape but which have now definitively broken away from it, the United States and India" (16). Both Shakespeare and Austen were writing at critical moments in colonial history, and each addresses issues of imperial enterprise in their writings. As theoretical circles within Shakespeare studies continue to explore the tensions between "post-colonial" and "transnational" as analytic terms, Hopkins demonstrates the benefits in allowing these tensions to remain in play. In this book, she treats timely and controversial topics of debate within the field in a delicate and sophisticated manner.

Shakespearean Utility

To return to the question I posed at the outset of this review, what worth lies in humanities scholarship and education? Many of us, because of our educational background in the humanities, undoubtedly contest what precisely ideologically laden terms such as "humanities," "education," and "worth" mean in this context. Which is to say, many of us cut our critical thinking teeth in consuming Shakespearean works and their adaptations or the theoretical principles they helped to develop. Shakespeare holds a special place in most humanities programs, and crises may hit Shakespeare studies differently because of that. As scholarship over the past two years has explored, the intrinsic value associated with Shakespeare's works has provided momentum to sometimes troubling, sometimes subversive, and sometimes failed social and

political movements. They do still, and each of these movements sends waves of disciplinary and epistemological change in approaches to Shakespeare and within the humanities more generally. We might look to Steven Mentz's new book *At the Bottom of Shakespeare's Ocean* as a case study. He develops a new "maritime humanities"—which is also referred to as "blue studies," "blue cultural humanities," and "the new thalassology"—which combines in scholarly and creative ways the discourses of post-colonialism, globalism, and environmentalism to explore the capacious, symbolic ways in which culture has come to understand the ocean. This exciting model of humanities examines the relationship between humans and the sea in a variety of contexts, including, but not limited to, literature, historical documents, and works of art. Paying close attention to the sea—one of the most "versatile symbols" (xiii)—can reveal how material reality circulates beyond its reach. On the topic of "our uncertain future," Mentz finds that "Shakespeare, sitting at the heart of English literature, has more to say … than we might expect" (xiii). The wide range of readings and plays Mentz manages to fit into this slim volume is impressive. It also suggests that, for Mentz, the one inexhaustible resource indeed is language. "[I]t's through language and narrative that our culture has always grappled with living in an unstable" condition, he argues, "[w]e just don't often put them in the center where they belong" (98). The innovative methodologies and archives that have emerged in recent scholarship enforce the need to rethink our understandings of how what we do in our offices and classrooms translates beyond those spaces. In other words, it feels incredibly appropriate to question the use-value of humanities education. Shifting the terms of the question, however, seems equally important. How do we measure the social use-value of the humanities, and if resources were to be funneled in new directions, where would they go? Perhaps, like Shakespeare, the humanities have become fodder for our desire for apocalypse stories. The humanities are dead. Long live the humanities.

Works Reviewed

Bevington, David. *Shakespeare and Biography.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Buchanan, Judith. *Shakespeare on Silent Film: An Excellent Dumb Discourse.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Croteau, Mellissa and Carolyn Jess-Cooke, eds. *Apocalyptic Shakespeare: Essays on Visions of Chaos and Revelation in Recent Film Adaptations.* Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., 2009.

Gajowski, Evelyn. *Presentism, Gender, and Sexuality in Shakespeare.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2009.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Freedom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Shakespeare and Literary Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Hopkins, Lisa. *Relocating Shakespeare and Austen on Screen.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2009.

Huang, Alexander C. Y. and Charles S. Ross, eds. *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace.* West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2009.

Klett, Elizabeth. *Cross-gender Shakespeare and English National Identity: Wearing the Codpiece.* New York: Palgrave, 2009.

Leonard, Kendra Preston. *Shakespeare, Madness, and Music: Scoring Insanity in Cinematic Adaptations.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2009.

Menon, Madhavi. *Shakesqueer: A Queer Companion to the Complete Works of Shakespeare.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011.

Mentz, Steve. *At the Bottom of Shakespeare's Ocean.* London: Continuum, 2009.

Purcell, Stephen. *Popular Shakespeare: Simulation and Subversion on the Modern Stage.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2009.

Raman, Shankar and Lowell Gallagher, eds. *Knowing Shakespeare: Senses, Embodiment and Cognition.* New York: Palgrave, 2010.

Rowe, Katherine, ed. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61, no. 4 (2010): Special issue: "Shakespeare and New Media."

Semenza, Greg Colón, ed. *The English Renaissance in Popular Culture: An Age of All Time.* New York: Palgrave, 2010.

Shakespeare Performance in Asia. (2008): at http://web.mit.edu/shakespeare/asia/.

Shapiro, James. *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare?* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2010.

Shaughnessy, Robert, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Popular Culture.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Smith, Bruce. *Phenomenal Shakespeare.* Chichester, UK and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Stewart, Stanley. *Shakespeare and Philosophy.* New York: Routledge, 2010.

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