



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

<http://muse.jhu.edu>

scholarship in quotation marks may soften the critical edge of Hong's history as a whole, the very fact of their inclusion enriches his text with a vivid historicity.

For students and scholars of Chinese literature, as well as for the interested layperson, Michael M. Day's translation can be considered better than the original in some aspects. It includes not only a glossary of terms, organizations, and periodicals, a bibliography, and a list of titles of works cited (that is, within the text but absent from footnotes or bibliography), but also a detailed index of personal names with Chinese characters accompanying Chinese names. All are added to the English translation with meticulous care for the sake of serious readers, who may be inspired to pursue further certain threads laid out in the original Chinese text.

Hong's panoramic history of contemporary Chinese literature, now in English translation for the first time after its many printings in Chinese, will be indispensable for both teaching and research. It will provide a solid basis for the teaching of Chinese literary history in both undergraduate and graduate programs. Its thorough and wide-ranging coverage from 1949 to 1999 touches upon many fascinating and understudied texts in that history, which can be points of entry for students and scholars of contemporary China to further their researches.

Liang Luo

Liang Luo teaches modern Chinese literature and culture at the University of Kentucky. She is interested in the avant-garde as an international movement and its relationship with modern China, with particular focus on the performance, politics, and popularity of the avant-garde in the context of twentieth-century China.



Alexander C. Y. Huang. *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009. xi, 350 pp. Paperback \$26.50, ISBN 978-0-231-14849-8.

Chinese Shakespeares explores a history of global exchanges, from the nineteenth century to the present, through two über-cultural signifiers: China and Shakespeare. Developing a theory of global localities, Alexander C.Y. Huang argues that multiple Chinas and multiple Shakespeares have intersected in a variety of context-specific configurations of ownership and cultural resonance. With a temporal scope ranging from the first Opium War (1839–1842) to the present; a geographical scope spanning mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and the global Chinese diaspora; and a media purview covering stage drama (text and perfor-

mance), opera, fiction, textbooks, essays, silent and sound cinema, music, and translation, *Chinese Shakespeares* is an ambitious work of cultural history that chooses its battles and case studies judiciously. Comparative in approach, it contributes to multiple fields, including comparative cultural and literary studies, Shakespeare studies, modern Chinese history and culture, global intellectual history, performance studies, and cross-cultural theory.

The book comprises a prologue, an epilogue, and seven numbered chapters grouped in four parts: “Theorizing Global Localities” (chapter 1), “The Fiction of Moral Space” (chapters 2–3), “Locality at Work” (chapters 4–5), and “Postmodern Shakespearean Orients” (chapters 6–7). In the back matter—before the notes, select bibliography, and index—Huang has included a handy select chronology that allows the reader to see “Historical Events,” “Worldwide Shakespeares,” and “Chinese Shakespeares” since the late sixteenth century in parallel, diachronic perspective. The bibliography reflects Huang’s multilingual scope, including sources in English, Chinese, Japanese, French, and German. A glossary of Chinese and Japanese characters (some appear in the bibliography) would have been a useful addition. Overall, the book is extremely well written and edited; this reviewer found few language errors or typos (p. 244).

In the prologue and the first chapter, “Owning Chinese Shakespeares,” Huang demonstrates an acute sensitivity to the perils of bringing the cultural tokens of China and Shakespeare into dialogue with one another. Each carries its own burden of received wisdom and cliché—Shakespeare as the Writer of the Millennium who belongs to the world, and China as a mysterious antithesis of things Western, to mention just a couple. Huang is loath to repeat these essentializing discourses, much less to magnify them by bringing Shakespeare and China together. He thus takes pains to enumerate and distance himself from these views, highlighting, in particular, how an obsession with authenticity often pushes cross-cultural comparisons into a dead end. Recent multilingual productions, such as Ong Keng Sen’s *LEAR* (1997) and David Tse’s *King Lear* (2006), illustrate the challenge of such critical inertia for contemporary directors and audiences alike, as new experiments may be readily subsumed under the logics of cultural tourism or platitudes about globalization. In its first pages, then, *Chinese Shakespeares* presents cultural exchange as a field beset by pervasive reductionism.

Weaving his way through this methodological minefield, Huang rejects, for example, treating traveling Shakespeares solely as a form of cultural colonialism, and the condescending so-that’s-how-they-do-Shakespeare-over-there attitude of much reportage on Chinese performances of Shakespeare. Instead, he “examines encounters of Shakespeare and China as a transformative process” in three dimensions: as cultural practices, as texts, and as performances (p. 39). As Huang’s plural categories suggest, a primary agenda of this book is to demonstrate the multiplicity, heterogeneity, and heteroglossia of discourses about Chinese Shakespeares in order to “frustrate intellectual tokenism and monolithic stereotypes” (p. 229),

both of which, Huang persuasively argues, continue to cling to both China and Shakespeare.

The history that Huang lays out demonstrates the diversity of these exchanges in dramatic fashion, and I will attempt to summarize them only briefly. Chapter 2, “Shakespeare in Absentia,” discusses how Shakespeare became a hypercanonical presence in China beginning in the nineteenth century despite the absence of his texts. In this reception prehistory, missionaries, translators, and Chinese reformers present Shakespeare as an exotic commodity, a symbol of Western humanism, and a moral paragon—but always second- or thirdhand. Examining Lin Zexu’s 1839 mention of Shakespeare in a translated geographic encyclopedia, the accounts by Chinese diplomats of overseas performances, and the Bard’s appearance as a character in Liang Qichao’s uncompleted Kun opera *New Rome* (Xin luoma, 1898), among other materials, Huang notes the overwhelmingly panegyric tone of this discourse and asks why it was so. His answer is that Shakespeare represented a progressivist ideal to these intellectuals: a classical literary figure that embodies a national cultural tradition but is still relevant and modern. (Du Fu and Tang Xianzu were among the nominees of a Chinese equivalent.) The textual vacuum, Huang shows, enabled these early critics to appropriate Shakespeare to legitimize a variety of reformist agendas.

Chapter 3, “Rescripting Moral Criticism,” heralds the arrival of the text in several forms: Lin Shu and Wei Yi’s 1903 rewriting of Charles and Mary Lamb’s *Tales from Shakespeare*, Lao She’s short story “New Hamlet” (Xin hamuliede, 1936), and several translations (the first being Tian Han’s 1921 *Hamlet*). Focusing on literary culture, Huang argues that during the early twentieth century “[b]oth Shakespeare and China were used as alibis or the pretexts for aesthetic experiments” (p. 68), a practice that continues today. Lin Shu’s approach to his source text was reverent (think of Lin’s exaltation of Dickens) but popularizing, bringing the Bard to a broader (albeit still elite) Chinese readership. Lao She’s, in contrast, was parodic, putting China on the couch to reveal its Hamlet complex, characterized by inaction and obsession with the past. In this chapter, Huang also provides new data to dispute various scholarly claims about firsts in the history of Shakespeare texts in China, and fleshes out our knowledge of the proliferation of Shakespeare (-inspired) texts in circulation at this time.

Part 3, “Locality at Work,” is divided into two chapters, the first focusing on new drama and silent cinema of the Republican period, and the second on site-specific readings from multiple historical periods (World War II, Mao era, post-Mao era). In chapter 4, Huang reveals that stage and screen adaptations of *The Merchant of Venice* (1927), *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1931), *Romeo and Juliet* (1937), *Macbeth* (1945), and *Othello* (1947) constructed images of cosmopolitan womanhood. To cite just two examples: Qiu Yixiang’s 1927 film *The Woman Lawyer* made Portia the central role (played by the star Hu Die), inspired in part by the media spectacle surrounding a French female lawyer who began practicing in

Shanghai that year. Bu Wancang's 1931 film *A Spray of Plum Blossoms*, starring Ruan Lingyu and drawing on chivalric maid (*xianü*) tropes, turned *Two Gentlemen* into a picaresque adventure about two women traveling from Shanghai to Canton. While adopting different approaches to foreignness, both films pursued a progressive agenda by presenting images of worldly and self-confident Chinese gentlewomen in the public sphere.

Chapter 5 turns from social agendas to more explicit politicizations of aesthetics, focusing on three Chinese Shakespeares from the 1940s to the 1970s: Jiao Juyin's wartime production of *Hamlet* (1942), staged in a Confucian temple; Wu Ningkun's (private) reading of *Hamlet* in a labor camp during the Cultural Revolution; and ostensibly apolitical Sino-Soviet coproductions of *Much Ado about Nothing* (1957, 1961, 1979). In these cases, Huang argues, the subject matter of the plays was not the main reason for their selection, as might be expected; instead, mid-twentieth-century directors explicitly sought to avoid topicality, due to the political sensitivity of the performance contexts. In each case, the specter of censorship and repression looms large, but Huang shows how such constraints spurred creativity. Jiao's temple, for instance, was a handy symbolic space of moral authority (the KMT having promoted a Confucian revival) but also a material expedient, since it saved the troupe from having to build a stage.

I have three criticisms of this otherwise fine chapter. First, while drawing fruitful comparisons to other existentialist "prison *Hamlets*," Huang's account of Wu's readings, atypically, is oddly fuzzy on contextual details. Second (perhaps unavoidably), the accounts of both Jiao's and Wu's Shakespeares are also heavily reliant on intentional sources (retrospectives by the men themselves). Third, while Huang does discuss Sino-Soviet relations during the 1950s, the cultural liberalization of the Hundred Flowers Movement (mentioned in passing on p. 151) could be amplified as a precondition for the very existence of Yevgeniya Lipkovskaya's 1957 *Much Ado*. Nevertheless, the history of her play's production, revivals, and reception before and after the Cultural Revolution, which Huang discusses in detail (drawing on both archival sources and interviews), is one of the book's most engaging passages, illustrating in detail the appeal of apolitical theater in an overpoliticized environment as "utopia in dystopia."

The final section of the book, comprising two chapters and an epilogue, engages with the inevitable postmodern readings of contemporary Chinese Shakespeares. Huang chronicles the efforts of Chinese directors and performers over three decades to connect with international audiences across the language and culture barriers, while using Shakespeare to renew and adapt Chinese performance genres such as *xiqu* and *huaju* (see esp. p. 185). Aesthetic strategies have included privileging universalist visual languages (e.g., masks in Feng Xiaogang's *The Banquet*), substitution of symbolism for dialogue, fourth-wall-breaking performances (e.g., Wu Hsing-kuo's *Lear Is Here*), foregrounding of Chinese performance conventions (e.g., *jingju*-style self-introduction in a 1983 blackface *Othello*), and

incorporation of religious motifs (e.g., Buddhist elements in Wu's and Stan Lai's productions of *King Lear*). The examples in chapters 6 and 7 testify to Shakespeare's continued relevance to Chinese artists as an artistic inspiration and a catalyst or mechanism for artistic/geographical boundary crossing. At the same time, Huang highlights a contemporary turn among Taiwanese and diasporic Chinese artists towards small-time Shakespeare, expressed through personalized and autobiographical performances that contrast starkly with earlier big-time mainland productions, which tended to be more allegorical, nationalistic, and Sinocentric. Huang's argument that these moves represent a disowning of Shakespeare and China serves as a welcome antidote to platitudes about the gallop of globalization leading to an inevitable harmonious convergence of a global Shakespeare with a local China.

For this Chinese literature specialist, the most fascinating aspect of *Chinese Shakespeares* is the rich genealogy that emerges from Huang's analyses of numerous works that are seldom discussed in cultural histories of modern China. These include Liang Qichao's *New Rome*, in which Shakespeare, Dante, Voltaire, and other representatives of national literary traditions are invoked as moral authorities to inspire Chinese patriotism—a type of great minds salon model of patriotic utopianism that Liang was to engage in again in his (also unfinished) 1902 novel *The Future of New China* (*Xin Zhongguo weilai ji*), which stars a reincarnation of Confucius. Comparative readings of Lin Shu's and the Lambs' prose retellings of *The Merchant of Venice* and *Hamlet* illustrate what each chose to emphasize or excise for their respective readerships. Later, readings of Wu Hsing-kuo and his contemporaries illustrate the astonishing creativity and sophistication of recent adaptations.

Indeed, this reader would have enjoyed even more textual analysis to accompany the ample theoretical and historical contextualization. If textual criticism has been exhausted for Shakespeare's plays, the same cannot be said for the texts of Chinese Shakespeares, whose texts are largely unfamiliar to Anglophone readers. Huang is understandably selective in choosing examples to support his theoretical thrust, but, symptomatic of a groundbreaking book, the examples he does analyze leave one wanting more.

Two omissions might strike the reader as puzzling. One is Liang Shiqiu, who translated Shakespeare's works in their entirety, but is relegated to a note in the chronology (p. 244) and is not listed in the index. What were his (or other translators') contributions to Chinese Shakespeares? (A book focused on cultural translation in its broadest sense might also have listed the word "translation" in the index.) The other is the sonnets, whose absence in this study suggests that they have played, at most, a minor role in this fascinating history of cultural exchange. (Two minor quibbles: Lee Kuo-hsiu's *Shamlet* is listed in the chronology under its 2007 Beijing revival but not its 1992 debut. Both deserve inclusion. On parody and breaks with the past, Huang might have bypassed the secondary source's para-

phrase [p. 87] and gone straight to Bourdieu [*The Field of Cultural Production*, p. 31].)

As such, while this book is well crafted as a stand-alone work, it also deserves to be read as part of the author's even more comprehensive scholarly engagement with global Shakespeares—Chinese, Asian, and otherwise. Huang has published extensively elsewhere on *Shamlet* (e.g., *Asian Theatre Journal* 22, no. 1), Liang Shiqiu and the sonnets (e.g., a chapter in Pfister and Gutsch's 2009 *Shakespeare's Sonnets*), and *Hamlet* during the Sino-Japanese War (a forthcoming book chapter). This book also complements several digitalization initiatives in which Huang has taken a leadership role, including Global Shakespeares.org and the MIT Shakespeare Electronic Archive.

Overall, Huang has done a remarkable job of executing an ambitious agenda and navigating the numerous pitfalls attendant on serious interdisciplinary work. By focusing on localities, Huang develops a useful critical paradigm that sidesteps more conventional categories of the national and the ethnic. At the same time, the great efforts that Huang makes to justify Chinese Shakespeares as a legitimate field of inquiry suggest a lamentable persistence of Eurocentricism in the field of Shakespeare studies (to which I am an outsider) and—I suspect—in the field of comparative literature more generally.

Christopher G. Rea

Christopher G. Rea is an assistant professor of Chinese literature in the Department of Asian Studies at the University of British Columbia.



Ian Johnston, translator and annotator. *The Mozi. A Complete Translation*. Translations from the Asian Classics. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010. lxxxv, 944 pp. Hardcover \$68.00, ISBN 978-0-231-15240-2.

Apart from Alfred Forke's almost complete translation,¹ which is *introuvable* and which I have never seen (but which was evidently consulted by Johnston), there existed up to now only partial translations of the *Mozi*. The most important are the English translation by Y. P. Mei,² who translated the introductory chapters (the "epitomes," as they were called by Stephen Durrant), the so-called core chapters and the dialogues, but not the logical and military chapters; and Burton Watson's,³ who made a selection from the core chapters. There were several attempts to translate the logical chapters or part of them (chapters 40–45), but, by far, the most