2016 marked the 400th anniversary of William Shakespeare’s death, and various movies, exhibitions, theatrical performances, academic treatises in relation to the Bard were springing up in venues ranging from his hometown and London to America and Asia. *Shakespeare: His Infinite Variety* edited by Krystyna Kujawińska Courtney and Grzegorz Zinkiewicz was one of the tributes to the “citizen of the world” (9). Inspired by questions such as why Shakespeare “still evoke[s] international interest” (12), the editors gather the essays with the aim of finding out the manifestations of and reasons for his everlasting appeal to later generations, especially to those from non-Anglophone countries.

In the Introduction titled “Living Daily with Shakespeare Worldwide,” editor Krystyna Kujawińska Courtney hints that the “multi-national encounters with Shakespeare” (12) are reinventions of his works that precipitate Shakespeare’s “infinite variety” (12) and enable him never to be “stale” (12) all around the world.

Shakespeare’s works are deeply invested in the Judeo-Christian tradition, which has intimate connections with Greek and Roman culture. In the first section “Revisiting Texts and Contexts,” what is interesting is that, the two contributors, from Italy and Greece respectively, interpret Shakespeare’s texts through the lens of their cultural experiences. Mario Domenichelli from the University of Florence lays emphasis on the power of rhetoric in Shakespeare’s Roman plays, and the political interactions behind the rhetorical battles. He starts with a reference to Machiavelli, the famous, or rather the notorious Florentine, who is often labeled as “the Evil Tutor.” The contributor presents a striking contrast between the languages spoken by the political figures in Roman “imperial diptych” (18), namely *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*. Brutus’s Roman and aristocratic discourse is defeated by Antony’s Asian and rhetoric demagogy, who is overwhelmed later by Octavian’s laconic and rational speech. What occurs among them is not merely rhetoric battles, but
also a confrontation between East and West, between an unqualified politician and Machiavelli’s outstanding disciple.

Xenia Georgopoulou from Greece concerns about human affairs in the political community. The contributor provides examples of bullying at great length, beginning with Shakespeare himself as a victim of bullying when he is a fledgling dramatist, together with various bullying by kings or usurpers, between family members, and towards servants and strangers depicted in the plays. The origin of bullying has been illustrated in the key word of her title “difference,” being different, or in other words, “power imbalance” (48). The differences between social hierarchy, language, appearance, morality, physical ability, and even clothing can lead to bullying. Bullying will remain, as long as there is imbalance of power.

It is appropriate to put the two contributions in the first section of this book, as critical interpretation is the foundation of later discussions of translations, appropriations, and productions of Shakespeare’s works. Moreover, the deep political concern and underlying humanistic sentiments the two contributions convey set the keynote for the whole collection of essays.

What do Shakespeare’s works mean today to non-Anglophone countries? The next two sections “Practices and Appropriations” and “National and Cultural Diversity in Theatre” show the geographical ubiquity of Shakespeare more clearly by analyzing diverse appropriations, adaptations, screen and stage productions in Europe including Poland, Russia, England, and Slovakia, and Asia including Bengal and Japan. People with different cultural backgrounds reinvent Shakespeare in accordance with their own national interests and political reality, so translations and appropriations of Shakespeare’s works become vehicles of political issues, which also exert tremendous impacts on the productions.

What is representative is that, among the eight contributions in the two sections, three of them are by Polish scholars who unanimously choose Hamlet as a case in point to illustrate the political and social predicament of Poland. Krystyna Kujawińska Courtney argues that, the changes introduced by Wojciech Boguslawski in his translation / adaptation of Hamlet (1798) is the result of his patriotism and political involvement. The most obvious modification in Boguslawski’s version is that Hamlet became Danish King without the interference of Fortinbras in the denouement, which reflects Poles’ expectation of being liberated from the foreign forces. Unfortunately, Poland as a country was perished in the 19th century due to the partitions, and the former optimistic expectations turned into negative emotions. In his “The one gentleman from Poland: Polonius and 19th century Polish translation,” Budrewicz demonstrates that, during this period, the pro-Polish and patriotic attitudes of many translators and critics of Hamlet were manifested in their dealing with the character Polonius. They either reduced the Polish elements in their translations of the
original text, or portrayed Polonius as a negative example of betrayal and disloyalty. In the new era, the political fate of Poland is demonstrated by Monika Sosnowska in her introduction of a Polish art quarter “Supergroup Azorro” and its seven-minute video, an avant-garde production of *Hamlet* (2002). One of its innovations is that, the human voices in the video are not articulated by the actors themselves, but from the soundtrack of an old version of BBC *Hamlet*. The strange mixture not only produces a fascinating artistic effect, but also demonstrates the cultural and political predicament that Poland confronts before joining the EU and the identity problem of Poles as civilized EU newcomers.

The two Polish editors of this book do not limit themselves only to the Polish history of Shakespeare reception and reinvention; they also gather essays exploring circumstances in other European countries such as Russia, England, and Slovakia.

Two distinguished literary geniuses: Pushkin from Russia and English novelist Angela Carter illustrate Shakespeare’s influence with their own literary practices. In his article, Mark Sokolyansky points out that Pushkin’s appropriations of Shakespeare are manifested in his own composition of sonnets, his epic poem *Count Nulin*, and the dramatic works *Angelo* and *Boris Godunov*. Likewise, Anna Pietrzykowska-Motyka uses Angela Carter’s novel *Wise Children* as a case study. Apart from many obvious references to Shakespeare, this novel is full of polarities and oppositions. Almost all the binaries in Shakespeare can be found in Carter’s, such as binaries between the legitimate and illegitimate, male and female, high culture and low culture. As a “postmodernist writer” (119), Carter cares more about the fragility of identity and the possibility of subverting or deconstructing those binaries.

In the book *Four Hundred Years of Shakespeare in Europe*, a collection of essays exploring the long history of Shakespearean reception on the Continent, one of the contributors Isabelle Schwartz-Gastine claims that “it would occur to no one at present to turn to the English stage as a model and a source of inspiration, or to consider English companies and directors as the sole heirs to the Shakespearean heritage” (p. 238), and Shakespeare “can be explored by directors, according to their whims, tastes, and interests” (p. 238). In this book being reviewed, the academic tradaptations of Shakespeare in Bengal, the Japanese version of *Hamlet* (2015) directed by Yukio Ninagawa, and the *Hamlet* (2004) in the Rusyn language staging in Slovakia are three telling instances of Schwartz-Gastine’s view.

Sarbani Chaudhury is probably the most belligerent one among all the contributors. By quoting Mao Zedong’s “Bombarding the Headquarters,” he appeals students and teachers to bombard the institutionalized education in India. By analyzing a little known act of academic tradaptations of Shakespeare undertaken by the Department of English, University of Kalyani, Chaudhury criticizes the “Anglo-American stranglehold” (109) and hopes Shakespeare to be
reconfigured as “a supplementary component of a hybrid product” (118). Unlike India, in another Asian country Japan, Shakespeare’s works are read without colonial influences. Emi Hamana starts off by looking at the success of Yukio Ninagawa’s Japanese version of *Hamlet* (2015). The talented director takes advantage of the power of theatre, such as the Japanese visualization, stage design, costumes, and lighting to break the boundaries between different cultures, and fuses Shakespeare with local tradition and creativity. Jana Wild focuses on another version of *Hamlet* (2004) in the Rusyn language. Its departure from stage tradition as an “Other” is manifested in its choice of *First Quarto Hamlet* version and the “de-heroization of the main character” (147).

Grace Ioppolo’s “Shakespeare and digital and social media” in the last section provides a fitting closing statement to the whole collection, for it touches upon the possibilities of the Net for further cultural transmission and exchanges. Ioppolo enumerates several authoritative websites offering educational resources for the study of Shakespeare, and especially mentions her own experience of using Twitter as a tool to share her love and understanding of Shakespeare with far more people. The timely issue of Shakespeare in the digital information era broadens the research field of Shakespearean scholarship.

One of the book’s greatest virtues is the wide subject coverage which has been manifested in the subtitle “infinite variety,” though the borrowed epithet is initially meant to praise Shakespeare’s dramatic talents. To those who work on questions related to the history of Shakespeare reception in Poland and other non-Anglophone countries, to the political implications in critical interpretations, translations, appropriations, and productions, and to the new research filed of Shakespearean scholarship in Internet era, this collection of essays is informative and worth-reading.

While it is understandable that no book can live up to the comprehensiveness promised in its title, I personally expect to read more contributions about Asian encounters with Shakespeare, especially about China, a country which is abundant of excellent appropriations and productions of the Bard’s works. But this is only a nitpicking to this rich array of essays.

**WORKS CITED**


Reviewed by *Eleonora Ringler-Pascu*


Structured in two parts, the book puts into foreground detailed information about the two film productions and the context of their genesis, comparing them with other productions and also mentioning important directors who influenced Kozintsev’s work—among them being Akira Kurosawa and Peter Brook. The influence of the Noh Theatre with its philosophy of extreme restraint, bringing together emotions, poetry and music in a powerful lyrical concentration is also to be noticed. This explains the directorial precision as the historical details are reduced to a minimum and the focus is put on human existence, like a mathematical equation, present in his statement: “an arithmetic of life and an algebra of existence” (qtd. in Hudgens 21).

The author of the study even brings arguments of how Shakespeare’s plays had been interpreted in the Elizabethan era, taking into account the Renaissance theatre aesthetic, so as to underline the innovative elements present in Kozintsev’s vision. As a representative of the Russian avant-garde artist group the Factory of the Eccentric Actor (FEKS), closely related to Dadaism and Futurism, he was interested to proclaim the power of the people and of the democratic revolution. Thus he illustrates in his productions the tragedy of an entire people rather than just of one single person. He focuses on the subject of the kingdoms, the subject of Claudius and Lear, showing how the actions of the few rich and powerful impact on the many, namely the poor. The film versions of *Hamlet* and *King Lear* depict the world of these plays against the context of society and culture, bringing to light the hidden political context from Shakespeare’s works.

Both film productions reflect a lifelong engagement with Shakespeare’s work, committed to fidelity with the original as well as with the idea of modernizing them through distinct interpretation. Thus the study includes quotations from Kozintsev’s books on Shakespeare—*Shakespeare: Time and Conscience* (1966) and *King Lear: The Space of Tragedy – The Diary of a Film Director* (1977), both allowing the reader to follow the questions of a filmmaker during the planning stages and the accomplishment of the production. The

* Faculty of Music and Theatre, West University of Timisoara, Romania.
author of the study works with the comments of the film director and with quotations from Shakespeare’s plays, explaining all the completion stages of the two film productions. Thus he describes the film techniques, the settings, portrays the dramatis personae and the special atmosphere. He is impressed by the simplicity of the making, but at the same time by the power of the filmic message.

Grigori Kozintsev was filming Shakespeare’s plays in Boris Pasternak’s outstanding translation, as the Russian verses have a “natural prosaic quality” (4) that achieves the visual comprehensibility within a real area, with the specific fluency and smoothness on the screen. Dimitri Shostakovich’s music score adds to the visual part the special sound effects, amplifies the force of emotional impact and creates a unique atmosphere, corresponding to the aesthetic position of the filmmaker.

The first unit of the book focuses on *King Lear*, shot in various places throughout the Soviet Union, underlining the common aspect of all of these locations as desolate nature, fitting with Kozintsev’s goal of providing a dark traceless environment to his film. The skillful use of outdoor scenes transformed nature into something similar to the chorus of the Greek tragedy. This masterpiece is a black-and-white production, as the intention was to bring it close to life, without any coloured “beautiful effects.”

Hudgens insists on the text of the drama and on the filmic language, taking into account all sequences while presenting the dramatis personae and their dialogues—comparing Pasternak’s translation with the original. A special accent is laid on Lear and the Fool, on the special atmosphere of the film, dominated by darkness, devastating winds and storm. Thus the director’s statement points out his own mindset: “*Lear* has its own arithmetic and it also has algebra. There is as well, and I am not afraid to say it, a magic in numbers. The work is devoted to the turbulence of the elements, to the chaos of the universe, but all the same it imitates the universe in that it divides, substracts, and multiplies” (qtd. in Hudgens 22).

Kozintsev’s film is faithful to the architecture of the play, but the text is optimized, drastically shortened, with major cuts to the original play in order to adapt it to an acceptable running time for a movie audience. The production is concentrating on the key dialogues of the characters and the main action, as there persists the idea to present the content of the play in visual terms, often with sequences which are constructed without the use of dialogue. Even silence creates a magic filmic atmosphere. The camera is continually mobile and extends shots, enabling the physical exploration of the space, and even of the inner lives of the characters, insisting on their facial expressions, fixing especially the glimpse of the eyes. Acting like an actor, the camera concentrates on attractive objects and thus underlines the statements of the acting characters in a specific atmosphere.
The second unit of the book covers Kozintsev’s *Hamlet* project, which does not open with the initial Ghost appearing, but with the image of the sea that surrounds Elsinore—a noticeable aspect of opening through the prominent role of location shooting. Capturing the sublimity of the tormented landscape represents one of the primary means through which the filmmaker tried to stick to his position, that emphasizes the fact that the screen must be charged with the “electricity” of tragedy. The turbulence of the elemental forces of nature functions as a mirror of the tormented world, focusing on Hamlet’s tormented soul and mind. Taking into account this context Sokolyansky explains that Kozintsev’s approach to emphasize the northern setting of *Hamlet* determined the use of black and white film with the aim to “capture the cool greys of the north,” in opposition to the colours used for the “warm south” in his earlier film production *Don Quixote* (1957) (Sokolyansky 201).

In the *Hamlet* film a superb rendition of the “To be or not to be” soliloquy is given, which, although much reduced from the stage version, is a masterpiece of cinematic compression. Even the final devastating scene with the famous soliloquy is reduced to “The rest is silence” (5.2.337). The adaptation is praised for its cinematic excellence, again a wide-screen black-and-white production with the score done by composer Dimitri Shostakovich, whose music fortifies action and emotions—becoming the voice of Shakespeare. Kozintsev is interested in Hamlet as the protagonist who discovers the world in which he lives, as his experiences lead him to discover the souls of his mother, the conscience of his friends, the moral philosophy of the courtiers and finally himself. The best description of the aesthetic position is given by the director himself: “It is quite possible and permissible, to make an academic production of the play, but I think at the same time Shakespeare needs a kind of new, individual interpretation. Every new effort of every generation creates a new aspect of this character. A new aspect of history, the spirit of poetry, the sense of humanity, should be modern and absolutely lifelike for audiences today… I shall try to show the general feelings, the general philosophy of the poetry, but I shall not use the medium of traditional theatre staging. I want to go the way of the cinema” (qtd. in Sokolyansky 204).

There are two key elements for understanding Kozintsev’s Shakespeare films: first, the advantage of filming that allows him to show men in close-up, so that one could “see” them think. Secondly, he considers Shakespeare to be a great poet, describing the world of nature that is almost forgotten by 20th-century urban people, a reason to film his plays in nature, creating fascinating cinematic “Shakespeare-worlds.”

Peter Brook regarded both film productions as being of special interest and expressed his admiration (posthumously) towards his old friend. “I remember with gratitude your joy and excitement and your deep seriousness. I remember in your *Hamlet* and in your *Lear*, your searching for truths about
man’s condition and your wish to speak through your art about one subject only: about humanity—no more, no less” (qtd. in Hudgens141).

It would have been helpful to underline the most important aspects, but sometimes it is quite difficult to follow the ideas of the author, as he works with many quotations creating a labyrinth of information. On the other hand, it is interesting to know a lot about the work of Kozintsev, especially through his diary notes; the director’s aesthetic view becomes a valuable guide through the discussion of the cinematic work of the two described productions.

As a conclusion the book of Hudgens offers a well-informed and wide-ranging introduction to the Shakespeare cinematic adaptations of *Hamlet* and *King Lear* as masterpieces of Grigori Kozintsev, representing a unique exploration of the universe of theatre and film, that we should keep in mind.

**WORKS CITED**


Reviewed by *Hisao Oshima*

Yoshiko Kawachi’s *Shakespeare: A World Traveler*, written in Japanese with the Japanese title of *Sekai o Tabisuru Shakespeare*, is the outcome of her life-long research on global Shakespeare. As readers of this journal might know well, the author is an internationally active Japanese Shakespearean scholar, herself travelling abroad to attend Shakespearean conferences all over the world. Fortunately, I shared precious Shakespearean moments with her in the VIII World Shakespeare Congress: “Shakespeare’s World / World Shakespeares” at Brisbane in 2006 and the Inaugural Conference of the Asian Shakespeare Association: “Shakespearean Journeys” at Taipei in 2014, with both of which this book surely has much in common in approaching global Shakespeare. In the latter conference, she gave a very impressive keynote speech “Shakespeare’s Long Journey to Japan and His Presence in Asia,” and this book is a much enlarged version about Shakespeare’s world travel. As Shakespeare has now spread all over the world, it is a very vast topic, but, as the co-editor of *Shakespeare Worldwide: Translation and Adaptation*, 4 vols (1986-95) and this journal, *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance* (2004-), no doubt she is one of the best qualified scholars to attempt this formidable task.

It is a great paradox that there is no historical record about Shakespeare’s travel abroad; we can only imagine he traveled back and forth between Stratford-upon-Avon and London, but his imagination flew to anywhere in the world in his plays. After his death, however, the universal power of his drama has made him transcend boundaries in space and time. As Kawachi wrote in the introduction, Shakespeare’s mirror up to nature reflects the universe as it is, and unless essential human nature change, his dramatic messages prove valid everywhere even in the modern world. The great malleability of his works has made them possible to adapt to various cultures in the world with different theatrical traditions, just as Shakespeare’s great popularity all over the world well testifies. In the first chapter, she traces it to its root, Shakespeare in his age, analyzing his portraits and stages. His portraits often tell much about Shakespeare the man; New portraits such as Cobbe’s and Sanders’s are new visual documents about the dramatist. The modern study on Shakespeare’s public and private theatres has led to new understandings about his dramatic style and so-called historical stage productions of his works at London Globe Theatre and its indoor theatre “Sam Wanamaker Theatre.”

* Kyushu University.
In the second chapter “Shakespeare’s Transformation in England,” the author divides it into four sections (1. 17th Century, 2. 18th Century, 3. 19th Century and 4. 20th Century and After) and describes the historical outline of Shakespeare’s reception and afterlife in his country. Shakespeare’s afterlife journey was much hindered and stopped by the Puritan Revolution when theatres were closed and Shakespeare’s plays were almost forgotten. After the restoration in 1660, the 17th century witnessed the introduction of classical drama theory, female actors and proscenium stages: King’s and Duke’s Theatres competed and staged his heavily cut plays and much musicalized adaptations. Starting from this much transformed Shakespeare, she concisely describes the process of authentic Shakespeare’s recovery and attainment of his status as a national icon in his country, introducing the great English tradition of Shakespearean actors and actresses (David Garrick, John Philip Kemble, Sara Siddons, Edmund Kean, Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, and so on) and another English tradition of bardolatry supported by Romanticism against classicists’ attacks, and these traditions are certainly behind many unique modern stage productions inaugurated by Peter Brooks and Shakespearean films by Orson Wells, Peter Greenaway and others.


In the United States, for example, many English companies toured the brave new world in its colonial days and Richard III in New York in 1752 is the earliest recorded Shakespearean stage production in America. Shakespeare’s dramatic literature has influenced many American thinkers, writers, and politicians. The author offers us an interesting episode about the second and third American presidents, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson who often quoted Shakespeare in their political speeches; they visited Shakespeare’s birthplace together, and the former deplored much to see Shakespeare’s dilapidated houses, noting in his diary that the citizens of the town were not interested in their historical
significance. In the United States, famous English actors were much respected; they served as bridges bringing Shakespeare’s drama to the new world. As she notes in the last section on the Japanese reception, Otojiro Kawakami and his wife Sadayakko watched *The Merchant of Venice* featuring Henry Irving and Ellen Terry in an American city. Kawakami later adapted its court scene and played the role of Shylock before Irving, who gave a letter of recommendation to Kawakami and contributed much to the success of the company of Otojiro and Sadayakko in England. Shakespeare seems to have a unique power to have people move around the world. American actors also became successful through Shakespeare and some of them crossed the Atlantic: the black actor Ira Aldridge in the role of Othello, Edwin Forest and Edwin Booth who competed with English actors such as Macready and Irving in London.

The old world was not behind in welcoming Shakespeare into its countries. In France where Shakespeare was first castigated for his violation of classical drama rules, Berlioz and Victor Hugo became his advocates in the Romantic movement. The author asserts it’s in France that Shakespearean stages were much simplified, shifting the focus more to actors, though influenced by Granville-Barker’s dramatic theory, citing Jacques Copeau’s *Twelfth Night* (1914), George Pitoiev’s *Hamlet* (1926) on its steel-paneled stage, and René-Louis Piachaud’s political *Coriglanus*, which are some of the forerunners of modern Shakespearean stages ushered in by Peter Brooks: *Timon of Athens* (1974), *Measure for Measure* (1978), and *The Tempest* (1990). Kawachi watched his stage production of *Hamlet* (2000) with a black actor as Hamlet and an Indian actress as Gertrude. In the process of Shakespeare’s globalization, she argues, international casting like this has been becoming more and more common, and translation of Shakespeare also has been changing accordingly, oriented more toward the body language of actors, which started in the modernizing process of Shakespeare’s stages in the 1980s.

In Germany, too, Shakespeare was first criticized for his violation of classical drama rules, but Lessing, Herder, and Goethe highly valued Shakespeare’s genius in their Romantic Movement, often called “Sturm und Drang.” Famous Japanese novelist Ogai Mori who studied in Germany in the Meiji period had five different German editions of Shakespeare such as those by Johan Heinrich Voss and Schlegel. Kawachi argues Mori later translated *Macbeth*, using Voss’s edition, because she found Mori’s personal jottings on its pages in the collection of Mori’s books preserved at Tokyo University Library. In 1911, Friedrich Gundolf published *Shakespeare and the German Spirit*. Thanks to this book, the author claims, Shakespeare continued to be staged even in the First and Second World Wars when most literatures of enemy countries were banned. In 1905, Max Reinhardt directed *Midsummer Night’s Dream* while Leopold Jessner staged *Richard III* in the style of German Expressionism in 1920, but political productions of Shakespeare were totally banned in the Third Reich.
After World War II, Germany was divided into the west and east, and the conflict of ideology much influenced the reception of Shakespeare in the two countries. The author duly emphasizes the importance of Brecht who formed the company of Berliner Ensemble and wrote his unfinished version about Coriolanus, making him an anti-hero. In 1941, Brecht used the alienation effect again in his adaptation of Richard III which set Hitler’s political success story in the world of Chicago gangs. Kawachi argues Brecht much influenced modern directors such as Peter Hall, founder of RSC, and others. When she served as the leader of a special conference on Shakespearean translation in the 1986 Shakespeare Congress held in West Germany, she visited East Germany through Checkpoint Charlie and witnessed the desolate (completely far from dream) stage production of Berliner Ensemble’s Midsummer Night’s Dream. Heiner Müller’s Hamlet / Machine, published in 1977 and staged in Berlin in 1979, became a seven-hour-and-half stage production in 1990, which she watched in Tokyo: “In October 1990, West and East Germanies were united. It’s no wonder that this adaptation was understood as an epitaph for East Germany” (Shakespeare: A World Traveler, 79).

Thus, political upheavals and changes in the last century all over the world have left clear marks on Shakespeare’s global reception, and its political aspects have been more and more important and hotly debated. Shakespeare’s works are intertextually and interculturally linked with political situations of countries or regions where they are staged. In Israel, The Merchant of Venice cannot be staged without some political repercussions as Shylock is an iconic character of Jewish people victimized in the Christian world. In Russia, too, the author argues, Shakespeare’s receptions in the age of Tsars and after the revolution are completely different. In the age of Tsars, Shakespeare’s plays in which kings are murdered, like Macbeth, were banned, though Shakespeare much influenced Russian poets, writers, and composers such as Pushkin, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Tchaikovsky, and so on. Tolstoy, often compared with Shakespeare, criticized the dramatist, writing Shakespeare and Drama in 1904. Stanislavsky introduced the new style of realistic acting in Shakespearean productions, though he was criticized for neglecting the original text. After the revolution, the communist ideology completely changed the direction of Shakespeare’s reception in which the sense of class and hierarchy of power were much emphasized; Shakespearean characters of lower classes were often regarded as the representative of proletarians in socialist productions: The Taming of the Shrew, directed by Aleksei Popov, was a Shakespearean comedy performed most often in the USSR, applauding love for its promotion of socialism. After Stalin’s death, however, the dictator was satirized in Nikolai Okhlopkov’s Hamlet (1954). In Czechoslovakia (Czech Republic now) and Poland, which were for some time under the shadow of the Soviet communist regime, Shakespeare was politically appropriated for and against the totalitarian
regime. The author argues Jan Kott’s *Shakespeare, Our Contemporary* and Polanski’s *Macbeth* are rooted in its dark oppressed days.

In Africa, India, Australia and Asian countries, Shakespeare frequently served as a colonial missionary of the Western culture. In some countries such as South Africa and India, Shakespeare became an important part of curriculums of schools and universities while Shakespeare was often uniquely transformed, or united with traditional theatres in Asian countries: Peking Opera in China, Pansori in Korea, Noh, Kyogen and Kabuki in Japan. Kawachi reminds Japanese readers that it is not only the British Empire which used and spread Shakespeare in its colonial expansionism. Japan also played a role in Korea’s reception of Shakespeare, for Shakespeare, an important part of Japanese theatrical culture, was introduced there when the Japanese empire colonized the country.

Kawachi notes the reception of Shakespeare in South Africa cannot be separated from its political problems. In 1994 Nelson Mandela who read Shakespeare in prison became the president and Apartheid was abolished with the result that the white minorities returned the control of the country to the black majority. It might not be irrelevant to add an episode of mine about an international conference of the Shakespeare Association of South Africa which she mentions in her book. In “Shakespeare Congress: The International Spread of Shakespeare” held in 2007 at Rhodes University in Grahamstown where I read my paper on *Ninagawa Tempest*, the delegates were advised to remain in the campus for security; I felt the mainly white academic community of Shakespeare was only possible in the protected campus while African people’s real life was going on outside. As its finale, the association’s drama company “Shakespeare SA” staged *Hamlet*, based on the first recorded Shakespearean production in the continent 400 years ago in which the English captain invited the native king and lords, staging the play on his ship “Red Dragon” in 1607. Then I witnessed the moment of the political power balance delicately shaping a Shakespeare performance. In its last scene, dying Hamlet, played by a white actor, handed his crown to a black actor personating Fortinbras, who graciously returns it to the white actor in the curtain call.

In this age of globalization, Shakespeare is spreading all over the world, and it is urgently necessary to understand various local Shakespeares from the global perspective. Therefore, *Shakespeare: A World Traveler* is a much welcome book for Japanese readers, for this kind of book on global Shakespeare for general readers is still rare in Japan. Notes are much missed as they are important signs for serious followers of the bard’s afterlife. As his world journey is daily expanding on the planet, great respectful thanks are due to the author who has accomplished such a tour de force to create its concise map. This book will surely serve as a useful guide for would-be researchers on global Shakespeare when they embark on their own journeys following the great dramatist’s steps.

Reviewed by *Mengtian Cui*

Originally published in 2005, *Ten Lectures on Shakespeare Studies* incorporates two speeches, seven papers and six short essays written from 1982 to 2004. No obvious alteration is made in this new edition. Professor Lu’s reputation in the field of lexicography has been so firmly established that his achievements in Shakespeare studies are somewhat overshadowed. Actually, Lu, according to this book, was the first scholar from Mainland China to publish Shakespearean criticism in an international journal (p. 149), and he had been teaching “Shakespeare In-Depth” at Fudan for more than two decades. Moreover, as a theatre lover, Lu not only took part in the First Shakespeare Festival (1986) but wrote his reflections and suggestions at length afterwards (pp. 71, 174). Hence, in encompassing Shakespearean criticism, teaching and staging Shakespeare, Lu’s book will remain a must-read for anyone interested in the reception history of the Bard in China.

Lu’s contribution to Shakespeare studies in this book is characterized by three qualities. Firstly, as an omnivorous reader in Western Shakespeare criticism, Lu is ready to acquaint readers with the critical heritage from Jonson to Greenblatt and inform us of the latest interpretations, even a deconstructive one as Updike’s adaptation, *Gertrude and Claudius* (pp. 13-14). Next, not only is Lu familiar with transatlantic Shakespeare in performance in Britain, the U.S. and Canada, but fully cognizant of traditional styles of Chinese Opera. Thus, his intellectual acuity and cultural attainments make him well-qualified to give suggestions on such intractable questions as how to bring Chinese and Western national essences together (pp. 98-99). Last but not least, Lu is fortunate enough to receive personal instructions from outstanding predecessors at Fudan, including Lin Tongji, Xu Yanmou, Ge Chuangui, Liu Dezhong, and Yang Bi (Collection, 159-171). Lin, for instance, highly acclaimed by Stanley Wells and Cyril Birch, was the one to kindle Lu’s interest in both Shakespeare and Roman history. According to Lu, it was also Lin that started the tradition of close reading Shakespeare in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Fudan (Collection, 167). The paper on *Coriolanus* in the book, for instance, evolves from a book report written for Lin’s class during 1964-1965 (p. 184). Lu’s book, on this account, covers the reception history of Shakespeare in China spanning 40 years, which deserves more attention from Shakespearean scholars, both at home and abroad.

* Sichuan University, China.
Shakespearean criticism has undergone so many changes during the past 400 years. Is it possible to discern a sort of pattern amongst the dramatic changes? What new trends are emerging in the beginning of the 21st century? Lu responds to these questions in his first speech, a welcome address delivered at “Shakespeare in China” Colloquium, held at Fudan in 2004. His answer to the former question could be summarized as “whirligig,” and the latter “throwback.” “Whirligig” is explained as follows: Shakespearean criticism over the four centuries has changed “from a historical approach with the playwright at the center to the New Critical approach with the text as a point of departure and thence to deconstructionism with whoever is at the receiving end free to ‘appropriate’ Shakespeare” (p. 4). In the beginning of the new century, there is “a resurgent robust interest in a historical approach to the Bard” (pp. 2-3), which is a “throw-back” to the past indeed. Why could Shakespeare recurrently arouse interests among readers and scholars? Lu attributes the Bard’s success to open-endedness and great capacity of his works. In a long speech entitled “Open-endedness of Shakespeare,” Lu, with his elegant English and British sense of humor, makes a comprehensive introduction to Shakespeare in front of all graduates at Fudan. In Lu’s opinion, owing to their open-endedness, Shakespeare’s plays could admit “an abundance of varied information.” lead to “doubts and uncertainties,” and make “an invitation to deconstruct” (p. 13). His illustration of the first point is particularly impressive, in which Shakespeare’s characters, scenes, plots and language are touched upon in sequence. To his mind, there is “a rich assortment of characters” in Shakespearean *dramatis personae* which almost cover every walk of life in Elizabethan England (p. 19). Scenes are also various in Shakespeare’s works, from elaborate ones of state to those in the lower strata of society (pp. 20-21). What impresses Lu most, however, is Shakespeare’s versatile language, since the Bard seems to be endowed with a rare talent in having both sublime and bawdy languages at his disposal. Lu’s familiarity with Shakespeare’s complete works makes him an excellent guide in an overview like this, but regrettably his discussion of plots is somehow omitted in this speech. The loss is not irretrievable, though. In the second paper of the book, plot is referred to again as one aspect to illustrate Shakespeare’s capacity. Other aspects include genres, characters, time and space, and stage performance (p. 103). To avoid redundancy, I will focus on plots and genres in this paper. Lu holds that Shakespeare often devises several plots in one single play and he is good at paralleling historical events with private lives, the former being the main storyline and the latter the subplot (p. 107). When genres are concerned, Lu contends that comedies, tragedies, histories and romances are classifications too mechanical for Shakespearean plays. Rather, he considers plays of English monarchs to be more appropriate than histories (p. 104). He continues to point out that there are tragic elements in
such a comedy as *Merchant of Venice* whereas so-called tragedies like *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *Romeo and Juliet* all contain comic elements (p. 105). The combination of different elements in one play, obviously, helps to enhance its capacity.

There has long been a debate on whether Shakespeare is a literary dramatist or a playwright writing theatrical texts for the stage. Lu, in his article “On Shakespeare’s Performability and Readability,” explains to readers when and why critics’ opinions polarize on this issue and suggests a neutral stand in the end (pp. 204-208). Besides, as a Chinese critic, Lu seems to be haunted by the compatibility between Shakespearean plays and traditional Chinese operas. In “Reflections after the Curtainfall,” he composes a detailed exposition on this issue and extends it to much larger spheres as Chinese and Western cultures. Being optimistic about the compatibility of Shakespearean plays and Chinese operas, Lu, however, opposes the so-called sinicization of Shakespeare. To make the argument clear, he then points out the deep-rooted differences between Western and Chinese cultures, enumerating radical conflicts between Hebraism and Hellenism in the former versus eclecticism and the golden mean in the latter. Bearing these distinctions in mind, Lu warns against the reduction or oversimplification of either culture and makes such a concluding remark: “Compatibility of two cultures is the most complicated and subtle work. One’s national culture should never be corroded and swallowed by foreign cultures. Nonetheless, neither should the nation itself exert such unbounded aggrandizement that it dissolves all characteristics of other cultures.” (pp. 98-99) Lu’s words might serve as an antidote to the resurgent nationalism in the contemporary world.

The strength of this book not only lies in macroscopic discussions, though. Equally impressive are the four papers analyzing specific plays of Shakespeare’s, which are *Henry V*, *Hamlet*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *Coriolanus* respectively. In each paper, Lu performs an in-depth textual analysis, while attaching importance to the plays’ historical backgrounds and critical heritage at the same time. While demonstrating *Henry V* as a typical history play, Lu informs readers of the concept of ideal monarchy in Renaissance humanism, public enthusiasm about lessons of history in Elizabethan England, Shakespeare’s optimistic view towards the world in his early and middle works (pp. 124-130), etc. In the paper on *Taming of the Shrew*, Lu embeds the motif of “taming” in the contemporary social background and elicits customs of Elizabethan marriages and weddings (pp. 166-170). Lu’s approach is best represented in “Dysfunction: The Root Cause of Tragedy in *Coriolanus*.” In this paper originally written in 1964, Lu analyzes the chaotic states of both the characters and the body politic in *Coriolanus*. With regard to the latter, Lu initially recounts the reception history of the play, amongst which completely
different interpretations of the play from the left to right wings in the political spectrum are specified in particular (p. 189). Meanwhile, Lu is not oblivious of the prevalent political ideas during the Tudor Dynasty, which, in his opinion, could be summarized as the divinely-ordered body politic. The best illustration of these political ideas in the play is Menenius’ fable of the belly (p. 191). In explaining this analogy, Lu makes full allowances for Shakespeare’s gradual change towards the idea of “people,” yet he rejects the assertion that the Bard’s sympathy completely lies with the populace. To elucidate this point, Lu even alludes to Gu Zhun’s commentary on Roman democracy and French Revolution (pp. 192-193), through which perceptive readers could unequivocally identify the direct bearing the play has on China. Of the four papers, “Hamlet across Space and Time” is the only one targeted at a foreign audience, so it begins with the translation and reception history of Hamlet in China. Then Lu suggests Shakespearean scholars in the world to “break new ground” and focus on Hamlet’s “relationship” and “inability to identify.” Lu claims, Hamlet, compared with other characters, “having something of everything, is not quite anything all over,” hence finds “identification virtually impossible” (p. 146). This paper was originally published in 1982, and it somewhat prophesized the crisis of identity today.

Professor Lu’s book is not flawless, of course. Being a collection of papers, speeches, and essays written at different times, its most obvious defect is redundancy. The general pattern of Shakespearean criticism is referred to at least four times (p. 4, pp. 42-45, p. 204, p. 213). Two articles incorporate the diversity of Shakespeare’s characters, scenes, and language, the first time in English, then in Chinese (p. 15, p. 102). Moreover, a few points in the book are in some way incoherent. As has been pointed out already, the discussion of plots is unexpectedly omitted in “Open-endedness of Shakespeare.” In the last paragraph of the paper on Henry V, the turning to comparison between Chinese and Shakespearean plays seems to be too abrupt due to a lack of transition (p. 132). Finally, certain improvement in editing work would surely rectify some minor errors in this otherwise brilliant book. For example, it would be more appropriate to change “17th century” on page 3 to “16th century;” “Protegenates” on page 28 should be replaced by “Plantagenets.”

However, these flaws mentioned above are trifling compared with the outstanding merits of Professor Lu’s book. I will spare the last paragraph for one rare quality this book is possessed of. Lu seems to have an acute awareness of carrying forward traditions. In “The Letter on Teaching Shakespeare” (one of the six short essays), he makes it plain that young scholars, with various academic strengths, lack patience and perseverance in reading first-hand texts intensively, which is what Lu will teach students in his class (p. 210). Obviously, close reading Shakespeare is what he has learned from predecessors like Lin
Tongji, and what he would like to bequeath to his students. Only a few lucky ones could attend “Shakespeare In-Depth,” but we readers are fortunate enough to have this book before us. As long as we read Shakespearean plays and books like Lu’s, we are continuing a tradition “which may be invisible and untouchable but will be passed on, from generation to generation.” (Collection, 170)
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Reviewed by *Coen Heijes*

“This book is not about Shakespeare [……] nor does it deal with his works”. In the first few sentences, Franssen sets out very clearly that he does not intend to discuss essential Shakespeare, but wants to zoom in on Shakespeare’s fictional afterlives, in other words how Shakespeare appears in fictional stories by creative writers throughout the centuries. In his book, Franssen shows the almost infinite variety of lives that Shakespeare takes on in fiction, ranging from regal ghosts to an android or even a dog. His intention in doing so, however, is not to provide an overview of these fictional stories as such, but to study the ideologies and the cultural constructions of Shakespeare that inform these stories. As so little is known of Shakespeare’s life, fiction writers, Franssen argues, can take more liberty with Shakespeare than would be possible in adapting or staging his plays. It is precisely in this fictional genre that the way Shakespeare is appropriated for various specific discourses can be made more manifest. What is of special interest, is that most research in this area has focused on the Anglophone world, and Franssen clearly sets out to move beyond that, studying these fictions in a more international context, and analysing the ideologies, in (mainly) Europe and North America, that inform the fictional stories in which Shakespeare appears as a character.

Rather than opting for a chronological approach, Franssen chooses a structure in which each chapter discusses a specific motif or factoid that occurs in several fictional stories as a basis for comparison within and across countries and time periods, using these stories as case studies to support his argument. In the first chapter, Franssen focuses on Shakespeare’s ghosts. The portrayal of Shakespeare before 1800 was mainly as a ghost, and while his roles were many, the character was generally installed with a sense of dignity, portrayed as a regal figure of authority. This figure was appropriated by the fiction writers, however, for a variety of purposes. In England, he was used for example to legitimise authors, such as Dryden, or as a character in theatrical disputes between rival companies. In Germany, Shakespeare’s ghost was used by Lenz in 1775 to support the Germanic school of Nature against French neoclassicism, while in the Netherlands Shakespeare’s ghost supported neoclassical principles, in line with the existing French cultural influence. Only in Spain, Shakespeare’s ghost was less dignified, but here he had to contend with that other great writer, Cervantes. More modern examples of Shakespeare as a ghost, show his stature to be diminished, as he turned more into a character of fun, but mainly so in
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Britain. Franssen argues this might be due to the British respect for the text since Edward Malone, which would need a compensatory outlet by ridiculing the ghost. As Continental Europe, forced to translate Shakespeare, would not need this outlet, the ghost could generally maintain its prestige. What makes for pleasant reading, is that Franssen does not try to shove this, or any other theory, down the reader’s throat, but generally argues in a more tentative manner, while clearly presenting his evidence.

The second chapter focuses on the development of Shakespeare in fiction as a man of flesh and blood, which can be dated to the beginning of the nineteenth century. A large part of the chapter is about Duval’s short play *Shakespeare Amoureux* (1804), in which Shakespeare triumphs over Lord Wilson, in the battle for a woman. Supposedly based on Manningham’s 1601 diary, Lord Wilson takes the place of the actor Burbage, thereby introducing Shakespeare not only as a lover but also pitting him as a bourgeois, a commoner, in a successful battle against the aristocrat Lord Wilson. It is a theme which would have been popular in France and vassal states in a timeframe that saw Napoleon’s rise to power. Franssen outlines how the play, with Shakespeare as a man of flesh and blood, became a hit, not only in France, but also in Spain, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Italy, and the Austrian-Hungarian Empire. He goes on to argue how this French play, with all the status of French culture and language of the time behind it, might have worked in the early nineteenth century as an accelerator in the process of setting off Shakespearomania across Continental Europe. At the same time, Franssen demonstrates how specific national conditions, particularly in Germany, would tend to play down the class conflict and rather focus on Shakespeare as a Romantic character, possessing an inner moral worth that would be the true mark of nobility.

In the third and fourth chapter Franssen demonstrates how changes in Shakespeare’s character reflect changing historical contexts. In the third chapter, he focuses on the difference between country (Stratford) and city (London). For example, the factoid of Shakespeare’s poaching a deer is shown to evolve hand in hand with discourses of authority. As class divisions came to be questioned, Shakespeare would gradually move from an innocent, youthful transgressor to one who would firmly and rightly stand up against the aristocracy. In the fourth chapter, the centre of attention is Shakespeare’s sexual orientation. Franssen traces the erosion of Shakespeare as a moral beacon in the twentieth century and zooms in on Oscar Wilde’s ‘The Portrait of Mr. W.H.’. The homoerotic preferences of Shakespeare, which are suggested, proved to be influential in later decades, for example in stories involving boy actors playing women’s roles and the ensuing gender confusion. Perhaps even more noteworthy is the attention Franssen draws to Wilde’s story as demonstrating the opacity of Shakespeare’s life. Wilde, he argues, was ahead of his time and would have seen that stories,
including his own, about Shakespeare are constructions, and more a reflection of the story’s author than of Shakespeare, thereby paving the way for further deconstruction, as in Joyce or Holderness. In a separate section on the Dark Lady, Franssen uses an impressive range of sources and indicates how the idea of Shakespeare’s involvement with a non-Caucasian Dark Lady became another construction, used for example to highlight racial exploitation and inequality in multicultural societies. With Shakespeare often cast in the role of scapegoat.

Franssen takes up the topical theme of religion in chapter five, where he argues that the religious constructions of Shakespeare generally reflect on secular issues. In an interesting case study, he demonstrates how the Anglo-Irish conflict appropriated varying religious Shakespeares on both sides of the conflict: an impeccable Protestant, a convert on his deathbed, and a crypto-Catholic. Gregg’s appropriation of Shakespeare as a Protestant, for example, is reconstructed as a plea from this Anglican author and clergyman, working in Catholic Ireland, for Queen Victoria to follow in Queen Elizabeth’s footsteps and protect Protestant interests. Her reward would be a period to match the Elizabethan age. As she did not, Franssen remarks on a personal note, “it is hardly surprising that, instead of another Shakespeare and Bacon, she got Charles Darwin, Thomas Hardy and Oscar Wilde.” In chapter six Franssen moves to Continental Europe and America once more, as he discusses the theme of Shakespeare’s travels as a character, in particular to Italy, Spain, and the New World. Where stories involving Italy were constructed around cooperation and indebtedness to the Italian cultural heritage, stories of Spain were informed by the rivalry between these two countries in Shakespeare’s time and between their two national writers. A supposed meeting in the early seventeenth century between a young Shakespeare and a more mature Cervantes is the theme of many of these stories, as in for example the Spanish movie, *Miguel y William* (2007). Although both authors learned from each other in the movie, Cervantes turned out to be the moral winner of the two, as, Franssen argues, would befit a movie which was subsidised by the regional government and meant to celebrate the quatercentenary of Don Quixote.

In his final chapter, Franssen comes full circle, as he returns to the topic he started with, Shakespeare’s ghosts, the early representations of direct contact with Shakespeare in fiction. Now, however, he analyses the modern equivalent of the regal apparition of the eighteenth century: time travel stories, which allow characters to travel back to Shakespeare’s time and meet him, or, vice versa, place Shakespeare in the twentieth century. Franssen situates these stories in the discourse between high brow and low brow culture. He agrees with Lanier’s theory that many of these popular stories, which often include a very fallible Shakespeare, are not so much concerned with attacking Shakespeare, as with attacking bardolatry as such and the elitist appreciation of Shakespeare, that never really understood him. When the scientist Dr Welch transported
Shakespeare to the twentieth century (in Asimov’s 1957 ‘The Immortal Bard’), his colleague in the English department, Robertson, unknowingly flunked Shakespeare for failing to understand his own works. Franssen, however, also diverges somewhat from Lanier’s approach, in his analysis of Burgess’s ‘The Muse’, where he argues how Burgess, in presenting an over-the-top monstrous Shakespeare, was ridiculing theories on the death of Shakespeare and the debunking of Shakespeare, instead of endorsing any of them. At the end of this last chapter, Franssen has half a page left in which he touches upon another variant of time travel, —by magical instead of technological means—, and explores how these popular stories present a more pleasant Shakespeare. However, the book has come to a close, and the analysis is necessarily brief and tentative. Although Franssen himself readily recognizes at the end that his study has only been able to explore part of the field, nevertheless his book covers a wide terrain, provides invaluable insights into the appropriations of Shakespeare and the underlying ideological assumptions, not just in the Anglophone world, but also in Continental Europe. The thematic and case-study based approach is not only useful for this topic but also allows for a very readable book. It is telling that I felt myself wanting to read on at the end, a tribute not just to the topic of the book, but also to the accessible style it was written in.