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“My angel!” A woman’s voice is heard outside a hut in the snow in Kashmir in 1995, a landscape devoid of colour other than mostly black, white, and deep blue. Ghazala’s son, Haider, a lone fighter, is hiding inside the severely damaged hut. Having sustained gunshot wounds, he is surrounded by the soldiers led by his uncle Khurram, who plans to kill him with a shoulder-launched rocket; but Ghazala, caught between her lover and her son, who is intent on avenging his father’s death, convinces Khurram to give her one last chance to persuade Haider to give up his revenge plan and surrender. Soft-spoken, Ghazala may not appear to be a particularly strong woman at first glance, but she is taking on the active role of a liaison, negotiator, and now a game-changer.

Family issues and personal identity are tragically entangled in terrorism, politics, and national identity when Haider responds to his mother’s plea that “there is no greater pain than to see the corpse of your own child” by reasserting that he cannot “die without avenging the murder of one’s father.” His moral compass is clearly pointing in a different direction. His mother does not believe politics should and can take precedence over love. His mother’s love is apparent, but it is not enough to change Haider’s mind. In her desperate last attempt to turn her son around, Ghazala spells out what is one of the most significant themes of Vishal Bhardwaj’s 2014 film Haider: “revenge begets revenge; revenge does not set us free. True freedom lies beyond revenge.” The clash between the world-views of the mother and her son is tragic.

What follows is a moving scene in which a determined mother sacrifices her own life to save her son. Ghazala kisses Haider goodbye and walks out towards Khurram and his men. Once standing in front of them, she opens her coat to reveal a suicide vest consisting of numerous hand-grenades. As everyone runs away from her, Khurram and Haider rush towards Ghazala but are unable to stop her. Bhardwaj’s choice of slow motion accentuates the impossible weight of time. Khurram and Haider finally realize what is at stake, only too late. They race against time to save their lover and mother, but they are up against time – linear time. Nothing can be turned back; life can be lived only in forward motion.
Shakespeare on film in Asia

also for all places and media? Shakespeare has been a part of the film and popular cultures of various Asian countries, with Romeo and Juliet, Macbeth, and Hamlet at the centre of cinematic imaginations.

This chapter introduces readers to the rich intercultural contexts and visual texts of Asian film adaptations of Shakespeare, particularly those films' network of allusions to Eastern and Western visual sources, Shakespearean characterization, and Asian histories. What is entailed in the screening, in both senses of the verb, of Shakespeare in transnational audio-visual idioms? How do Haider and Hamlet talk to each other across cultural and historical divides? How are pre-linguistic structures of spectacle and music appropriated along with dramatic narratives in Shakespeare and the new screenplay? What are some of the common strategies to adapt Shakespeare to Asian cinemas?

ASIAN SHAKESPEARE FILMS PAST AND PRESENT

Japanese director Akira Kurosawa's Throne of Blood (his adaptation of Macbeth, 1957) and Ran (his adaptation of King Lear, 1985) – while now canonical in Anglophone education and the study of Shakespeare – are far from the earliest or the only Shakespeare films from Asia: there are also early twentieth-century silent-film adaptations. Around the time that actress Asta Nielsen's cross-dressed Hamlet (directed by Svend Gade and Heinz Schall, 1921) was filmed, gender-bending silent-film adaptations of The Merchant of Venice and The Two Gentlemen of Verona were being made in Shanghai and marketed to the European expatriate and Chinese diasporic communities there and in Canton and Southeast Asia (see the Filmography at the end of Chapter 13).

Since 1927, the Indian cinematic tradition has engaged Shakespearean motifs in diverse genres ranging from silent film and theatrical cinematization to feature films that localize the plays. Shakespeare films have been produced in India, Malaysia, Tibet, Hong Kong, Singapore, China, and Japan.

Some Asian films have not only become world classics but also influenced other films and theatre productions. Throne of Blood (Figure 12.1), for example, has inspired Taiwanese performer and director Wu Hsing-kuo's Beijing opera The Kingdom of Desire (1987); American playwright John R. Briggs's Shogun Macbeth, an English-language adaptation of Kurosawa on stage in New York (premiered in 1985); and an English stage version called Throne of Blood, visually faithful to the film and staged at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival (2010).

There has been an explosion of bold and imaginative filmic interpretations of Shakespeare's plays since the 1990s, many of which aim to attract audiences in multiple locations both East and West. The beginning of the new millennium is for Asian cinematic Shakespeare as the 1990s were for Anglophone Shakespeare on film. Asian Shakespeare films dazzle with unique visual, kinetic energy, aural and musical landscapes, and – often but not always – contemporary political significance. While Asian films are by no means devoid of speech, some scholars have observed a particular kind of freedom enjoyed mostly by non-Anglophone filmmakers, namely that “not needing to record in English on the soundtrack, filmmakers such as Kurosawa enjoyed the luxury of reinventing the plays in purely cinematic terms” (Rothwell 2004: 160). Likewise, British theatre director Tim Supple, who has produced A Midsummer Night's Dream with a pan-Asian cast in seven languages (Royal Shakespeare
increasingly aggressive transnationalizing strategies since the 1990s. Asian audiovisual idioms have been appropriated along with Shakespeare’s texts.

**SEEING DOUBLES**

Last thing he did, dear Queen,
He kissed – the last of many doubled kisses –
This orient pearl.

Antony and Cleopatra [1.5:38-40]

The films considered here recast Shakespeare and Asia as condensed collective signifiers of cultural values through their double marketability for audiences in different locations. Outside their countries of origin, they attract audiences who are enthralled by the performance of the exotic, whether it is through Shakespearean or Asian motifs. Within their local markets, the name brand of an editorialized Anglophile Shakespeare helps boost their production value. Further, the co-presence of Shakespearean and Asian motifs in these films suggests that certain cinematic elements – such as Shakespeare’s imagery and narrative patterns in tragedy, and conventionalized Bollywood dance and Chinese martial-arts sequences – are used as common denominators and bonding agents between different periods and cultures. Further, filmmakers (whatever their ethnicity or “origin”) working with Asian motifs, aesthetics, or outlooks often need to contend with their own aesthetic or political visions and their regionally marked cultural identities. Their works respond to the competing demands to inhabit simultaneously the local and the global; in other words, to represent “Asia” on the world market and to be the conveyer of a “global West” to Asian audiences.

For example, we see doubles in director Ing Kanjanavanit’s metatheatrical adaptation of *Macbeth*, *Shakespeare Must Die* (2012). The duality of its reception was anticipated in the parallel worlds depicted by *Shakespeare Must Die*. The general in *Macbeth*, which characters in the film are staging, takes the throne through a bloody series of murders; he parallels a contemporary superstitious and murderous dictator known as Dear Leader. The two worlds collide when the players stage *Macbeth* in a world ruled by the dictator. Like *Haider*, *Shakespeare Must Die* is political in nature and critiques Thai politicians; its fate of being censored seems unavoidable. Shakespeare’s tragedy serves as a platform to launch a difficult conversation about contemporary issues, as Ing said in an interview: “When Cambodians watch this they’ll think it’s Hun Sen. When Libyans watch it they would think it’s Gaddafi” (Kennedy 2013)

Likewise, Haider’s life experience and identity are full of paradoxes: the film engages with the notion of duality. Ironically, Haider’s Muslim family send him away to university in the hope that he will not be religiously and politically radicalized. A student of “revolutionary poets of British India” (as he tells the Indian guard at the check-point), Haider returns to his homeland of militarized Kashmir in the midst of mid-1990s Pakistan–India conflicts upon the news of his dissident father’s disappearance. Even the props carry this duality. Arsha (Ophelia) knits her father a red scarf, which he wears often and proudly; the same scarf is used to tie Haider’s hands in a later scene. Many scenes, shot on site in Kashmir, are colourless and overwhelmed by the weight of politics. Politics means there are always more than two sides to the
story. Haider finds his mother in a relationship with his uncle, a high-ranking official. The play-within-a-play and grave-digger scenes are staged in the form of musical numbers. Cited at the beginning of this chapter, Haider (2014; in Hindi and Urdu), directed by Vishal Bhardwaj and written by the Kashmiri journalist Basharat Peer, is one of the latest Asian Shakespeare films. Similar to Shakespeare Must Die, which was banned in Thailand— even though, ironically, the Culture Ministry’s Office of Contemporary Art and Culture partially funded the production (Shakespeare News 2013) — Haider had a limited distribution in Asia and did not pass the Pakistani censors. It was screened in the US and UK, however, and is available now on DVD with English subtitles and reasonably easy to obtain in Canada, the US, and the UK. The same could not be said of other Asian Shakespeare films which are not available on VCD or DVD, do not have subtitles (in any language), or are not easy to obtain even if they have been commercially released.

Like Kurosawa’s, Bhardwaj’s international career is an exception rather than the norm for a large number of Asian directors. He is very well established; and he has also appropriated other Shakespearean tragedies previously and with success, including Othello (Omkara, 2006) and Macbeth (Maqbool, 2003). Maqbool is the first Indian film adaptation of Shakespeare to gain international recognition. As a bold period epic, Maqbool has been described as “Macbeth meets The Godfather” on its Internet Movie Database (IMDb) entry. It combines Bollywood gangster film, Muslim social drama, ethnography, and postmodernist art. For instance, the closing scene is connected to Luc Besson’s Léon (1994) through its visual strategies. The Macbeths inhabit both the present-day Mumbai criminal underworld and India’s film industry in an environment reminiscent of the world of the Scottish play. As an intensely Bollywood film with transnational networks of funding and artistic collaboration, Maqbool is self-conscious about its local as well as international audiences. The double visions in Asian film adaptations are perhaps not surprising, because Shakespearean tragedy is often constructed on a framework of mighty opposites and sometimes irreconcilable differences. Omkara explores universals in human emotions through caste politics and gang culture. This adaptation of Othello, set in contemporary India, focuses on the notion of fraternity which, as Gitanjali Shahani and Brinda Chary note, can in fact be fully understood only through the idea of otherwise. One’s brother is an extension of oneself, but he is also an independent person, an “other” (2014: 174). Omkara (Othello) naively assumes that Tiagi (Iago), “our own brother,” will not be jealous and will surely understand Kesu’s (Cassio’s) promotion. The gang’s interest should always take precedence over its members’ individual needs, so goes the assumption. Omkara’s tragedy is his failure to realize the falsehood of this brotherly bond. The narrative about duality also corresponds with the reception of the film. The film offers “an international fraternity of art” — Bollywood cinema, Shakespeare, and Hollywood aesthetics; but the question remains: “Will popular Indian cinema ever be perceived across the world as being on par with Shakespeare?” (Shahani and Chary 2014: 175).

The narrative of the James Ivory film Shakespeare Wallah (1965) may signal the collapse of Shakespeare’s status in twentieth-century India. Its story about the fate of a touring British theatre company performing Shakespeare in post-independence India perhaps conveys “the end of cultural colonization.” By comparison, Bhardwaj’s internationally acclaimed films suggest the rise of local aesthetics in the post-national marketplace (Singh 2008: 233). The double identities and visions of these Asian films are both exciting and confusing. Scholars have debated the dual visions of films such as Shakespeare Wallah, whether it is “an example of or a critique of cultural imperialism,” and the ethical burden and validity of intercultural exchange (Venning 2011: 162–63). The real challenge is in pinpointing not what an artwork is (a cultural-imperialist project or a site of cultural redemption), but rather how artists — across time and culture — listen to and respond to one another. Beyond politics and multiple markets, filmmakers also have to contend with the inevitable tensions between various cultural sources and cinematic spaces. Several films compel us to reconsider our assumptions about the kinetic energy of Asian media and the textual foundation of English-language Shakespeare films. The King and the Clown (dir. Lee Jun-ik, 2001), set during the Joseon era, chronicles a king who hires a group of vagabond travelling players to help him catch the conscience of corrupt court officials. Like Chicken Rice War, the film thrives on the tension between theatrical presentation (play-within-a-play in the genre of namdang non) and cinematic narrative (the fabula of the film itself). The “moustrap” play gradually supersedes the cinematic framework to become the primary, more interesting narrative. Like Kurosawa’s use of traditional Japanese theatrical elements in his films, The King and the Clown draws attention to Korean theatrical traditions by frequently placing an emphasis, ironically, on the stage rather than the screen as a medium of expression.

LOCAL PLEASURE, GLOBAL BRAND

Depictions of the tension between the stage and the screen and metatheatrical frameworks are not unique to Shakespeare Wallah and The King and the Clown. In a college rehearsal of Romeo and Juliet, a stuttering student, Fenson Wong (Pierre Png), asks his drama coach if he may act the part of Romeo. The young lady playing Juliet, Audrey Chan (May Yee Lum), rolls her eyes and challenges her class-mate: “What makes you think that you can play Romeo? You don’t have the looks, and you can’t even speak properly.” She is quick to point out that another student, originally cast for the male lead, is eminently more qualified even if he cannot remember his lines: “Nick, on the other hand, looks like Leonardo DiCaprio. That’s why he’s Romeo.” Her protégé promptly supports her cause and leaves the aspiring thespian speechless. The Singaporean Chicken Rice War parodies Hollywood rhetoric and global teen culture by commenting on the popularity of Baz Luhrmann’s 1996 film William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet, starring Claire Danes and Leonardo DiCaprio, which brought the classic tale of power and passion to modern-day Verona Beach. Producer Daniel Yun pitched the film as “a very Singaporean experience. You can call it Singapore’s take on Shakespeare in Love. Or rather Romeo and Juliet at the hawker centre [a large food-stall market]” (quoted in Yong 2007: 141).

Eventually, Fenson gets the role and “cures” his stutter through reciting and performing Shakespeare. While recitation of Shakespearean passages seems to have “cured” Fenson of his stuttering, however, other scenes expose the instability of any illusion of Shakespeare’s universal utility. One family member asks during the bilingual performance: “Hey, aren’t they supposed to speak in English?” As Mark Thornton Burnett theorizes, such scenes “demolish the illusion that Shakespeare constitutes a universal
language” (2013: 134). The text of Romeo and Juliet haunts, informs, and structures Chicken Rice War, not only because rehearsals and a final performance of key scenes play the action of the film, but also because these re-enactments serve as reminders of the film’s investment in critiquing the popular belief that enabling Anglo-European civilization is a staple of progressive global modernity.

Linguistically marked cultural difference also plays an important role in Chicken Rice War. The older generation converses in Cantonese, while the younger generation speaks mostly Singlish (an English patois used in Singapore). Marked linguistically, the feud between the two families appears both arbitrary and historically rooted, English, Singlish, and Cantonese serve as reminders of both the “Global West” and “New Asia” that Singapore embodies – “New Asia” being part of the government’s slogan for tourism development. The characters are aware of the cultural crossroads where they stand and where Singapore finds itself; the familiar trope of “star-crossed lovers” is turned inside out in this tragedy-turned-parody. Contrary to The King and the Clown, the tension between the stage and the screen as media of expression in Chicken Rice War leads to comedy of incongruity and mismatched identities on and off stage.

THE ART OF CITING SHAKESPEARE AND LOCAL HISTORIES

This artistic and market duality of Asian Shakespeare films is embodied in the making and reception of a notable, full-length silent film entitled A Spray of Plum Blossoms (1931), directed by Bu Wancang in China (available on DVD). Its engagement with contemporary politics parallels that of several films discussed so far, including Haider. Also known as The Amorous Bandit, the 110-minute silent film turned Shakespeare’s The Two Gentlemen of Verona into a chivalric romance about two self-determined modern women travelling from Shanghai to Canton (Guangzhou). Canton, China’s gateway to Hong Kong and Southeast Asia, stands in for Milan, where the men go to complete their education in male friendship and become knightly gentlemen. The “amorous bandit” refers to Hu Lunting (Valentine), an exile who leads a group of Robin Hood-style bandits identifying themselves as “A Spray of Plum Blossoms.” They vow to “help the weak and suppress the villains,” as the plum-blossom-marked notes they leave at crime scenes reveal. Another source for the film’s title is a classical Chinese poem composed by Hu Lunting (played by Jin Yan) and Shi Luohua (played by Lin Chuchu) on a rock in Shi’s garden, which is filled with plum blossoms. The setting, the characters’ names, and the codes governing social behaviours have been thoroughly localized.

The film boasts a stellar cast, including Ruan Lingyu, one of the most revered actresses of the 1930s. Her acclaimed roles and films include a protagonist in Three Modern Women (San ge modeng xixing, also directed by Bu Wancang, 1933) and a writer in New Woman (Xiu niu, directed by Cai Chusheng, 1934). Before committing suicide in 1935 at the age of twenty-four, she appeared in twenty-nine films. In the culture of stardom, Ruan’s private life attracted as much media attention as her films. Her unhappy marriage, pending divorce, and affair with another man attracted vindictive coverage. Her extra-marital romantic interest and defiance of normative social roles assigned to women in real life seem to parallel her role in A Spray of Plum Blossoms.

Although the film was marketed as both a “domestic film” (national film guojiaojian) and a “Great Picture of Knightsly Love,” one of its advertisements clearly demonstrated that frame the ad read:

Resist Foreign Cultural and Economic Invasions;
Propagate the Essential Virtues of Our Nation.

Down with Films That Are Nonartistic and Harmful to Society;
Regain the International Status of Domestic Films.

Similar to Chicken Rice War, A Spray of Plum Blossoms thrives at the crossroads of genres and cultures, and it does not shy away from its hybrid identity. The complex genre, style, and theme. Interestingly, the Lianhua Studio initially marketed the film with an “original screenplay by Huang Yixiao,” rather than cinema derived from Shakespeare, although the film itself opens with a quotation from As You Like It (with modernized spelling) and attributes it to Shakespeare: “All the world is a stage. And men and women merely players.”

The film’s title marks its distance from the Shakespearean point of origin, and its opening sequence lays claim to Shakespeare but references a completely different desire for Western novelty; and yet at the same time it teasingly denies the validity of any sense of authenticity. A Spray of Plum Blossoms opens up a new vista where Shakespeare: “All the world is a stage. And men and women merely players.”

The opening sequence is followed by a statement in English that establishes the film’s mood: “Life’s adventure commences as college session terminates.” Hu Lunting (Valentine) and Bai Lede (Proteus) are recent graduates of a military academy ready to take on the world, although Bai Lede “knows more about girls than soldiers.” The cast list – first appearing in traditional Chinese characters and then in English – also provides the original names of Shakespearean characters, making it clear that the localized Chinese names are partly based on Chinese transliteration of the foreign names (for example, Julia as Zhuli). The cast members’ names are also listed in English as they were known outside the Chinese-speaking community: Lily Yuen (Ruan Lingyu), Lim Chocho (Lin Chuchu), Raymond King (Jin Yan), and so forth. The Lianhua Studio had clearly hoped for a large market that extended beyond China.

This film displaced the themes of fidelity and betrayal in The Two Gentlemen of Verona into a female-centred frame of narration that was perceived by the filmmaker and the studio as more modern. Familial ties further complicate the gendered representation of Shakespeare’s characters. Hu Lunting (Valentine) is the brother of Hu Zhuli (Julia), and Shi Luohua (Silvia) is the daughter of Governor Shi of Canton (the Duke of Milan in The Two Gentlemen of Verona) and the cousin of Bai Lede (Proteus). The Duke, who is unrelated to Proteus in Shakespeare, is now his uncle. The familial connections shift the audience’s attention to domestic matters. The film thus turns Shakespeare’s picareque adventure into a Bildungsroman about two modern women.
While the film retains Shakespeare's two pairs of troubled lovers, the emphasis has been shifted to the roles of Hu Zhuli (played by Ruan Lingyu) and Shi Luohua. Ruan Lingyu departs from her previous melodramatic roles (e.g., a modern woman who is unable to resist her tragic fate) to play a witty and self-determined woman. In an early scene in which she sings and plays the song “I Am Willing” on the piano, the English intertitle introduce her as “Julia, sister of Valentine, a model of the modern maidens,” and the Chinese intertitle describes her as “a modern woman ahead of her times.” Throughout the film, she and Shi Luohua form a strong bond of sisterhood in masculine disguise or posture. The two “modern” women are often dressed in military costumes. Shakespeare’s feisty Silvia becomes Shi Luohua, “a maiden with a spirit of masculinity” who often walks around with a horsewhip in hand and, in a prolonged scene, rides horses with her male peers. She also commands her male and female subordinates. After Hu Lunting is banished, Shi Luohua takes his position, showcasing “the way of a perfume general.” The scene highlights the theatricality of a woman playing the role of a general, a situation that exists in fiction but not yet in real life. When Hu Zhuli arrives in Canton in search of Bai Lede (Proteus), her fiancé, Shi Luohua has her dress as a man and serve as her protegé. In Shakespeare’s play, Silvia disguises herself to serve as Proteus’s page. In the film, played by Ruan, Hu Zhuli appears in masculine military uniform. To make her transformation in Canton more dramatic, the film shows Hu Zhuli arriving in Canton in extremely feminine clothes and in tears, alone. Coupled with Ruan Lingyu’s star power and the force of the market economy, the rhetoric of female agency helped turn Shakespeare’s The Two Gentlemen of Verona, a “shallow story of deep love” (1.1.21), into a Bildungsroman for two “gentlewomen” of Shanghai and Canton.

The image of these two women, accentuated by such epithets as “perfume general,” fed into the dominant subgenre of the new martial-arts film commonly known as martial-heroine (nüxia) film, which expanded both the domestic and foreign markets for Chinese cinema. Zhen Zhang’s study discusses several salient features in the narrative pattern of these films. The protagonist, usually a maiden turned knight-errant, “rescues” another maiden in distress and “initiates” the other maiden into the world of martial arts and knightly grace.” The heroine often becomes the arbiter of a community. The theatrics of female agency mean that other characters are relegated to the background. The men they “love to hate” – in this case Bai Lede (Proteus) and Diao Li’ao (Thurio) – “serve as mere foils to the two ‘gentlewomen’” (Zhen Zhang cited in Huang 2009: 121).

Of special interest is a scene in A Spray of Plum Blossoms where Shi Luohua takes over Hu Lunting’s position as chief of the military police squad. As she takes command, she walks in military uniform, sabre hanging from her waist, to the front of the squad in a courtyard as her squad salutes her. But she dons a striped skirt and wears her hair long instead of tucking it into the officer’s cap. The androgynous quality underscores at once her femininity and her transformation: she appears in the same costume at the end of the film. As a result, the film adds a twist to the popular female-knight genre by interrogating the gendered imagination of the figure of the new woman as necessarily masculine in appearance and outlook. Hu Zhuli and Shi Luohua’s androgynous quality also reflects the widespread anxiety about the hybrid identity of the new woman, which is located between tradition and modernity, and between variously defined gender roles.

Interestingly, the central position of the two women in the film anticipates the general sentiments of late twentieth-century Shakespeare criticism. As one of the least appreciated and performed Shakespearean plays, The Two Gentlemen of Verona has historically been either ignored or slighted. Yet criticism of the recent past has condemned Shakespeare’s “tendency to hand over most of the initiative and just judgement to the women” in the play, as well as Silvia and Julia’s remarkable “constancy, devotion, and empathy” (Anne Barton cited in Huang 2009: 122). Although at the end of the play Julia and Silvia are subjected to female identities defined by heterosexuality, their Chinese incarnations as martial heroines do not go through the same process. The play ends with a disturbing silence from Julia and Silvia as the Duke and Valentine sort out the entangled relationships and arrange the marriages (4.1.120–71). In the film, after Hu Lunting is reinstated to his previous position and the two couples are married (Hu Lunting and Shi Luohua, Bai Lede and Hu Zhuli), the film now adds additional ties. Though marriage and service in the same squad as officers – are shown riding on horses to inspect the troops. (For an analysis of a little-known context, see Huang 2009: 118–23.)

**CHARACTERIZATION: DIVERGENT PATHS**

_A Spray of Plum Blossoms_ is not the only film that gives Shakespeare’s women characters more agency and visibility. An innocent yet assertive Ophelia emerges from Chinese director Feng Xiaogang’s 2006 _The Banquet_ (or _The Legend of the Black Scorpion_), a high-profile kung fu epic set in fifth-century China with an all-star cast (Figure 12.2). Feng is a household name in China, known for his invention of a new genre, the comic and often farcical “New Year celebration film” screened during the Chinese New Year. Highly profitable and entertaining, the genre subverts the didacticism that is standard fare in films produced by state studios. _The Banquet’s_ Ophelia (Qing Nü, played by Zhou Xun) dominates many scenes with her songs and dances, and is not shy about expressing her affection for Hamlet (Prince Wu Luan, played by Daniel Wu) even when she is threatened by the Gertrude figure (Empress Wan, played by Zhang Ziyi), who is both the Prince’s stepmother and his lover. Significantly, Ophelia does not go mad. Although her songs allude to rivers and boats, and her intimate scene with Hamlet involves rain, Ophelia is not drowned in the end.

This bold cinematic reimagining of _Hamlet_ shifts the focus from the question of interiority – traditionally embodied by Hamlet – to an ambitious, articulate Gertrude (Empress Wan) and an assertive Ophelia (Qing Nü): both characters do not hesitate to express their love for the Prince. As mentioned, Empress Wan is the Prince’s stepmother, and she has kept her romantic relationship with him secret. Qing Nü’s naivete and purity make her a desirable yet unattainable figure of hope, in contrast to the calculating Empress; she is an ideal contrast to China’s post-socialist society, driven by a new market economy that turns everything, including romance and love, into a commodity (McGrath 2008: 1–24). Instead, she is innocent, passionate, and courageous. Despite China’s economic growth, censorship continues to pose a challenge to artists. In the film, Qing Nü shuns traditional methods of communication altogether. In response to Empress Wan’s probing question as to whether Qing Nü has received any letters from the Prince, she offers a straightforward answer: “We never exchange letters.” She also speaks of her dreams.
openly: “The Prince always comes in my dreams. He came last night as well.” She makes this admission with a sense of pride.

The Banquet turns Ophelia into a symbol of innocence in a court of violence and intrigue. Significantly, for a martial-arts film, Qing Nü is the only character not versed in swordsmanship, and her only weapons are her perseverance in the face of insurmountable obstacles and headstrong adherence to her love for the Prince. Her name, Qing Nü, derives from the goddess of snow in Chinese mythology; and her robes are always white, regardless of the occasion. This symbolism highlights the idea of chastity, as snow is used as a trope for chaste women in traditional poetry (Cyuan 1997). Qing Nü is uninterested in politics, and she refuses to accept her father’s advice to “learn from the Empress” and to use marriage as a political stepping-stone. Empress Wan, by contrast, marries her brother-in-law in exchange for power and security after her husband is killed by a scorpion’s sting. Yet Qing Nü’s innocence and dedication do not translate into childishness. In response to her brother’s reminder that “you are not in [the Prince’s] heart. Do not fool yourself,” Qing Nü indicates that she is fully aware of the situation, but she has “promised to always wait for him.” She chooses to stay by his side and sing to him so that he will not be lonely. The consequences are painful. Jealous of Qing Nü’s intimacy with the Prince and her ability to offer unconditional love, Empress Wan orders her to be whipped. Ever defiant and refusing to be manipulated by anyone, Qing Nü almost gets her face branded and is exiled to the south by the Empress.

Qing Nü also publicly expresses her love for the Prince. When Wu Luan is being sent by Emperor Li as a hostage to the Khitans, a nomadic people in northwestern China, Qing Nü petitions in front of the court to be allowed to go along, echoing Desdemona’s insistence on accompanying Othello to Cyprus. Her passion is uncensored, and her reasons simple: so that the Prince will not be lonely. Unlike Shakespeare’s Ophelia, Qing Nü does not have to go mad or speak allusively to express herself, although she sings on multiple occasions just as Ophelia does in Hamlet. Towards the end of the film, at the banquet celebrating the coronation of the Empress, she sings a song of solitude that the Prince has taught her, and she leads a group dance:

What blessed night is this?  
Drifting down the river Qian.  
What auspicious day is this?  
On the boat with my Prince.  
Too bashful to stare,  
A secret I cannot share.  
My heart is filled with longing.  
Longing to know you, dear Prince.  
Trees live on mountains,  
And branches live on trees.  
My heart lives for your heart,  
But you do not see me.

She seems to be content simply to love the Prince without seeking anything in return. Qing Nü’s entrance takes Emperor Li and Empress Wan by surprise: her performance at the court commemorates her lover, who has been presumed dead en route to the Khitans. Unbeknown to Qing Nü and everyone in the court, however, the Prince has returned and disguised himself as one of the masked dancers.

Qing Nü’s accidental death at the hands of the Empress has more in common with Shakespeare’s Claudius or Gertrude than with Ophelia: she drinks from a poisoned cup the Empress intends for the Emperor. Ever a saintly presence, Qing Nü addresses her last words to the Prince: “Do you still feel lonely?” Mourning Qing Nü’s demise, the Prince, a kung fu master, finally moves forward with his revenge plan. Ophelia’s fatal fall from the willow tree into the stream in Hamlet is thus replaced by Qing Nü’s selfless sacrifice and symbolic purging of the court’s collective sins in The Banquet. The Ophelia-figure therefore represents ideal femininity in the face of a dysfunctional courtly structure and in opposition to Hamlet’s ambiguous gender identity (Ko 2009).

In terms of visual strategy, Asian films have been known to draw on a wide range of sources, including renowned paintings such as John Everett Millais’s famous Ophelia (1851), which has been exhibited in Tokyo, Kobe, and elsewhere and is well known to East Asian audiences. One of the themes of the painting is the cycle of growth and decay. Ophelia is portrayed as being in the transitional moment between life and death. Buoyed temporarily by the stream, the dying Ophelia is half submerged, but her head is still above the water. Extending upward, her open arms at first glance might resemble the traditional pose of a martyr at the moment of death.

Shot in Tibet with an all-Tibetan cast, Sherwood Hu’s Prince of the Himalayas (2006) offers a fuller visual response to Millais’s representation of the drowning Ophelia. Tibetan actress Sonam Dolgor as Odsaluyang presents a feisty and assertive Ophelia who links the secular with the sacred and death with life. Ophelia is associated with water throughout the film. Early on, we are shown a rather explicit, intimate scene between Prince Lhamoklodan (Hamlet, played by Purba Rgyal) and
Odsaluyang in her hut by a stream, after which Ophelia becomes pregnant (the two are not married). In labour, Odsaluyang approaches Namtso Lake, a sacred site to Tibetan pilgrims, in search of the Prince, whom she loves — but also hates for killing her father. It seems that she walks into the lake to ease her pain, but the scene presents a haunting image of Ophelia’s death that amounts to a visual citation of Millais’s painting. Picking wild flowers and wearing a white garment with a floral wreath on her head, she lies down and floats on water, giving birth to her and Hamlet’s child before “sinking down to the river bed in deep sleep” where she “meets her father and mother” (Pang 2006: 54). The camera pans over the water to give us a glimpse of the baby floating away from the mother. Presumably Odsaluyang dies after giving birth in the lake, but her death is not depicted on screen.

This scene takes Ophelia’s association with the cyclical quality of nature in Millais to a different level, hinting at the necessary, if cruel, process of fadings and emerging generations. It is depicted in a painterly mode in Hu’s film to focus attention on Ophelia’s suffering. As Odsaluyang walks into the lake singing a song, the water runs red with her blood. The baby is carried by water to safety, rescued by the Wolf Woman, a prophet. As one of the most interesting departures from Hamlet, this scene hints at the possibility of a samely Ophelia who, in her death, brings forth a new life and hope for the next generation. Prince of the Himalayas offers a courageous, independent Ophelia.

If Gertrude’s account of Ophelia recasts her as a fairy-tale creature (“mermaid-like,” 4.7.148), Odsaluyang in Prince of the Himalayas is a kind of goddess of nature, an immortal bride who returns to nature. The strong association between water and suffering women in Chinese art and film history contributed to Hu’s decision to shoot Ophelia’s death scene by the mirror-like Namtso Lake near Lhasa. Water may play the role of a mirror of beauty or a gateway to darker realities lying beneath its surface. Female water deities celebrated in Chinese poetry “ruled the waves,” and water can represent either “a mirror of beauty” or “dark possibilities hidden below its surface” (Silbergeld 1999: 175). Hu’s film associates Ophelia with a water goddess not unlike the Luo River goddess or the goddesses of the Xiang River. She is a source of danger but also of rebirth. Such goddesses, according to legends, start out as:

unhappy spirits of drowned victims involved in female sacrifice, young girls given in local rituals as brides to pacify male river gods. Others may have been romantic love suicides (noblly following their deceased husbands) . . . or victims of no-love situations . . . while others represented punishment for female sexual transgression.

(Silbergeld 1999: 175)

Prince of the Himalayas gives birth to a more sexual as well as a spiritual vision of Ophelia in the water. (For an analysis of Prince of the Himalayas in a different context, see Huang 2012.)

**CONCLUSION**

If but as well I other accents borrow
That can my speech diffuse, . . .

*(King Lear 1.4.1-2)*

These lines, spoken by the banished Earl of Kent in disguise as he approaches the raging Lear, provides a way to understand Shakespeare on Asian films. Kent’s statement about borrowed identities, a new accent, true intent, and the ethics of communication provides a lexicon for describing intercultural traffic on screen in the age of global Shakespeare, particularly Asian Shakespeare films. Performances of Shakespeare have always borrowed other accents – English, American, or otherwise and the accents we learn from Asian films help us re-examine familiar and unfamiliar parts of Shakespeare’s plays. Filming Shakespearean plays is an act that diffuses the speech and intensifies the vocabulary for performance such as costumes, stylization, sets, acting methods, and subtitles – whether the latter are Shakespearean lines used for their indigenous value or translations back into English of the screenplay in a foreign language.
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INTRODUCTION

Jill L. Levenson and Robert Ormsby

This volume’s title, *The Shakespearean World*, may suggest a territory to be identified, described, and mapped as though it were a discrete and knowable entity. The title may also provoke a number of questions meant to qualify the singular nature of any such phenomenon. Do we mean to depict a world circumscribed and dominated by Shakespeare, one that has been made in his image? Or do we envision a Shakespeare that has been remade by the world? Finally, is this world truly singular, or does Shakespeare entail some kind of plurality? We knew when we proposed this collection that such questions would make charting the Shakespearean world tremendously complex. Indeed, the Shakespeare we define for this book has acquired an array of meanings over the past four centuries; and those meanings accompany him throughout the world and in a number of media. “Shakespeare” signifies the historical person who lived between 1564 and 1616, as well as the plays and verse attributed to him. It also signifies the attitudes towards both author and works determined by their reception; and reception varies not only from culture to culture, but even within cultures. “Shakespeare” the classic can be politically charged to speak many languages with many voices.

Our definition of Shakespeare, like our title, implies a relationship to what is now often called global Shakespeare. Since the mid-1990s, there has been a great proliferation of scholarship on Shakespeare’s manifestations in numerous locales across the world; and, since the turn of the twenty-first century, critics have increasingly employed ideas about globalization to explain these manifestations. As this body of criticism makes clear, global Shakespeare is the consequence of efforts by a tremendous range of local cultural agents. Furthermore, attuned to developments in globalization studies, scholars have detailed the “problems of location and possession” of Shakespeare that “seem to be multiplying geometrically under conditions of late capitalism as ‘globalization,’” while “supposedly differentiating ‘national’ symbols are being struggled over and re-coded at the ‘global’ [intercultural] level” (Bartolovich 2001: 178, 195). In recognition of such complexity, Douglas Lanier argues: “To complement the myriad of isolated examples of ‘local’ Shakespearean that challenge the received notions of Shakespeare’s meaning, we need . . . to consider other, broader paradigms for understanding the Bard’s place in the ever-expanding global village” (2006: 242).
In an effort to devise paradigms, or at least provide a framework, for understanding Shakespearean worlds, past and present, we have designed this book to cover as many historical, geographic, and thematic manifestations of Shakespeare as possible. The result is a dual structure. The first two sections, on live performance and film, are divided geographically; and each chapter discusses the history of Shakespeare within a given region. The last three sections are divided thematically, because not all topics have the same pervasive global history as live performance and film. Nevertheless, we have encouraged contributors to Parts III–V to provide significant analyses of geographically and historically distinct cultures wherever possible. This combination of geographic and thematic organization is meant not to be exhaustive, but rather to indicate the most salient features belonging to the history of Shakespeare’s diffusion through many cultures. We have commissioned the volume’s thirty-six chapters to offer a comprehensive transhistorical and international view of the ways that Shakespeare, as we define him above, has not only influenced but also been influenced by diverse cultures during four centuries of performance, adaptation, criticism, and citation. Consequently, we have planned for each chapter to deliver an incisive examination of one subject fundamental to the current field of Shakespeare studies. The structure is designed to help readers find their ways through the diverse particulars that constitute Shakespeare’s afterlives.

Our five-part structure may be designed to chart the Shakespearean world as practically as possible, but the contributors often provide valuable insights when they cross these theoretical boundaries. Perhaps it should come as no surprise that our framework is less compelling than the recurrent preoccupations that form the bases of connections between chapters – connections that cast doubt on any straightforward division of all that Shakespeare has become. Only in recent years have the themes of location and possession, or the intertwined questions of where Shakespeare is to be found and who may credibly claim to own him. As this volume’s essays make clear, framing such questions is complicated by the fact that the converging lines of global, national, and local cultural influences may be evident in certain Shakespearean manifestations, whereas these influences are opaque and latent in many others. Furthermore, those who adapt and analyse Shakespeare frequently do so with various combinations of respect and criticism, or even hostility. Such issues often result in anxieties about discovering or producing an authentic Shakespeare; although this anxiety, which cuts across numerous media, is frequently highly productive as a source of intellectual and creative inspiration. In the discussion of contributions to The Shakespearean World that follows, it becomes clear that Shakespeare has been and continues to be, above all, a resource employed by artists and thinkers around the world who reproduce a vast range of Shakespeare’s as they pursue their own diverse ends.

PART I: SHAKESPEARE ON STAGE SINCE THE LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

In the first part of this volume, Chapter 5 on performance in the Middle East exemplifies the challenges of coming to terms with the theatrical Shakespearean world. As the chapter acknowledges, the Middle East itself is a sprawling region with imperfectly defined geographic and imaginative borders; and it is composed of numerous

linguistic, ethnic, and religious groups. The area has a long and rich history of interaction (peaceful and hostile) between competing local and national constituencies, typically influenced by powerful external forces advancing their own imperial ambitions. When commissioning the chapter, we realized that, in order to understand how Shakespeare migrated to and around the Middle East – becoming diffused through the translation, adaptation, and performance of his work – the essay would require a collective effort. The collaborators are Margaret Litvin, who studies Shakespeare in the Arab world; Avraham Oz, who focuses on Shakespeare in Israel; and Parviz Partovi, who addresses Shakespeare in Iran and Turkey. They aimed to ensure representative though not total coverage of the subject. Indeed, the three contributors offer a helpful caution about the difficulties of attempting complete coverage of their subject, a caution echoed in almost all of the volume’s other chapters. They remark that “reception of a prestigious literary text [such as one of Shakespeare’s] is seldom direct” (p. 97), and that artists “can deliberately obscure the intermediary sources through which they accessed Shakespeare, and historical shifts can occlude them from view” (p. 97). Their approach to theatrical Shakespeare in the Middle East is shaped by these observations. Instead of offering a schematic arrangement of their argument that conforms strictly to each contributor’s area of expertise, they opt for an historical overview that reveals indirect and occult lines of influence, and subtle, rather than exact, similarities between nations and peoples.

This overview raises concerns that recur, to varying degrees, throughout the section and the volume. Like many other contributors, Litvin, Oz, and Partovi recognize that theatre artists use Shakespeare as a resource, as raw material, or, in their words, for “script-fodder” (p. 98). Most often, the authors describe how Shakespeare was regarded as an ally, especially for nineteenth- and early twentieth-century nationalist and modernizing movements in the region. Productions associated with these movements were translated into Arabic, Persian, and Turkish through intermediary texts such as Jean-François Ducis’s French versions of Shakespeare, and were brought to life with the help of third parties such as Armenian, Greek, and Italian acting companies. These productions complicate any straightforward sense of centre/periphery, colonial/post-colonial relationships that shape the Shakespearean world, while suggesting indifference to questions of authenticity based on fidelity to the playwright’s language. Still, the authors make it clear that purportedly authentic Shakespeare has been a reliable resource for Middle Eastern artists’ self-authentication. They argue, for instance, that early translations of Shakespeare into Hebrew were part of an effort to “revive” the ancient form as a “living language” (p. 101), while the post-Second World War era saw a boom in scholarly translations of Shakespeare that helped prove nations’ cultural worth and maturity. They reveal, in effect, that such alliances made Shakespeare part of the Middle Eastern world, as nations in the region developed affinities for certain plays – including the embrace of Othello by Arab countries and modern Turkey, and Israel’s abiding relationship with The Merchant of Venice. In the process of forging such performance traditions, the Middle East has claimed partial ownership in what the playwright has become. Litvin, Oz, and Partovi illustrate this impression that Shakespeare is shared when they describe the Palestinian Ashtar Theatre Company’s desire to prove it could deliver “a high-quality, pointedly literary Shakespeare production” for the world to see at the 2012 Globe to Globe Festival in London (Richard II, p. 112). The company showed the international festival's
audiences how it had made Shakespeare part of its world at the reconstructed Globe Theatre, popularly seen as one of the primary sites of theatrical authenticity in the Shakespearean world.

Like the essay on the Middle East, the chapters on Shakespearean theatre in Continental Europe and in Latin America required multiple authors to grapple with long and diverse performance histories. The authors of these two chapters are not greatly concerned with portraying either region as Shakespeare's rival. Instead, they examine those who have treated the playwright as a resource for reshaping existing worlds, thereby confirming Shakespeare's usefulness in the service of nation-building projects. Martin Procházka, Marta Gibińska, and Florence March relate how European artists and intellectuals have reworked Shakespeare since the late seventeenth century in creating national theatres and literatures: Shakespeare's plays were frequently employed for "romantic political and aesthetic revolutions" and "often identified with the ideological objectives of national emancipation movements" (p. 46). Although European Shakespearean touring productions that emerged from those revolutions helped establish theatre traditions in various South American countries in the nineteenth century, Maria Clara Versiani Galery and Anna Stegh Camati relate that, since the mid-1970s, Shakespearean theatre has been a powerful means of protesting against corrupt politicians and the legacy of brutal authoritarianism in Argentina and Brazil.

Both of these chapters reveal the complex cultural forces that draw Shakespeare into very different transnational relationships. Gibińska describes how technological innovations and the singular circumstances of the Saxe-Meiningen company converged to make Shakespeare an important catalyst for the spread of directors' theatre across Europe. If directors' theatre gave creative power to those in Europe (and eventually around the world) who could best marshal all elements of production, local theatre festivals across Europe employed Shakespearean performance, as March argues, in efforts to create social cohesion following the global catastrophe of the Second World War. Meanwhile, Galery and Camati note the complicated functions Shakespeare has been conscripted to serve, via The Tempest, in addressing different phases of colonialism in Latin America. In his 1900 essay, Uruguayan José Enrique Rodó used the play as a metaphor for venerating European culture as an act of rejecting US colonial expansion; but, by 1971, Cuban Roberto Fernández Retamar could urge Latin Americans to embrace their purportedly Caliban-like hybridities, which represented "the contamination of the culture of the former [European] colonial powers" (p. 80). Here, sharing Shakespeare means abstracting him into an analogy that makes his work stand for European culture in general. The Shakespearean world is not simply a place; it is also a vague identity to be used as a defence against or alloyed with other vague identities.

Other chapters reveal a more balanced mix of rivalry with and opposition to the English identity associated with Shakespeare in regions that had direct colonial relationships with Britain. James C. Bulman depicts this blend of competition and reverence as a long-standing feature of American theatrical Shakespeare. He argues that New York's 1849 Astor Place Riot over Edwin Forrest's and William Macready's competing Macbeth was driven by the locals' belief in a populist American spirit revolting against perceived British elitism; but Bulman demonstrates that this belief coincides with an enduring Anglophilia in the US that extends to contemporary reception of competing domestic and English touring productions. According to Bulman, among the most notable instances of the US making over Shakespeare in its own image is Virginia's Blackfriars Theatre, which employs a "British 'original practices' aesthetic" and nearly rivals English companies' deliveries of Shakespeare while maintaining an aura of "American populism and festive occasion" (p. 75).

In a similar vein, Rob Conkie and Nicola Hyland use the metaphor of Shakespeare's sacred-book that is both "kissed" and "drowned" - revered and destroyed - to suggest the many ways that performance has linked Shakespeare to locales in Australia and New Zealand. Performances in both countries have claimed ownership of Shakespeare through productions that were "recruited into the imperial project" (p. 154) and rejected the colonialism associated with the playwright in the Antipodes. Conkie and Hyland encapsulate these claim-staking processes by evocatively combining the bibliographic with the territorial:

Even as those who brought Shakespeare's book to these lands as an instrument of civilization intended to authorize ownership claims, the re-colonizing of these stories for local concerns - the kissing and drowning of the book - have meant that the land owns Shakespeare, too.

At the same time, all such re-groundings displace Shakespeare from his singular British location. For instance, Sandra Young points out that Shakespeare's place in Africa is partly associated with an "Englishness" that is "made exclusionary through the power relations of colonization and its racialized imaginary"; but she portrays Shakespeare as raw material for African artists who fit the playwright's works "into their worlds" (pp. 117, 118). Such retitling has meant everything from perpetuating an image of exoticized Africa to reinscribing pernicious stereotypes. It has also meant dramatizing the complexities of public forgiveness attendant upon the end of South African apartheid and affirming "the elevated capacities of local languages" through translations of Shakespeare's work (p. 126). Young observes that, in travelling so "far from late sixteenth-century Stratford-upon-Avon, Shakespeare in Africa has become wonderfully, productively unhinged" (p. 132), suggesting the rootlessness associated with globalization.

Yong Li Lan's chapter on East Asian performance reveals yet more of what becomes refitted and unhinged in global Shakespearean theatre. Yong argues that Shakespeare has been made to stand in for a whole modern performance tradition, deployed in theatrical encounters with East Asian performance modes that, together, "constitute a project to disrupt a realism modelled on Western naturalism" (p. 137). Like Rodo's and Fernandez's take on The Tempest in Latin America, this project abstracts the playwright and fixes him at the centre of the West and its supposedly dominant form of theatre. Yet it also scatters his work among Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Taiwanese performance styles and the assumptions underlying them. Yong's analysis captures an important feature of Shakespeare's place in the world: it is at once consolidated and dispersed.

This interaction between consolidation and dispersal occurs even at the Shakespearean world's supposed centre, England. Kathryn Prince describes the history of Shakespearean performance in Britain as one in which native tradition is influenced by international cultures so that domestic theatrical Shakespeare acquires an increasingly global character. Furthermore, she depicts this history as shaped by two
kinds of productive tensions: between assertions of Shakespeare’s Englishness and
claims about his universality or contemporary relevance; and “between professedly
authentic and determinedly innovative approaches to the performance of his plays,”
(p. 21). Prince also emphasizes that mainstream post-war English Shakespeare, especial-
ly the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC), was particularly
produced by the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC), which
markedly by two Continental influences: the criticism of Polish writer Jan Kott, which
influenced the work of the company. Discussing the 2012 Globe
Shakespeare and the Berliner Ensemble, which
furnished a working example of political theatre in action. Discussing the 2012 Globe
Globe Festival, which featured productions by dozens of non-English-language
Shakespeare companies, she asks a question that might be directed at this volume as
a whole: “could Shakespeare, the common cause that brought this parade of human
diversity together in London, serve as a catalyst for cosmopolitanism?” (p. 34). Given
the diversity of cultural influences represented in the chapters of this first section,
we might ask: what does it mean to be cosmopolitan – to be worldly – in a Shake-

PART II: SHAKESPEARE ON FILM

Peter Kirwan’s chapter on Shakespearean film in the UK describes a fundamental
tension that runs throughout essays in both Parts I and II. He argues that much
British cinematic Shakespeare is characterized by anxiety about film’s relationship
with British theatre, which many filmmakers posit as the tradition, medium, and location
of Shakespearean authenticity. Whereas most chapters in Part I discuss productions
and broad historical contexts that associate Shakespeare with an English (or European
or regional) authority located at a colonial centre, that relationship is transposed
on to one between a supposedly authoritative and authentic medium and a derivative
one that is driven by an impetus to entertain for a popular spectatorship. Kirwan
reminds us that anxiety about cinema’s derivative status is manifested in its explicit
and implicit engagement with the theatre. He notes, for instance, the prevalence in
British Shakespearean film of “techniques such as tracking shots, direct address, and
disruption of mainstream cinematic realism that attempt to evoke the ‘liveness’ asso-
ciated with the theatrical event” (p. 21). The anxiety Kirwan describes has various
effects. It can influence the selection of plays for filming: dramas such as Richard III
and Henry V, both of which received two major British cinematic treatments in the
second half of the twentieth century, contain the self-consciously theatrical elements of direct address and
chorus, respectively. Evidently, it can also influence casting, as those Richard III
and Henry V films rely on actors strongly associated with twentieth-century thea-
trical Shakespeare: Laurence Olivier (as Henry V in 1944 and Richard III in 1955),
Kenneth Branagh (as Henry V in 1989), and Ian McKellen (as Richard III in 1995).
Still, Kirwan is careful to point out that “this anxiety is frequently productive
and challenging rather than restrictive, making explicit the negotiation of medium and content” (p. 21). On the one hand, Olivier privileges the theatre when his Henry V
presents an imagined Globe audience by enacting “an induction of the cinema audi-
ance into Shakespeare via the theatre” (p. 214). On the other hand, Roland Emmerich’s
Anonynous regards the Elizabethan theatre as “a source of power” but depicts
the early modern play-going crowd as a “gullible, easily led mob” (p. 186). Consequently,

Shakespeare or an imagined early modern playhouse locale do not serve alone as
foster for artistic impulses. The antagonism between cinema and live performance
can world of the theatre.

Shakespearean cinema in Europe and the US is marked by tensions similar to
those Kirwan describes. Mariangela Tempera notes, in her English European
Shakespeare films, there is often a trade-off between the loss of the playwright’s lan-
guage and an improved understanding of the text in translation, arguably refl ecting
a similar balancing act, linking Shakespeare with film stars rather than theatre
performers from London and New York while using Shakespeare to lend its
own distinctive visions” on their films (p. 190). This actor spirit is embodied in
the US by Orson Welles, who, Crowl remarks, “took the American Shakespeare film
from the Hollywood studio to the European street” while “allowing visual images
to take precedence over spoken” ones (pp. 215, 217). The compromises that Welles
had to make in cobbling together funding for his films are similar to those of other
Europeans. The success of these films indicates that the director must occasionally
yield to pressure from backers who insist on filming English-language scripts that can be marketed in England and North America. Reminding us that film’s popularity is fundamentally a matter of financial success, Crowl is partic-
ularly attuned to the influence of money and film-studio organization on the nature
of Shakespearean cinema. In effect, he uses Shakespearean film to track the evolution
of funding systems in the Hollywood industry: Joseph Mankiewicz’s 1953
Julius Caesar was made in the mould of big-studio sword-and-sandals epics; Franco
Zeffirelli’s 1968 Romeo and Juliet represents a shift from the big-studio system to a
more international financing arrangement; and the cinema of the 1990s is the result of
an Anglo-American alliance [that is] increasingly uniting all English-language Shakespeare films” (pp. 220). Given the relentless financial pressure that filmmakers experience, it is unsurprising that Tempera remarks upon the frequency with which European directors return to anti-corporate adaptations of Shakespeare.

Mark Thornton Burnett and Alexa Huang are more concerned with questions of
location than with anxieties about film’s relationship to the theatre. Burnett covers
an eye-opening range of films, a body of work in which, like many others in the volume,
he observes that Shakespeare is both “an artistic resource” and “an ideological battle-
ground” (p. 244). He notes that Romeo and Juliet is often adapted in Africa to negotiate
ethnic violence, legacies of apartheid, and “the continuing role of familial authority
in expressions of emancipated womanhood” (p. 242), remarking, for instance, upon
the frequency with which The Taming of the Shrew has been adapted in Egyptian
cinema. He also describes the ways that the Māori Merchant of Venice employs
the Shakespearean past to stimulate its audience in the present to contemplate
ongoing land claims in New Zealand. Furthermore, he echoes Galley and Camiti’s
chapter in considering how Shakespearean cinema in South America has been ap-
plied to address issues of race, class, and military dictatorship, and to serve as a
buttress against the global spread of American culture. Having surveyed the variety
of the cinematic Shakespearean world elsewhere, he concludes that “we still require a movement away from the ‘rest’ which would involve acknowledgement of plurality and polysemy: a holistic understanding of the field” (p. 254).

Huang’s analysis of Asian Shakespeare films suggests that such a holistic understanding would benefit from careful consideration of how location is construed cinematically. Following her discussion of the Prologue of Zenon’s ship that is cast away in a storm, she examines the visual arts and music, two non-literary formulations. Each of these large topics extends, more or less, over four centuries and most continents. Like earlier chapters, those in Part III resist schematization of their subject matter in 9,000 words or less. The authors had to find approaches which revealed their topics’ complexities within narrow word limits, a challenge which has led to economical presentations of original arguments and new insights.

A poet and a professor, Peter Robinson brings to the topic of Shakespeare and poetry two perspectives which inform each other as they define his subject. When we invited him to write for the volume, he had already begun to prepare for a sonnet workshop at York University (UK) in February 2014. “The subject of Shakespearean Sonnets and afterlife in lyric poetry” began with what Robinson describes as a viva voce summary of the ideas he would elaborate in this chapter. Having fixed his attention on the Sonnets, Robinson covers their place in the Shakespeare canon as a whole, their critical history to date, and their poetic repercussions in later verse. He accomplishes this organizational feat by focusing on the use of pronouns in the Sonnets, specifically “I,” arguing through speech-act theory and related critical vocabularies that the “I” may not be a proxy figure but the historical author himself.

In the last two sections of this chapter – “Acts that the subject performs by writing speech” and “The subject’s afterlife in use” – Robinson addresses two interrelated concepts key not only to his argument but also to many of the essays in this book. The first, what J.L. Austin calls “uptake,” predetermines the second, “afterlife” – a term loosely connected with appropriation. According to Robinson, “uptake cannot mean simply understanding meaning and force, for a reader’s responding so as to work with the poem to generate self-reflexive thought and feeling will be what counts, and counts for readers too” (p. 273). He concludes that the sonnets invite and have received uptake, achieving afterlife – “the role of a predecessor’s work plays when adopted by [later] generations” (p. 273). With instances of Shakespeare’s sonnets imitated and translated from Wordsworth and Keats to European poets of the twentieth century, he directs readers to see performance of uptake and achievement of afterlife throughout the poetic canon, across different media, and in a range of cultures: “Successful allusion in work that is itself remembered forms uptake’s most indelible trace” (p. 276).

Using another critical lexicon, Jane Kingsley-Smith’s chapter on Shakespeare and the novel, more Harold Bloom than J.L. Austin, perceives tension in the uptake/afterlife continuum. As Kingsley-Smith acknowledges at the start, “Shakespeare has had a remarkable influence on prose fiction across the globe” (p. 252), from works by Ivan Turgenev to those of Tayeb Salih and Margaret Atwood. Debates about subjects raised by Shakespearean drama – the requirements of successful character-building, the nature and demands of tragedy on stage and in fiction, views of history alternative to Shakespeare’s – have been mediated by earlier works of fiction: Goethe influenced George Eliot; Laurence Sterne provided models for Salman Rushdie and Angela Carter. Speaking to this vast topic complicated by interventions, Kingsley-Smith focuses on English-language novels which address the three main objects of debate. This strategy leads her to consider a recent, thought-provoking, and opened-ended manifestation of what the chapter calls “rewriting Shakespearean history”: “The sudden proliferation of Shakespearean novels by women at the end of the twentieth century [which] shows a remarkable coherence around the figures of King Lear and Prospero” (p. 290).

Katherine Scheil’s chapter on Shakespeare and non-fiction centres on the biography, following its combinations of facts and fiction from the eighteenth to the twenty-first century. Quoting William Hazlitt, Scheil summarizes this history in terms that anticipate uptake and afterlife: “Shakespeare was nothing in himself; but he was all that others were, or that they could become” (p. 299). In effect, Shakespearean biography contains and generates multitudes; but Scheil’s use of chronology makes it comprehensible, even when it explodes in the twentieth century and as it becomes globalized. She concludes that these narrative conflations supply an unlimited market with material for speculation about Shakespeare the historical figure, his works, and his times.

Chronology also helps Jim Davis to shape his chapter on Shakespeare in the visual arts, a subject large in size and scope. Davis follows “a vast number of paintings, illustrations, prints, caricatures, cartoons, comics, and sculptures” – from Hogarth in the eighteenth century to manga Shakespeare since the late twentieth. At the same time, he sets up a theoretical frame of reference for the visual arts of each age, which he considers “a form of critique and commentary: never merely descriptive, but always invariably implying a perspective or point of view” (pp. 314–315). Adopting an essentially historical approach, Davis combines the interpretative methodology of scholars like
Stuart Sillars with his own versions of uptake and afterlife. His analysis not only gives the topic an appropriate sense of eclecticism and ongoing change, but also enables him to make illuminating connections between recent graphic constructions of Shakespeare and portrayals by the Victorians and their predecessors.

In the last chapter of Part III, Christy Desmet and David M. Schiller face the amplitude of their topic straightforwardly with their opening sentence: “The Shakespearean world of music addresses a global audience without borders” (p. 339). Moreover, entry to this world can occur through any site in Shakespeare’s canon, from individual tones to whole plots. Exploration of the Shakespearean components—ranging through musical formats from the eighteenth century to the twenty-first—may include European and Asian opera, orchestral and choral music, ballet, and American musical theatre. Responding to the abundance, Desmet and Schiller create a master plan which allows them, in mapping this territory, to give an impression of the whole. They choose five plays and one narrative poem, discussing transcriptions of the Shakespearean material to music originating in different periods and places. This condensed survey raises two points which apply not only to this chapter but also to Part III generally—and perhaps to the entire volume:

First, the line between local and global Shakespeares is tenuous and shifting. Second, the translation of Shakespeare’s poems and plays into different national or cultural idioms, languages, musical genres, and historical aesthetics challenges the distinction between what is and is not Shakespeare.

(P. 354)

**PART IV: SHAKESPEARE IN EVERYDAY LIFE**

In Part IV, seven chapters follow the line between local and global Shakespeares as it extends beyond strictly artistic pursuits through a broad range of cultural practices within different historical and geographical contexts. The subjects, on a spectrum from pedagogy to new media, tend to concentrate on the period between the mid-eighteenth and the early twenty-first centuries, paying special attention to the twentieth century. Topographical boundaries expand and contract according to the authors’ conceptions of their topics. For example, two chapters which focus on the UK explore very different spaces: Stephen Purcell writes about British Shakespeare and live performance in his contribution on amateur production; Robert Ormsby considers Stratford-upon-Avon and London’s Globe in his examination of Shakespearean tourism, his view widening to encompass international Shakespeare performances within the 2012 Globe to Globe Festival.

Two of the chapters display notable continuities with earlier sections of the volume on performance and other arts. In Ormsby’s “Shakespearean tourism: from national heritage to global attraction,” the title itself expresses tension central to the argument. If anxiety is free-floating in Part IV generally, this chapter echoes the theme as it recurs throughout overviews of Shakespeare in theatre, film, and arts beyond drama and performance. Its point of departure is David Garrick’s three-day Jubilee in 1769, which “caused the first stirrings of the anxiety about sharing Shakespeare with tourists” (p. 433). Ormsby reviews the evolution of the tourist industry until 2014, describing his own self-conscious position as a tourist in Stratford-upon-Avon during August of that year, and asking what criteria determine the difference between tourist and professional Shakespearean. In the last section of this chapter, he considers both answers to such questions and the kinds of strains exposed by the Globe to Globe Festival, “attending to what happened when performers from around the world brought their cultures into Shakespeare’s London home” (p. 436).

Like Scheil’s chapter on Shakespearean biography, Brett D. Hirsch and Michael Best’s on new media manages to contain a topic which erupted during the second half of the twentieth century:

Since the 1960s, when Trevor Howard-Hill painstakingly transcribed the First Folio texts on a mainframe computer, the digital world of Shakespeare has exploded in volume and variety through a period of constant experimentation and flux.

(P. 458)

Hirsch and Best, like Scheil, impose order on potential chaos through chronology. They produce a thorough and comprehensible narrative by tracking new media from anticipations in print through mainframe and personal computers and, finally, to the Internet, where digital Shakespeare can be read on many and multifaceted devices.

The other chapters in Part IV aim to fill gaps in Shakespeare studies with varying degrees of determination. As his title—from Shakespearean and Shakespearean performance history” (p. 409)—Jensen argues, demonstrating what it reveals about well-known actors and actors who should be better known; directors, including women; collaborations between broadcasters and theatrical companies; and productions of rarely performed works. The conclusion makes a strong appeal for other Shakespeare scholars to join Jensen’s project; and it generously offers a consolidated summary of resources.

In her chapter on Shakespeare and global television, Susanne Greenhalgh emphasizes the neglect of her subject: “The relationship between Shakespeare and television remains notably underexamined by scholars compared with the attention that has been given to filmed Shakespeare” (p. 420). As she offers reasons for this neglect, Greenhalgh echoes concerns expressed by earlier chapters in this volume. From its beginnings, British televisual concepts of ‘quality drama’ were… in thrill to theatre, epitomized by Shakespeare” (p. 431). The section of her chapter titled “Shakespeare and the single play” takes an overview of the reciprocity between theatre and television until the end of the twentieth century; and it remarks as well that recent archival research has uncovered television adaptations of Shakespeare involving transnational exchange and co-commissions. With this summary, and less obviously in her discussion of serialized Shakespeare, Greenhalgh makes a case for the value of primary research and theoretical work on the relationship between Shakespeare and a significant medium of popular culture.

Purcell concentrates on live amateur performances of Shakespearean work in modern Britain: “My decision to focus on British Shakespeare was a pragmatic one: amateur Shakespeare is a much neglected subject” (p. 393). With this chapter, the author counters neglect with research collected from his own on-line survey of amateur groups performing in the UK. After defining key terms and explaining his
methodology, Purcell interprets the survey results to see which plays dominate the amateur Shakespeare repertoire; what ambitions, customs, and innovations distinguish the companies; and which features characterize open-air Shakespeare. In the process, he sets an example for filling this particular gap in Shakespeare studies. This template appears also in the first two chapters of Part IV, which together identify a gap and propose ways of filling it. Both consider the topic of Shakespeare and the education of young readers.

At the beginning of her chapter on Shakespeare and education, Kate Flaherty reviews the current state of her subject: "Shakespeare is near ubiquitous on humanities curricula throughout the world." Specifically, she cites a recent survey by the RSC which shows that 65 per cent of countries name Shakespeare on their curricula, and that 50 per cent of schoolchildren in the world study Shakespeare. Although analytical scholarship about Shakespeare and education is prolific in a number of categories, none of it considers when and how the bond formed. Flaherty undertakes an investigation of this bond: "What emerges in the narrative of an unlikely marriage formed on the margins of the formal English educational establishment" (pp. 361-62). In four sections, she follows the emergence of Shakespeare studies in Scotland, England, India, and the United States. "These contexts and the ideological transactions between them provide a picture of the founding of an educational discipline to which Shakespeare is still central" (p. 362).

Naomi J. Miller focuses on the ways adaptations for young audiences engage the imaginations of children, then young adults, and finally of creative adults who reinterpret Shakespeare around the globe through verbal and graphic conventions. Consequently, she passes through territory mapped by Davis in his chapter on Shakespeare in the visual arts; but Miller limits her analysis to adaptations of A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Tempest, plays which generate fantasy worlds that appeal especially to young audiences. She identifies a new model for examining these Shakespearean adaptations: "habitual appropriation." Drawn from a modern picture-book by Eric Carle, A House for Hermit Crab, this model allows Miller to "suggest that both adapters and audiences can experience habitual appropriation by inhabiting (both growing into and outgrowing) the interpretive and experiential space offered by the adaptations" (p. 388). Her chapter demonstrates the use of this model, introducing another method for understanding the subject of Shakespeare and education.

PART V: SHAKESPEARE AND CRITICAL PRACTICE

The first four parts of this volume contribute directly to the history of Shakespeare and critical practice by taking individual approaches to twenty-five significant topics which constitute that narrative to date. As they analyse Shakespeare in and beyond performance, specialists have explored his place in the theatre and on film; through literary and non-literary art-forms; and in the cultural practices of everyday life, from education to new media. Many have depended on primary material or offered original theories. In the process, all have situated themselves within the critical discourses which define their own work. Sometimes those discourses originated as long ago as the early modern era; at other times they have appeared as recently as the second half of the twentieth century; and various topics took shape along the chronological trajectory from the English Renaissance to the twenty-first century. Whenever their origin, a number of subjects have generated substantial critical mass (e.g. Shakespeare's language, politics, religion; Shakespeare and psychology). Others are dynamic works in progress (e.g., Shakespearean archives; Shakespeare and race, gender and sexuality; ecology and eco-criticism). By the early years of the twenty-first century, most of these fields have been influenced to different degrees by awareness of the complexity, advance, and effects of globalization.

To this point many chapters in The Shakespearean World have not only acknowledged critical practices relevant to their arguments but also challenged or questioned those discourses. Part V focuses on the critical practices themselves, surveying almost a dozen fields crucial to understanding Shakespeare's legacy over four centuries and to considering the directions it may follow in the future. As a result, the chapters which close this book provide valuable documentation for its subject as a whole. Although they do not fall into any particular order, they tend to make their ways from long-established topics to newer fields, and from subjects connected with Shakespeare's texts and their transmission to the history of ideas as it applies to Shakespeare's art. At the same time, proximity foregrounds the links between chapters that happen to cluster.

Part V opens with Eugene Giddens's account of Shakespeare's texts and editions. Starting with the printing of plays in Shakespeare's era, the chapter moves forward as a history of developments still in progress which affect the publication of Shakespeare's canon. It covers bibliographers' understanding and treatment of the earliest printed texts; and it outlines the editorial practices which emerged through the eighteenth century, underwent changes during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and displayed new refinements with every fresh Shakespeare edition that appears in print or on-line. Emphasizing the multiplicity of Shakespeare's texts—a feature which has grown exponentially with access to the Internet—Giddens argues that "Shakespeare's plays and poems have a textual history of almost unparallel complexity" (p. 467). In the course of explaining that complexity, he points out how French and German translations during the eighteenth century, along with American-printed editions, transmitted some of the first signals of globalization.

While scholarly debates about texts and editions of Shakespeare have often sparked intense differences of opinion, Christie Carson maintains in the next chapter that archiving, the preservation of those and related materials, has lately become "a hot but contested topic in theoretical circles" (p. 483). As a member of those circles and a researcher invested in the value of Shakespearean archives, Carson has addressed for more than a decade the major problems of establishing efficient and meaningful archives. Her chapter defines the terms of the hot topic, characterized by its subtitle as "the containment of chaos," through questions. What should be archived and how? Is it likely that the assembling of archives can avoid the interference of commercial interests? Can researchers who use or contribute to archives make objective decisions about their contents? Carson offers two case studies: Footsbarn Theatre, a company who reside in France, although they have travelled around the world; and the documentary Muse of Fire, a project centred in the UK but collecting interviews globally from actors and other theatre experts. Both illustrate with great clarity the
ways in which archives are now compiled and the difficulties that arise from the lack of consistent guidelines. In view of this evidence, Carson ends on a note of uncertainty: "it is possible to imagine a not-too-distant future when text, criticism, and performance can cohabit on the stage, in the library, and on the screen. But what about the archive?" (p. 492).

With the following chapter, Keith Johnson facilitates a transition between two kinds of critical practice. Like Giddens and Carson, he addresses a material component of Shakespeare's texts: language. Like several of the writers who follow, he travels over an enormous field: "today there are very few Shakespearean linguistic stones which remain unturned" (p. 496). He introduces his subject with a summary of its development – from Ben Jonson in the seventeenth century to the editors, lexicons, glossaries, and concordances that became available throughout the nineteenth century, when Shakespeare strengthened as a pedagogical force (see Chapter 19). In the rest of this well-documented contribution, Johnson discusses Shakespeare language studies during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries in relation to seven linguistic areas from lexis to rhetoric; and he indicates that this scholarship originated at times outside English-speaking countries (e.g., *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*). A valuable conclusion, "The future," draws on the opinions of four prominent linguists cited in the chapter who responded to Johnson's questions about major developments to come. They all considered the potential effects of digitalized texts. "In some areas of study," Johnson suggests in his closing paragraph, "the more that is done, the more there is revealed to do" (p. 508).

The next three chapters also cover large fields of study, at points interconnected, which nevertheless reveal unturned stones and more to do. Setting boundaries for their sizeable but still developing subjects, they apply different methods in their presentations. Peter Holbrook explains his intention to outline Shakespeare's connections with "philosophy," the word signifying in this context "a total and fundamental vision of reality" (p. 512). Arguing for a "dynamic" perspective throughout the canon, the chapter maintains "that Shakespeare apprehends the world in terms of change, flux, and ongoings, and that the ceaseless flow of experience constitutes a kind of ultimate category of his art" (p. 512). As he builds this argument, Holbrook considers Shakespeare's place in the history of philosophy; and he aligns the artist with those he calls "process-minded philosophers" – from Niccolò Machiavelli to Alfred North Whitehead – engaged by intense debates about different ways of rationalizing the world. He expects that his argument will render problematic Shakespeare's relation to the Platonizing and Christian tradition in Western philosophy.

With the following chapter, Hugh Grady focuses on a major subject – perhaps the major subject – of process-minded Shakespearean critics: "The attempt to define Shakespeare's political dimensions has in fact been the major work of the last thirty years of academic Shakespeare studies" (p. 527). Grady believes that criticism has already disabled the Platonizing and Christian tradition which Holbrook undermines. Starting from the premise that Shakespeare's views on political power changed through the course of his professional life, the chapter tracks the critical approaches which have contextualized those shifts from the Restoration to what Grady calls "the critical present" (p. 537). As he covers the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries, Grady's illustrations extend from the UK to Europe, from the Romantics to Marx – more and

more widely through Modernist aesthetics and the modern research university. By the critical present, political approaches to Shakespeare have become, "for the first time in the history of academic criticism, overtly political, and a chapter like the present one becomes possible, even mandatory" (p. 539).

Equally imperative, the topic of religion, secularity, and Shakespeare embeds the tradition briefly acknowledged by both Holbrook and Grady. Arthur F. Marotti and Ken Jackson first identify two points of view which allow for examination of the subject of Shakespeare and religion along either historical or transhistorical lines.

In the first case, one can study specific intellectual, cultural, or socio-political contexts within which Shakespearean drama was or is situated. In the second, one can treat Shakespeare as a religious or, in some cases, a secular or non-religious thinker engaging either universal religious or general ethical questions that resonate in any period.

Recently, scholar-critics have taken three approaches to the subject from those two positions: secularity (Shakespeare's art converted religious into secular material); historicism (Shakespeare's beliefs exist in the context of early modern religious events); and philosophy or theology (Shakespeare produced important religious insights which can be articulated in modern terms). In their thoroughly documented chapter, Marotti and Jackson survey the results of these investigations. The last section, "Shakespeare's religious thinking," offers their own complex view. Citing Michael Witmore, they agree that Shakespeare is a "dramaturgical monist," but they also insist that he is still religious: "Let us consider the continuity there, not the division" (p. 552). Via *Hamlet*, they end in the interrogative mode, with a series of questions about the contradictions in modern critical attitudes towards Shakespeare and religion.

The next chapter – "Shakespeare and psychology: 'Who's there?'" – both starts and ends with *Hamlet*. As they introduce their subject, Murray M. Schwartz and David Willborn explain how it grew so immense:

This chapter maps the terrain from several perspectives: early modern "faculty psychology"; the range of theories subsumed under the term "psychoanalysis"; and new developments in cognitive psychology, neuroscience, and evolutionary psychology. Recent interventions from potent cultural movements – feminism, gender studies, queer studies, new historicism – have made the field especially fertile, and astoundingly vast.

Their cartography takes its point of departure from a question, the sentinel's charge as *Hamlet* begins: "'Who's there?' Just whose psyche is our subject?" (p. 557). Initially the answers range from Shakespeare himself to his dramatic characters. In seven parts, Schwartz and Willborn's chapter follows the directions outlined in its introduction along a chronological path, from early psychological models to what the authors call "contemporary psychologies" (p. 565). Schwartz and Willborn provide a clear, well-documented guide through their fertile and vast field. Finally, they return to *Hamlet*.
and the sentinel's passage in 1.1, where Francisco replies: "Nay, answer me. Stand and unfold yourself." This exchange suggests the psychological transaction between Shakespeare's texts and his readers – actors, scholar-critics, students of all kinds – which constitutes the lasting attraction of his dramatic art. His poetic language and its theatrical representation bring the question back to Shakespeare's audience: "Who's there? We are" (p. 667).

In their introduction, Schwartz and Willborn refer to "potent cultural movements" which have influenced the size, shape, and complexity of their field (p. 577). The next three chapters explore several of those movements and their effects, beginning with Jason Demeter and Ayanna Thompson's study of Shakespeare and race. According to the authors, "race has never functioned as a unified conceptual field" (p. 574); "cruses, controversies, and continuities... make early modern race studies [a] vibrant and vital... subject of inquiry today" (p. 575). In their portrayal of this ongoing debate, they begin with the international contention caused by Nicholas Wade's recent book A Troublesome Inheritance: Genes, Race and Human History (2014); and end with a stage history of Othello, the tragedy whose transhistorical reputation is entwined with the historical narrative of European and American colonialism. Their argument defines the terms of the debate, working from contemporary theory (geohumoralism versus complex early modern ideologues of race relations); lexical implications of the word race; and current discussions about the use of historical records. Finally, they recommend the application of both historicist and presentist methodologies in future analyses of this dynamic field.

Susan Bennett and Nicole Edge bring race into their chapter on gender and sexuality as they track critical practice through the 1980s until the present. Framing their argument in the overarching topic of identity formation, they review feminist critiques; gay, lesbian, and new queer theory; and the influence of Foucault. In the course of their survey they emphasize the intersections of those approaches which have generated, or promise to generate, the most valuable results, such as race and feminist studies. The second part of their own account places the subject of identity formation in the context of a capitalistic economy. Like other crossings identified in the chapter, this one allows theorists to produce new results from their own "lived experiences" or "critical activist work" (pp. 594, 596), another sign of globalization in Shakespeare studies.

Randall Martin's chapter -- "Shakespeare, ecology, and ecocriticism" -- also emphasizes cross-disciplinary dialogues. At the start Martin describes ecocriticism as a relatively new academic field: "it applies contemporary knowledge to Shakespeare's writings... to rediscover early modern ecologies and to use the playwright's narrative and poetic insights to illuminate present-day environmental issues" (p. 606). In the conclusion he stresses the convergence of ecocriticism and other disciplines "now essential to solve the material and ethical complexities of environmental problems" (p. 617). His argument identifies Shakespeare's crucial role in the dialogue, as the artist addresses newly apparent environmental issues – from deforestation to increasing resource consumption – and prompts their resolutions by strategies such as "conservationist activism" (p. 614). Like Demeter and Thompson, Martin views two complementary approaches key to his study: "The early modern and twenty-first-century poles of ecocriticism's knowledge-spectrum correspond to 'historicist' and 'presentist' modes of analysis" (p. 607). Consequently, he describes the epistemological text of his chapter as "evolutionary ecology":

Its principles underpin the contemporary pursuit of biodiversity, sustainability, and humane animal relations which ecocritics seek to find anticipated or analo-gized in Shakespeare, or contrasted there by the different conditions of his age.

(p. 608)

By good fortune, Karen J. Cunningham's chapter, "The Shakespearean legal imaginary," provides a notably fit conclusion for this diverse and wide-ranging volume. Initially she analyses her assigned topic, Shakespeare and the law, as inadequate in its phrasing. "'Shakespeare' really is 'Shakespeares,'" she claims (p. 622). Moreover, the law is not only a practice but also a way of thinking and writing shaped by such variables as language and imagination. If the connections between Shakespeare and legal thought extend in time and depth, the scope of current scholarship has grown wide enough to accommodate almost every play and almost every kind of legal question. Cunningham explains her approach to this material:

In what follows, I chart a course through the diffuse recent work on Shakespeare and the law. The course is neither straight nor narrow, and its limitations reflect the challenges of the topic: how best to frame a conversation about work that is interdisciplinary and transhistorical? Although individuals may use Shakespeare and law to champion a particular politics, the Shakespeare and law movement as a whole does not; nor does it require membership in a single political or theoretical school.

(p. 623)

In her chapter, Cunningham aims to convey the complexity of current work on her subject and demonstrate how Shakespeare's canon has become central in literature and law studies. She makes her way through different kinds of evidence: the origins of links between literature and law, in particular between Shakespeare and the law; awareness of the law's linguistic presence in Shakespeare's canon, from legal words or phrases to whole trial scenes; reflections of law applied to early modern life in relation to property, marriage, and the ancient constitution; and institutionalizing of the chapter's subject in university courses, as well as in conferences and colloquia which often leave their imprints in published proceedings.

Like many contributors to this book, Cunningham ends with questions about the next phase in the evolution of her topic, with one question especially pertinent in a general sense to most of the other chapters: how have relationships between Shakespeare and the law been affected by globalization?

How do the interests of scholars around the globe help us re-envision Shakespeare and/in law? ... How might it affect our understanding to see productions in which the audible and visible signs of legal culture were emphasized and dispersed throughout rather than compressed into "legal" scenes?
In its open-minded and individual treatment of its topic, the closing chapter represents the content that precedes it. Contributors have considered a wide range of topics, focused or vast, and articulated their findings in all their unresolved complexity. On the whole, they make it clear how exploration of the Shakespearean world promises a future as rich and challenging as its past.
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The Shakespearean World takes a global view of Shakespeare and his works, especially their afterlives. Constantly changing, the Shakespeare central to this volume has acquired an array of meanings over the past four centuries. “Shakespeare” signifies the historical person, as well as the plays and verse attributed to him. It also signifies the attitudes towards both author and works determined by their receptions. Throughout the book, specialists aim to situate Shakespeare’s world and what the world is because of him. In adopting a global perspective, the volume arranges thirty-six chapters in five parts:

- Shakespeare on stage internationally since the late seventeenth century;
- Shakespeare on film throughout the world;
- Shakespeare in the arts beyond drama and performance;
- Shakespeare in everyday life;
- Shakespeare and critical practice.

Through its coverage, The Shakespearean World offers a comprehensive transhistorical and international view of the ways this Shakespeare has not only influenced but has also been influenced by diverse cultures during 400 years of performance, adaptation, criticism, and citation. While each chapter is a freshly conceived introduction to a significant topic, all of the chapters move beyond the level of survey, suggesting new directions in Shakespeare studies – such as ecology, tourism, and new media – and making substantial contributions to the field. This volume is an essential resource for all those studying Shakespeare, from beginners to advanced specialists.
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