

Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance

Volume 9

Article 7

December 2012

Book Reviews

Alexander C. Y. Huang

George Washington University, Washington DC, USA

Sandip Mondal

Department of English, University of Kalyani, West Bengal, India

Sharmistha Chatterjee Sriwastav

English Department, Rishi Bankim Chandra College For Women, Naihati, West Bengal, India

Natalia Giza

Pedagogical University of Cracow, Poland; State Higher Vocational School in Nowy Sacz, Poland

Yoshiko Kawachi

English at Kyorin University, Japan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/multishake>



Part of the [Theatre and Performance Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Huang, Alexander C. Y.; Mondal, Sandip; Sriwastav, Sharmistha Chatterjee; Giza, Natalia; and Kawachi, Yoshiko (2012) "Book Reviews," *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance*. Vol. 9 , Article 7.

DOI: 10.2478/v10224-011-0017-2

Available at: <https://digijournals.uni.lodz.pl/multishake/vol9/iss24/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Arts & Humanities Journals at University of Lodz Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance by an authorized editor of University of Lodz Research Online. For more information, please contact agnieszka.kalowska@uni.lodz.pl.

Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance, vol. 9 (24), 2012
DOI: 10.2478/v10224-011-0017-2

Book Reviews

Diana E Henderson, *Collaborations with the Past: Reshaping Shakespeare across Time and Media*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006. Pp. xi + 289. ISBN 978-0801444197.

Reviewed by Alexander C. Y. Huang*

To write about subject matters that straddle several centuries, disciplines and genres, is, by any measure, a bold move, even in a post-disciplinary age. One also has to make the argument pertinent to readers on the far side of the fence who may be otherwise unfamiliar or uninterested in it. Such are the challenges facing any scholar working on Shakespeare's long and unpredictable afterlife. Diana Henderson's *Collaborations with the Past: Reshaping Shakespeare across Time and Media* reshapes our understanding of Shakespeare's afterlife. The book makes the case for the notion of writers' and artists' collaboration with Shakespeare. In her lucid analysis of this process of collaboration which Henderson calls "Shake-shifting as a means of self-authorization," Shakespeare's plays are likened to a kaleidoscope that modern artists shake up, after which Shakespeare's "glassy essence" is cut to bits to help create "newly evocative patterns" (2), allowing us to also "pick and choose our Shakespeares" (36). Of special interest to readers of this journal are the thought-provoking Introduction and Chapters 3 and 4.

Henderson's study of theatrical, cinematic and literary adaptations deftly carves a space for new ways to think about how Shakespeare's plays survived and evolved through time and media. At the heart of the Introduction and the book lies the concept of collaboration. Henderson finds such terms as adaptation and appropriation are limited in their capacity to explain the phenomenon. Therefore, she develops "Shake-shifting" and collaboration as notions that emphasize interpersonal interaction and reworking of Shakespeare in various forms. As demonstrated throughout the book, the notion of collaboration, while not new in textual scholarship, takes the discussion of Shakespeare's afterlife to a different level by attending to "the connections among individuals, allowing artists credit and responsibility, but at the same time refusing to separate them from their social location and the work of others" (8). These critical possibilities are usefully juxtaposed with a candid assessment of Henderson's own collaboration with or contentions against other critics' theories (such as Herald Bloom's *Anxiety*

* Alexander C. Y. Huang is Associate Professor of English, George Washington University, Washington DC, USA.

of *Influence*, Joseph Roach's theory of "the enactment of cultural memory by substitution" and "surrogation" among different generations, and Jay Bolter and Richard Grusin's *Remediation*).¹

The first part of the book (Chapters 1 and 2) focuses on "novel transformations" of *Othello* by Sir Walter Scott (*Kenilworth*, 1821) and *Cymbeline* by Virginia Woolf (*Mrs. Dalloway*, 1925) and Charlotte Brontë (*Jane Eyre*). The second part (Chapters 3 and 4), draws upon modern stage and screen adaptations of *The Taming of a Shrew* and *Henry V* to explore works that appear to aspire to "nothing more (or less) than a seeming translation to the new medium – even when in fact they drastically altered both story and theme" (25) and films that provide rich opportunities for a reassessment of scholarship on both *Henry V* and its diachronic collaboration in the twentieth century (205-06).

Chapter 3, "The Return of the Shrew: New Media, Old Stories, and Shakespearean Comedy," invites the readers to "apprehend why this so-dated text can still provide a strangely modern experience" (201), and Henderson carefully points out that the appeal is distinct from a "timeless" experience. She examines a wide range of engagements with the figures of shrew and Petruchio, including a 1929 film version (Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks, Jr.) that anticipates Franco Zeffirelli's film (1967) and Gil Junger's *10 Things I Hate About You* (1999), a version of the story told from Kate's perspective. Pickford's strategy of "keeping things light" contrasts with Freud's "perception of disturbing contradictions within the human psyche" in "A Child Is Being Beaten," an essay Henderson calls "the comedy's uncanny double" (166). This comparative analysis is followed by a discussion of Jonathan Miller's BBC-Time/Life television production (1980) that seems to be informed by Freud's interpretation, and an interesting observation on the creative use of video in *Kiss Me, Petruchio* (1981), "a pastiche of scenes, backstage moments, and audience responses from the New York Shakespeare Festival's summer production in Central Park" (179). Meryl Streep's Katherine has to "earn" her voice through her taming. Her voiceovers do not come in until the latter half of the production, while Petruchio's (Raúl Juliá) comments dominate the first part. These works demonstrate a paradigm shift from "collaboration-as-endorsement" to "collaboration-as-performance" (200).

The cultural logic of the erasure and subjugation of the feminine in adaptations of *Henry V* (a play Kenneth Branagh admits to be a "depressingly male piece") is the subject of Chapter 4, "What's Past Is Prologue: Shakespeare's History and the Modern Performance of *Henry V*" (240ff). The chapter moves elegantly between discussions of the strategies of such "historically based political 'collaborators'" as Queen Isabel of France and modern filmmakers' parallel processes of collaborating with Shakespeare and English histories. Despite Isabel's historical importance as a symbol that troubled the definitions of Englishness (217), she is erased from Branagh's 1989 film adaptation (first speech cut and final prayer for peace given to Henry). Though Isabel's role is retained – as Henry's accomplice – in Laurence Olivier's 1944 film version, she is subsumed by the male gaze in a "celebratory collaboration with the victor" (245, 242). As instructive examples of diachronic collaboration, these works can expose a number of problematic assumptions about adaptations that regard rewritings as either "a mere reiteration of a nostalgic past" nor "a narcissistic love affair with a falsely conceived present" (258).

Students and scholars of Shakespeare, film, theatre, and Romanticism, will have much to learn from *Collaborations with the Past* which is a pleasant read.

¹ Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2000); Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), p. 80.

***Vintage Shakespeare: New Perspectives From India and Abroad*, eds. Prashant K. Sinha and Mohini Khot, Jaipur: Book Enclave, 2010. Pp. 240. ISBN 978-81-8152-271-9.**

Reviewed by Sandip Mondal*

As the full title of the book suggests, *Vintage Shakespeare: New Perspectives from India and Abroad*, offers a varied range of perspectives on the Bard's plays. Edited by Prashant K. Sinha and Mohini Khot, the book includes articles on Culture Studies, Feminism, New Historicism and Indian poetics. That in the process of the dissemination of the Bard's canon, the tragedies have been privileged over other genres is manifested clearly, as most of the articles in this book discuss tragedies and more specifically *Hamlet*. Some essays also discuss *Hamlet* along with other plays.

R. W. Desai's article is an attempt to unravel "Shakespeare's Ambivalence toward His Profession" (66-92). The first section of the essay comments on the elements of self-reflexivity in *Hamlet*. That *Hamlet* is a play which hinges largely on its involvement with the profession of the Bard, is justified in the light of two well known sonnets 110 and 111. The deliberate theatricality of the play has been deployed to uncover the conflict within the author. Hamlet's own involvement in the theatrical practice within the play, the instructions given to the players finally becomes an ironic strategy to underscore that conflict. The character of Hamlet as an analogue of Shakespeare himself is delineated by drawing upon the theatrical tradition. But Desai moves beyond simply reiterating the trend of biographical criticism. In the next two sections, Desai examines how the theatrical technique of *Hamlet* is fundamental to Elizabethan theatre, and provides a model for twentieth century theatre as reflected in Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author*. The article becomes most informative when Desai offers us a history of the performance of the play's different versions in different productions during Shakespeare's own time, specifically pointing out the variations in Q1 and Q2 and F.

Mohini Khot's "To Play or Not to Play (Roles Women Play at Elsinore)" (117-30), shows how the individual gains social subjectivity by choosing to play roles. For the characters of *Hamlet* playing roles becomes a means to secure their own societal position which in turn maintains the stability of the state apparatus. Adopting almost a feminist standpoint, she points out how the roles, decisive for the mechanism of the state authority, are played mostly by the male characters of the play. But playing roles also entails concealing one's true disposition: Claudius, concealing the embedded cruelty of his character primarily plays the role of a living father to stop forces, detrimental to his throne, ensuing from Hamlet's part. Courtiers like Polonius and commoners like Rosencrantz and Guildenstern all play roles to secure the throne of Claudius and stop Hamlet from jeopardizing the stability of the throne. Pitted sharply against men, women do not voluntarily participate in the game of role playing. Khot argues that women engage themselves in role playing only to contribute to the schemes of the male members of the society. Ophelia's identity is thus constructed by Polonius and Leartes and also by Hamlet. If on one hand, Ophelia is asked to play a role to get some inkling of Hamlet's mind by Polonius and Leartes, Hamlet uses her to send back the confusing message of 'madness'. Thus Khot's essay is an interesting exposure of how Ophelia's own role is caught up within the conflicting forces of

* Sandip Mondal is an Assistant Professor in English, Department of English, University of Kalyani, West Bengal, India.

the male members of her society. Gertrude's role is precarious too. Khot perceives her as a mother who quickly steps into the role of the new queen in order to retain state authority and secure the throne of Denmark for Hamlet by ensuring that Claudius does not marry any young woman and beget another claimant for the throne.

That the first scene of *Hamlet* structures the whole play, is evident from question papers circulated among students in academic institutions. But such an idea when related to *Hamlet*, it offers a new perspective to Shakespeare criticism. Paul Smith's "A Drastic Solution: The First Scene of *Hamlet*" (117-130) incorporates within its purview an elaborate analysis of the first scene of *Hamlet*, the sequence of events and the analysis of words and imageries showing how they refer to the central meaning of the play.

In "*Hamlet* among the Romans" (41-65), Lisa Hopkins primarily refers to the affinity between *Hamlet* and the classical world, examining the thematic resemblances between *Hamlet* and other classical plays that inform the text. The thematic content of *Hamlet* is analyzed in terms of contemporary history and texts. Hopkins, all along her argument, maintains a truly new historicist approach. She accommodates within her range of discussion the Danish history and also examines how *Hamlet* evolves from its predecessors. She cites the examples of several anonymous texts like *Caesar's Revenge*, *Claudius Teirius Nero*. Apart from the analytical dimension of the article it informs the readers about a large chunk of classical writing that functions as an informing source of Elizabethan plays.

Prashant K. Sinha illustrates how "Modern Realism Holds the Mirror up to *Hamlet*" (131-46), by discussing the manner in which *Hamlet* continues to inform the structural and diegetic forces of Ibsen's *Ghosts* and Chekhov's *The Seagull*, though Shakespeare, Ibsen and Chekhov belong to altogether different schools of dramaturgy. Chekhov and Ibsen, the two exponents of realism have accommodated the essence of *Hamlet* in their realistic mode of drama. Sinha demonstrates how Shakespeare's popularity in Russia testified by eminent writers like Boris Pasternak has permeated the realistic theatre of Russia through plays like *The Cherry Orchard*. Similarly Ibsen's *Peer Gynt* incorporates stray references to *Hamlet*. *Hamlet*'s motif of the ghost influences the image of late Captain Alving and also the dead conventions and ideals in *Ghosts*. In drawing parallels between the characters and schemes of Ibsen's *Ghosts* and *Hamlet*, Sinha seem to depend largely on the psychoanalytical criticism of Ernest Jones and the imagery school of Caroline Spurgeon. Sinha continues his argument with a comparative study of Chekhov's *The Seagull* and *Hamlet*. He examines how Chekhov's treatment of the theme of adultery and family discord is a re-working of *Hamlet*. The resemblance between the two plays becomes all the more obvious when Sinha refers to the 'play within the play' in *The Seagull*. But ultimately Sinha fails to relate the modes of realism in the Norwegian and the Russian theatre remaining more or less faithful to a text based analysis.

In his brief essay, "The 'King's Two Bodies' in *Hamlet* and *King Lear*" (147-57), S. Viswnathan makes a distinction between two notions of kingship, one signifying the corporeality of the king which he calls the Body natural and the office of the king which he calls the Body politic or the Dignity royal. Viswnathan argues that only the Body natural dies while the undying Body politic mystically transfers itself to the successor. This idea of the undying Body politic has been extended to the notions of a kind of royal Christiology or royal Theology whereby a common man should not touch the king or a king's touch can cure diseases. Viswanathan attempts to examine the notions of kingship in *Hamlet* and *King Lear* in relation to the notions of Body natural and Body politic. The union of the two Bodies (Body natural) of Gertrude and Claudius, through their marriage is, he argues, a contamination of the Body politic of senior Hamlet. But Viswanathan could have elaborated this a little further relating Hamlet's numerous references to the body and flesh to the central argument of the article. Viswanathan devotes less

time to *King Lear*, but argues that both the Body politic and the Body natural suffer in the play and that the suffering of the Body natural climaxes in the storm scene.

Though the title refers to the sonnets of Shakespeare, Prabha Sampath's "...Love, which Alters when it Alteration Finds..." (195-210), re-examines Shakespeare's concept of love in the tragedies and comedies. She feels that the issue of love in Shakespearean canon has not received sufficient critical attention. Sampath refers to Catherine Bates's Freudian discussion of the tragedy of love in terms of history and civilization but does not extend line of thought in what becomes primarily a text-based analysis of Shakespeare's notions of love. Love, which functions as a uniting force in Shakespearean comedy, argues Sampath, turns out to be an alienating agent in some of his tragedies particularly *Hamlet* and *Othello*: in both cases the heroes put it in jeopardy by prioritizing the evil embedded in their love. This ambivalent nature of love assumes a significant dimension when Sampath, towards the end of the article, discusses it in the light of the notions of love as explored in the sonnets.

Of course, Shakespeare tragedy itself and the schools of Shakespeare criticism grew around Aristotelian thesis as explored in *Poetics*. But can't we really do away with this? Nagrajan's "The Tragic Effect In *King Lear*" (158-72), is a satisfactory answer to this question. Indian students/readers can pretty well resort to Indian philosophy and aesthetics, concerning drama, in order to understand a Shakespearean tragedy. The essay begins with a brief account of the development of Sanskrit poetics in India centering primarily upon Bharat's *Natya Sastra*. A major portion in this section is devoted to explaining what Bharat calls *rasa*. *Rasa* refers to aesthetic experience in a work. A short description of different *rasas* like *sringara* (love), *hasya* (the humourous) or *karuna* (grief) would initiate the readers, especially foreign readers, to relate this theory of *rasa* to *King Lear*. Nagrajan's application of this theory of *rasa* to the diegetic proportion of *King Lear* seems really effective. But, far from establishing this streak of criticism as a separate and alternative one, Nagrajan seems to draw a relationship between this Indian approach and different schools of Western criticism. Drawing an analogy between the tragic emotions like pity and terror and the *rasas*, he moves on to valorize the application of Indian poetics to Romantic artistic theory, particularly to that of Shelly and refers to Freud's theory of tragic pleasure.

Dorothea Kehlar's "*King Lear*: Widow Regan goes to War" (173-86) foregrounds the study of Regan's status of a widow, but moves beyond it, with a new historicist approach, to locate the issue of widowhood in *King Lear* in relation to the other plays of Shakespeare, other contemporary plays and the social history of England. For Renaissance patriarchal practices, female sexuality especially manifested through widows remarrying, poses a political threat. Kehlar resorts to the English common law, Old Testament, Pauline Gospels and the Conduct Books, Ludovicus Vives and Nicholas Bacon to explain the dictates regarding the social and the theological stipulations about the positions of a widow. Kehlar's new historicist approach becomes explicit when she places her arguments against the context of the various 'remarrying' widows in the works written during this period. Webster's *Duchess of Malfi* and Marston's *The Insatiate Woman* are immediate references. Regan's widow status is also examined in terms of thirty one widows in the whole Shakespearean canon. Kehlar also traces the critical development of this issue of widowhood in *King Lear*. Despite the title focusing on the character of Regan in *King Lear*, the article does not elaborate on the issue, rather uses it as a reference point to take up the issues of the contexts rather than the texts.

The kind of study that Shernavaz Buhariwala attempts in "*Antony and Cleopatra*: Essence and Evanescence" (211-19), is quite unconventional. She discusses *Antony and Cleopatra* in the light of the four elements, earth, air, water and fire. Normally this kind of reading exposes the 'humourous' elements of the protagonists, but Buhariwala goes beyond it to

consider the diegetic movement of the play. The issues of barrenness, marriage and procreation are discussed in connection with the metaphors of land and harvest. But when Buhariwala comes to analyze water she focuses more on the interiority of the body/mind. The references to rivers, to the barge, finally relate to the flow and movement of the emotional ingredients of human characters. The antithetical relation between Egypt and Rome, embedded in the imageries of the play, are analyzed in relation to these four elements.

Rajiva Verma's approach in discussing "Conflict and resolution in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*" (220-32) is both new historicist and psychoanalytical. He refers to events like the Midland Rising and the Corn Riots of 1607 which testify the new historicist orientation but apart from addressing this ideological/historical reference, what makes this article really interesting is the way Verma accommodates the issues of psychoanalytical criticism. He traces how psychoanalytical critics show the references to food and the anger of Coriolanus as elements of the oral stage. In the concluding part however, Verma brings in the references to two other tragedies *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* and *Antony and Cleopatra* where he treats Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra as mother figures and also shows how the ghost as a father figure structures the play *Hamlet*.

The idea of damnation is common to several Elizabethan tragedies. The heroes of classical tragedy were victimized by the malevolent scheme of the divine forces, but for the Elizabethan playwrights, imbued with a deep sense of Christianity, it was unimaginable because of the just, loving nature of Christian God. V. M. Madge's "Three Men in the Boat of Damnation – Dr. Faustus, Macbeth and Mistah Kurtz" (187-94), is a study of the Elizabethan over-reachers like Dr. Faustus and Macbeth linking them to notions of temptation, evil and sin. But what makes this article more interesting is how Madge places Dr. Faustus and Macbeth alongside Conrad's Mistah Kurtz in *Heart of Darkness*. For Madge all the three characters are connected with the theme of 'fascination with abomination' (189). All three characters are sinners in a very Christian sense for tampering with nature. The article, towards the end, becomes more or less a textual analysis which elaborates on the theme by analyzing the imageries of the three works.

R. S. White's essay, "*Troilus and Cressida*: Shakespeare's Anti-war Play" (14-24), shows how Shakespeare's antiwar sentiments find expression in the two plays, *Henry V* and *Troilus and Cressida*, where public war is often driven by the personal motives. White attempts to relate these two plays to different texts like Greville's *A Treatise on War* is interesting, the article fails to relate the theme of antiwar sensibility to Elizabethan history. White's reference to Olivier's film version of *Henry V*, offers a new dimension to the article.

Sukanta Chaudhuri's "*The Merchant of Venice*" (25-40) is the only article in the edition, to take up Shakespearean comedy. Chaudhuri primarily places the merchants of Venice in the mercantile milieu of Venice and of course England. Though this kind of reading is not a completely unexplored one, he starts his argument by differing sharply from Frederick Turner's position, considered formidable in this line of Shakespeare criticism. Chaudhuri, in his usual scholarly manner, examines the play in the light of the mercantile schemes like exchange value and surplus theory. The human relations and the social institutions, Chaudhuri argues, are reliant on different schemes of exchange: a casket for a wife, a ring for marital faith and three hundred ducats for a pound of flesh. Chaudhuri's sprawling range of studies is reflected when he relates this analysis of the play to the theory of exchange existing in the classical body of knowledge, Plato and Aristotle.

The "Introduction" (1-13) by the editors, pre-fixed to the articles, explains the genesis of the book. It combines the proceedings of an international seminar held in honour of the eminent Indian teacher and scholar, Prof. S. Nagarajan with additional articles by other critics keeping in mind the centrality of Shakespeare in Indian pedagogy and academia. With contributions from

no less than four continents – Asia, Europe, Africa and Australia – and an eclectic array of perspectives, *Vintage Shakespeare* reinforces the perennial interest in Shakespeare across the globe.

The Tempest by William Shakespeare, ed. Sarbani Chaudhury, New Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2009. Pp. Liii +217. ISBN 978-81-317-0981-8.

Reviewed by Sharmistha Chatterjee Sriwastav*

At the outset one must be aware that *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare is one of the popular texts included in the syllabi of almost all the Indian universities. It is taught at the postgraduate level. In the given circumstances it is not hard to find copies of various editions of the popular text. Some of them are indeed old wine in new bottles.

Knowing well that choosing a standard edition is a hard task (there is an abundance of choices of every kind), a critical reader/ reviewer/ student looks for more than average material while buying and recommending. The Pearson Longman edition of the text edited by Sarbani Chaudhury does not disappoint in this regard. With carefully selected critical approaches including traditional and contemporary criticism, a glimpse into the social/ cultural/ political background of the text, and an overall deft editing, the text comes with extra endowments.

The introduction lays bare the essential conflict between the traditional criticisms which “project(s) (...) the play as ushering a blissful heaven on earth through the future rulers” and post 1970 avant garde criticism, “reading *The Tempest* almost exclusively as a paradigm for the colonial encounter” (Introduction ix). The editor warns that both these critical positions need to be treated with caution. The issue of “double narrative” in the play is briefly touched upon, before the editor moves on to the dates of composition, performance and subsequent stage history. Readers and critics are sure to find additional information about the African and Afro-American responses to the play, the twentieth century plethora of literary take offs, critical explorations, stage and film productions. Chaudhury cites examples of how these responses have proved fruitful given the fact that the play, “doubles as a paradigm for colonial imposition and as dramatized slave narrative” (Introduction x). Such claims are strengthened with authentic information beginning from Richard Wright’s novel, *Native Son* (1940) down to Octavo Mannoni’s *Prospero and Caliban* (1956). The English responses are accommodated too. Thereafter Chaudhury briefly dwells upon recent Western performance exhibiting a greater interest in the play’s spectacle element as in Mac Donald’s 2000-01 staging of the play and Boyd’s concentration on undermining Prospero’s authority. She cites examples of such innovation too which necessarily did not lead to new insights; as for instance the production with Vanessa Redgrave, the famous actress playing Prospero. Productions which explicitly evoke colonial elements are referred to.¹ An element of additional interest and research in the edition is a brief critical summary of the reception of *The Tempest* in India. Readers may be saddened to find that despite sporadic attempts at translating the play into Bengali and performances made by college students and The New Shakespeare Company touring India, the play has never been quite popular. The editor mentions the notable Hindi productions and explores the long standing relationship of the state of Tamil Nadu with the play.² Information like the first full length

* Sharmistha Chatterjee Sriwastav is an Assistant Professor in the English Department, Rishi Bankim Chandra College For Women, Naihati, West Bengal, India

¹ Two notable exceptions that explicitly evoked colonial elements, Jonathan Miller’s 1970 production and George Wolfe’s 1995 endeavour are mentioned by the editor.

² Toofan, the 1982 Hindi production by national School of Drama and K.V. Subanna directed *Birugali* in Karnataka, followed by the production for Children *Dham Dham Sundergati* have been recorded by Chaudhury.

version of the play in Bengal being enacted by Jadavpur University students in 1964 comes as a bit of surprise to scholars who draw upon the West for inspiration. The stage history also mentions other notable productions in West Bengal and Bangladesh.³

Apart from citing the regular sources of the play from which Shakespeare draws his inspiration, the edition mentions the Spanish works from which Shakespeare might have borrowed the folkloric ingredients – viz, Antonio de Esclava's *Las Nochosde Invierno* [*The Winter Nights*] 1609, and Diego Ortunez de Calahorra's *Espejo de Principes y Caballeros* [*The Mirror of the Princes and Noble Men*] (1562, trans 1578). Apart from mentioning the alignment of the play with contemporary colonial discourses, the editor takes pains to cite detailed parallels between various episodes of the play and William Strachey's *True Repertory of the Wrack* (written 1610).

In the discussing the context of the play, the editor identifies the text as being one which legitimizes various strands of colonial discourse, encompassing the early phases of the colonial encounter in unknown lands, when the Englishmen were still engaged in the act of surveying and studying the alien terrain and its inhabitants. Prospero's dependence on Caliban is placed alongside the initial stages of colonial settlement in the New World when the Virginian settlers depended considerably on the charity of the farming Indians and resorted to "enlightened acculturation" (Introduction xvii). The subsequent Caliban-Prospero negotiation is linked to the later phase when the colonizers resorted to force and coercion in order to accentuate their dominion and "profit". The issue of enslavement in *The Tempest* is also discussed against the backdrop of issues like "marketability" and "sexual conquest" which served as "common trope of European domination" (Introduction xviii).

The hectic alliances attempted throughout the play: between Alonso and the Tunisian prince; Caliban and Prospero; Antonio and Sebastian; Prospero, Ferdinand and Miranda; Caliban, Stephano and Trinculo along with shipwreck, sea sorrows and the tempest are read as symptomatic of the anxieties and tensions of the Europeans having to negotiate their dynastic preoccupations and with the Ottomans for gaining foothold on the Mediterranean trade. The African connection of the play is thus traced to Alonso's insistence on a Tunisian match for Claribel – again an attempt to gain foothold by "wooing a powerful other" (Introduction xix). Thus, traditional readings of *The Tempest*, interpreting the island as an idyllic site is challenged and disproved. Machiavellian deceit and manipulations are the tools of political empowerment on the island just as they are in the mother countries. The editor proposes marriage diplomacy to be the prime mode of political manoeuvre. In a similar manner she suggests that Prospero-Antonio relationship could be situated within "European dynastic conflicts and debates over the king's rights and responsibilities [which lies] at the core of the play" (Introduction xx).

While discussing the generic affiliations of the play, the editor goes on to identify the usual ways in which *The Tempest* is placed among the group of Last Plays, categorized as Romance and often as pastoral tragicomedy. In this context the possibility of the play belonging to a hybrid genre is discussed, with references to Fletcher's, *The Faithful Shepherdess* (in turn indebted to Guarini), which attempts to define a tragicomedy, elaborating upon the characteristics of such a genre. Chaudhury's addition however to the discussion is to draw the readers' attention to Shakespeare's concept of incomplete reconciliation whereby, except a few, none of the characters are allowed a true deliverance at the end of the play which again is a unique contribution to the tragicomic format. The comic elements of the plot are traced to the pastoral tradition with a brief history of pastoral drama in Europe. The editor elaborates the fact

³ The editor mentions the Bengali production by Theatre Passion based on Syed Samsul Haque's translation among others.

that Elizabethan and Jacobean Pastoral is an artificial reconstruction of nature in what is perceived as its ideal state. She points out, how in *The Tempest* the pastoral tragicomedy and romance coalesce through various strategies employed by the dramatist. A tailpiece adds a note on the contrast between the real political world of Naples and Milan where magic is ineffectual and the island where magic is all powerful, and the anxiety created by the precondition that Prospero's return to Milan must necessarily and precisely mean the abjuration of this very magic with which he controls the affairs of the island.

In a continuation of the theme of magic, Chaudhury discusses the ambivalence of the play that is promoted by the ambiguous subjectivity of the island. She talks about the instability of the nature, surroundings and the musical magic of the island which appeals differently to the senses of different characters often creating conflating manifestations. She identifies this as a factor intensifying the ambivalent aura of the play. There is a note on Prospero's magic, powerful yet ineffectual to mould all and the mention of Mowat's article,⁴ which provides useful information on the kind of studies engaged in by a Renaissance magician in relation to the same magic. A useful input in the hoard of critical information remains the discussion about the racial and gendered discourse of the play apropos magic, suggesting the European male dominance over the female non-European and how this could be traced to the political transition that had happened in contemporary England from Elizabeth I to James I.

Apart from dwelling upon the usual aspects of the structure of the play the editor comments on the racial prejudice which shapes the structure by distributing itself between Caliban and Ferdinand. The information on Guarini's model (upon which the structure of *The Tempest* is patterned) mentions the function of each act and how Shakespeare adheres to the above. The innovations in the structure like the "double prologue" and a "clearly demarcated epilogue" (Introduction xxx) are mentioned. The editor is particularly convincing in demonstrating how "the entire action of play becomes an elaborate metaphor for theatrical activity" (Introduction xxxi-xxxii).

While the Introduction mentions the masque reiterating "real-life hierarchy and order" it also mentions critics like Enid Welsford, who consider the entire play to be an elaborate masque with Prospero heading the masque and the anti-masque initiated by Caliban and the group. The banquet (3.3.18SD – 83 SD) and the betrothal masque (4.1.60 – 138 SD) are discussed in detail. The comparison of the banquets in *The Tempest* with the Biblical ones elaborates upon the functions of the traditional plots. The editor mentions the departures made by the masques in the play because, as she explains: "it is a device within a play serving a precise and temporary function" (Introduction xxxiii). Chaudhury also points to the conflict of interest in the play and the masques included in it. She also discusses the betrothal masque and explains the exclusion of Venus, the goddess of love from the celebration.

Taking a cue from Paul Brown, the editor explains how *The Tempest* is not simply a reflection of colonialist practices but an intervention in an ambivalent and contradictory discourse. In elaborating the authorities' attitude towards unfixed and unsupervised elements located in internal margins of civil society the editor draws upon appropriate and number of examples from Morison, Hobbes and Beier. While concentrating on the issue of colonialism, Chaudhury further and interestingly interprets and includes the subjugation of Antonio and Sebastian on one hand and Stephano and Trinculo on the other as colonization of the core and internal semi-periphery respectively. To this is included the colonization of Caliban who becomes in a way a prototype of a Native American conquered by the Europeans. In this context,

⁴ The editor includes detailed information of the article in the bibliography.

the editor pertinently and relevantly differentiates between the nature of European engagement with the North African Other and the colonization of the New World.

The issue of gender is discussed with usual references to male empowerment in various forms with an explanation of the sexual, political tropes and the gendered metaphor used in the text. An important inclusion in the discussion is the issue of banishment of women from the narrative due to the apprehensions generated by “female presence” which is so great that “even Prospero’s wife, the mother of Miranda, is banished from the narrative” (Introduction xli). Another issue brought to the forefront is Miranda’s ignorance manifested most crucially in her lack of realization that she is actually allowed no choice and her naïve understanding which clubs all the newcomers as “beauteous mankind”, thereby unable to distinguish between moral fibre of Gonzalo and Antonio.

The issue of colonization remains incomplete without considering linguistic subjugation. Chaudhury points to this strategy of imposing the superior language of the settlers over the inferior one of the colonized whereby erasure of the language becomes the starting point of the erasure of indigenous associations. Caliban reverses the process by using the colonizers tongue and making it a weapon of self defense. The introduction also explains how language operates as crucial vehicle for recording affinities and enmities. The scholarly and detailed introduction is rounded off with a brief discussion of the key issues.

The introduction to this edition is a work of detailed analysis and should very helpful to the students at the advanced level. As mentioned earlier, not merely limiting itself to discussion of the text, it familiarizes teachers and students alike to the recent Shakespearean interpretations, adaptations and appropriations, thereby offering those interested, the scope of moving to broader vistas of Shakespeare studies. Although at times heavily theorized the Introduction should be a critical material in itself to serious students.

The text itself conforms to the standard annotated editions with evidences of the editor having consulted all major available editions, which have contributed to the enrichment of the annotations. Apart from providing necessary information and interpretation, the annotations draw upon theoretical issues and refer back and forth to the material available in the Introduction of the edition.

Certain important texts for reference are also alluded to (e.g., 1.2.81-83). The editor has taken pains to bring in inter-textual references for a better understanding of the text. This includes references to other Shakespearean plays, as well as to texts by other authors (viz- 2.2. 6 or 3.3. 23-24). The unity of effect created by the play and the recurrence of the motifs and issues in the ‘text’ is reminded of, by constantly referring to the key terms which occur back and forth in the text. Instead of traditionally summarizing the scene at the beginning, the editor provides the back ground often drawing up traditions and established strategies before finally offering an overview of the scene.

The annotations (which sincerely keep to the original Shakespearean editions) along with the text, should be immensely useful to the students. Pedagogically, the edition is a useful one to teachers who should find enough hyperlinks to explore further. In a way the edition also tends to steer and manipulate interpretations to a certain extent. Conscious readers might as well have an advantage from this because it mentions traditional ones as well. Appropriate teaching strategies should enable the educators to balance one with the other.

Three erudite critical essays enrich this edition of *The Tempest*. They provide rewarding exposure for students and teachers because they manifest very different perspectives. Penned by eminent scholars, they look at the play from traditional, contemporary and comparative out looks. Sukanta Chaudhuri’s essay *The Last plays* emphasizes the need to balance the two extremist readings – one hovering on ‘cosmic design’, ‘heaven’s bounty’ to understand the

scheme of things and the other emphasizing the role of man, his power and virtue, even his problems and failures (147). The essay warns us against any one sided reading which might ignore vital truths. While the former essay records more the convictions of the author himself, David Norbrook (*What cares These Roarers for the Name of King? Language and Utopia in The Tempest*) allows avid and careful readers to sift from contemporary critical discourses. The dialogic of critiques brought into focus are based on the claim that *The Tempest*, “is structured around oppositions between courtly discourse and wider linguistic contexts” (159). Readers have ample material to think, dwell and select for themselves from the polyphony of opinions and perspectives, although at times the overlapping conglomeration of ideas could be intimidating for average Indian students. The last essay, *Race and Gender in Patriarchal and Colonial Discourse: The Case of the Foul witch Sycorax in the Context of Modern witch Hunting Practices in India* by Aparna Mahanta, is a case of recent cross-cultural studies. Besides centering the identity of Caliban, previously marginalized in European readings, it dwells upon the “black, women, invisibilized, erased out” (199) who nevertheless has a “massive presence” in the play, i.e., Sycorax the dead witch. The examination of her character is done in the historical perspective of witch hunting both in the east and the west, thereby attempting to recuperate what Mahanta calls “gender history” (201). Those interested in popular culture, folklore and magic should find the piece exciting and informative.

The Bibliography is a fairly exhaustive list of different editions of *The Tempest* although few popular and standard ones could as well be mentioned (viz Swan and Cambridge). References include, apart from standard European discourses, multicultural responses to the text. Some of the references deal with the background of the text and its historical context, apart from indicating interesting adaptations and appropriations of the same. The editor has painstakingly added notes to identify topics, mark the areas, in the reference books which could be studied for understanding the text. In addition, the asterisk marks with the footnote at the end of the list, help the student to identify and choose the more essential ones.

For those interested in a detailed understanding of the text and contexts, information on stage adaptations and various appropriations of *The Tempest* in a multicultural setting, the Pearson Longman edition is a satisfying and reinforcing experience.

Elżbieta Stanisz, *Kierunki Polskiej Szekspiologicznej Myśli Krytycznej w Dwudziestoleciu Międzywojennym (1918-1939)* [Shakespearean Criticism in Poland in the Inter-War Period], Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2011. Pp. 290. ISBN 978-83-7611-887-1.

Reviewed by Natalia Giza*

Polish fascination with Shakespeare and his literary masterpieces has been present in our culture since the very beginning, but the development of “Shakespeareology” – a new academic field of study, is a relatively new phenomenon. It is inseparably linked with the growing interest in the English literature and culture among people in Poland and runs parallel to the establishment of the first Chairs of English Language and Literature at Polish universities.

The book by Elżbieta Stanisz constitutes an invaluable source for those who would like to trace the origins of the Shakespearean criticism in Poland. It deals with the turbulent times of the inter-war period (1918-1939) which witnessed the birth and the initial evolvement of what is today known as “English Studies”. The pioneers and promoters of that new academic discipline did not only bring Shakespeare closer to the Polish readers but also facilitated the reception of his works. The author enlivens the most prominent of those historical figures, whose versatility, persistency and diligence could still serve as an example to the contemporary, as well as subsequent, generations of philologists, translators and historians of literature.

The concise Introduction (7-41) allows the reader to enter the magical world of Shakespeare’s spellbinding epoch. It is followed by an overview of monographs and essays presenting the appearance of Shakespeare in the Polish cultural sphere, with several pages being devoted to the problem of the earliest Polish attempts at “deciphering” and understanding the Shakespearean style and language. Stanisz states that the first translations, as well as the analyses of Shakespeare’s works date back to the beginnings of the nineteenth century, but she highlights the fact that it was not until the end of that era that the representatives of the *Młoda Polska* movement¹ took an interest in English literature and were particularly drawn to Shakespeare, whose way of portraying the world and describing people’s feelings seemed to be quite close to their own literary vision. By presenting a brief outline of events leading up to the climax of the Polish interest in Shakespeare, the author points out the gradualism of the entire process of the introduction of the English Renaissance genius at universities on the Vistula.

An academic approach to Shakespeare is the axis around which the main body of the book is constructed. Clearly divided chapters present four of the most outstanding Polish scholars from the inter-war period: Roman Dyboski, Władysław Tarnawski, Andrzej Tretiak and Stanisław Helsztyński. All of them dealt with Shakespeare, but each man contributed in his own, unique way. In her descriptions, the author seems to follow the same pattern: she commences

* Natalia Giza is a doctoral student at the Pedagogical University of Cracow, Poland, and a Lecturer at the State Higher Vocational School in Nowy Sacz, Poland.

¹ *Młoda Polska* was a Polish Modernist movement from the years 1890-1918. Artists beginning their careers at the end of the nineteenth century (French: *fin de siècle*) were united by their common protest against the ideals of Naturalism and Positivism. They openly criticized realism and did not refrain from drawing upon idealistic notions of Romanticism. Being dissatisfied with the development of their civilization, they predicted the inevitable end of the world. Their works were full of symbolic meanings, melancholy, pessimism and tragedy. Rejecting reality, they frequently presented life in a form of dreams.

with a short biography of the scholar and ends with his critical activity, but never fails to adjust the schema to the specific character and the literary output of the writer.

Stanisz devotes the first section (43-107) to the founder of the English Studies in Poland – Roman Dyboski – for whom the first Chair of English Language and Literature was established in Cracow before the World War I. During his thriving academic career he produced numerous articles on the English language and culture which were published in many foreign magazines thus popularizing the knowledge of the English Renaissance around the world. The author meticulously describes the most conspicuous of his literary achievements, which initiated the Polish academic research in Shakespearean studies. She also underlines the didactic value of Dyboski's writings. Acquainting Polish readers with Shakespeare required an appropriate historical and literary background which Dyboski did not fail to provide. His vivid portrayals of the Tudor kingdom and the juxtaposition of England and Poland in the sixteenth century facilitated the general reception of English Renaissance literature and definitely helped in the understanding of Shakespeare. (54)

The second chapter (109-179) concentrates on Władysław Tarnawski – another first-class pundit whose pioneering work accelerated the development of the newly-established English Studies in Poland. Focusing on the language, he became the only scholar who succeeded in translating all of Shakespeare's plays (177). Stanisz highlights Tarnawski's innovative, experience-based approach to literary translation and criticism. Although he was Dyboski's student, in his texts on Shakespeare Tarnawski tried not to emulate the style of his master. Instead of paying a lot of attention to the characters, he accentuated the main aspects and twists of the plots. Tarnawski, as any other academic dealing with Shakespeare, also diligently investigated the origins of Shakespeare's works but, unlike others, he concentrated more on original elements which had not been based on any other previously existing ideas and concepts.

Another distinguished scholar included by Stanisz in her book is Andrzej Tretiak, whose greatest achievements are presented in the third chapter (181-232). The author calls Tretiak a researcher of the structure of Shakespeare's plays and an expert on Elizabethan theatre (181) thus accurately summarizing the focal points of his academic career. Throughout his life he focused on various aspects of the English literature but Shakespeare had always occupied the privileged position. As a scholar, Tretiak was the first one who undertook research on the Elizabethan theatre. At the time when the field of the history of the theatre was just budding, Tretiak's exhaustive descriptions of integral elements of a stage and members of an artistic troupe proved to be extremely helpful in further philological studies (207-208). Stanisz also emphasizes Tretiak's linguistic and structural analyses of Shakespeare's dramas which significantly supplemented and expanded the general philological knowledge of the inter-war period in Poland.

The last chapter (233-259) begins with a presentation of Stanisław Helsztyński – one of the most renowned philologists, whose academic career commenced in the early 30's but did not have a chance to flourish until the end of the World War II. Following the steps of his predecessors, Helsztyński also concentrated on various aspects of the Polish reception of Shakespeare's works and tried to analyze their influence on Polish writers (244). Additionally, he tried to clarify the literary contexts of Shakespeare's texts, supplementing them with extensive descriptions and explanations. In Helsztyński's publications his own findings were skilfully compared and contrasted with opinions of other distinguished scholars from abroad, which popularized the international knowledge of Shakespeare in Poland.

In chapter four, apart from Helsztyński, Stanisz also lists several other academics from that period who contributed to the field of the English Studies and Shakespearean criticism even though they did not belong to English departments. The majority of them were experts on Polish

literature who produced papers connected with one particular drama or a character of interest to them. They usually wrote about the influence of Shakespeare on Polish culture, seeking traces of Shakespearean characters and motives in Polish literary works. The author concludes that all of the writings helped in the general development of the field of the English Studies and proved that academic interest in Shakespeare was not restricted to the inner circle of Polish Shakespearologists (259).

The final conclusions (261-274) contain Stanisz's assessment of the most impressive achievements of the four scholars, setting side by side similarities and differences in their approaches to Shakespeare. She states that all of the academics were faithful to the nineteenth century method of interpretation called biographical criticism. For them Shakespearean characters were brimming with obscure hints which, if correctly deciphered, could reveal interesting facts concerning Shakespeare's life. Their works, successfully combining the results of their own research and findings of reputed foreign specialists greatly facilitated the understanding of English Renaissance literature and, in particular, Shakespeare in Poland. According to the author, Polish publications of the inter-war period became an indubitable contribution to the international study of Shakespearean criticism.

Detailed descriptions and objectivism of the author make the book by Elżbieta Stanisza a reliable academic work. Her overview of the most important pioneers of the English Studies in Poland and exhaustive analyses of their Shakespearean output will definitely serve as an invaluable reference source to everybody interested in the origins of Polish fascination with English culture, literature and Shakespeare's dramatic masterpieces. The thing which deserves acknowledgment is the author's determination in seeking precursory elements in the texts written in the inter-war period, which were developed in subsequent epochs. At some point it makes us realize how indebted we are to that generation of great Polish minds, who struggled to fulfil their life's mission against all the odds.

***Shakespeare: The Indian Icon*, ed. Vikram Chopra, New Delhi: The Readers Paradise, 2011. Pp. xxvi + 836. ISBN 978-81-920751-2-9**

Reviewed by Yoshiko Kawachi*

The title of *Shakespeare: The Indian Icon* suits this book which contains a great deal of useful information on Indian response to Shakespeare: social, cultural and academic. It is a voluminous collection of essays on Shakespearean interpretation, adaptation, appropriation, performances, films, and so on. Readers will understand well how the Indians have received the Bard and what they have learned from him. This is a thick book of over nearly 850 pages. It contains more than 150 colour photographs and paintings.

Professor Vikram Chopra, lately of ARSD College, University of Delhi, is an ardent lover of Shakespeare. He was the Founder Secretary of the Shakespeare Society of India (1987-93), and the Coordinating Editor for India in the Shakespeare Data Bank. He is now on the Executive Committee of the Shakespeare Society of India and a member of the International Committee of Correspondents for World Shakespeare Bibliography. Besides, he is the editor of *Shakespeare: Varied Perspectives* (1996), a collection of critical essays by European, American, and Asian academics. I believe beyond all doubt that both his devotion to the Bard and his professional career enhanced the possibility of publishing this all-inclusive book.

Today Shakespeare as “a delighter of all mankind” (xiii) is a world icon. How has he become an Indian icon? This book will answer this important question. In Asian countries, for instance, Japan, China and Korea, Shakespearean acceptance was closely related to their Westernization or modernization. In India, however, things are different. Shakespeare was imported into this country as one of the political tools for British purposes to colonize her, with the Bible and the English language.

In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1594-96), an Indian woman dies in childbirth and Titania quarrels with Oberon about an Indian page. This scene offers proof that England had formed a relationship with India before Shakespeare wrote the play. In 1600 the East India Company was founded in order to further trade relations with India. In 1607 *Hamlet* was performed aboard the *Hector* commanded by William Hawkins who was on his way to the court of the Great Maharaja. In 1877 Queen Victoria became the Indian Empress. Under British rule, Shakespeare's plays were performed for the English residents, and western-style theatres were established in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. Moreover, Shakespeare was added to the school curriculum, and his works were translated into Hindi, Bengali, Urdu, Tamil, Malayam and other local languages.

The Indians had their own literature, philosophy, religion, ethos, tradition and culture; consequently, they tried to forge connections between the traditions of classic Indian drama and Western drama. However, they gradually underwent a process of cultural assimilation on the one hand, and suffered conflict between colonialism and nationalism on the other; they had to fight against imperialism until Britain granted independence to India in 1947. Nationalists regarded Sanskrit literature including *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana* higher than Shakespeare's drama. This volume clearly and fully reveals their inner feelings toward the Bard and the reflections of his

* Yoshiko Kawachi is a Professor of English at Kyorin University, Japan.

drama on Indian thought. In addition, it clarifies how positively the Indians have appropriated him for their own use and why they admire him.

In the Introduction (1-56), Chopra refers to John Keats' wording, "negative capability," and points out the similarities between Indian thought and Shakespeare's vision. He regards this 'chameleon poetic stance' as "the mind's capacity to remain in uncertainties, mysteries and doubts without any irritable reaching after fact and reason" (20). He says, "As an observer of life Shakespeare knew that life is never static, and that nothing exists as absolute truth" (20). Furthermore, he says, "Life itself is a journey in the aesthetics of wonder; literature and art are explorations into this aesthetics" (22). Thus he warns each person to re-discover Shakespeare's literary works because he thinks literature may help men and women of today try not to lose their humanity.

This volume represents the fruit of Indian intellectuals' efforts to seek commune with the Bard. In the Foreward (vii-viii), Jay L. Halio says, "We can no longer remain encased in our Anglo-American approaches to Shakespeare's works" (viii). Chopra divides the collection into five sections: (1) The Panorama – A Few Gleanings; (2) Shakespeare's Evolution and Assimilation in the Cultural Milieu of India – some details; (3) Craft and Art; (4) Visions and Values; (5) Cross-Cultural Perceptions.

The first section includes Muhammad Iqbal's poem (63), Sri Aurobindo's comments on the poetic qualities of Valmiki, Vyasa, Homer, Shakespeare and Goethe (64-66), and the essays by Tagore (73-74) and Gandhi (69-72). Tagore was a great admirer of the Bard, and his bust was installed in the garden of Shakespeare Birthplace in 1995. Readers will know of the bonds between India and UK through the essay by the English actor-director Geoffrey Kendal who toured India from the 1940s to the early 1960s. His prologue to autobiography: *The Shakespearewallah* is included here (141-42). Joy Michael, an Indian director influenced by Kendal, writes an essay, "Directing Shakespeare" (145-48).

C.N. Menon writes "The Tragic in Us" (79-80), in which he brings out the element of the tragic and illustrates both Shakespeare and the Indian mind. In the essays entitled "What Shakespeare Means to Me" (113-31), R. K. Narayan says, "Shakespeare was endowed with a mind so transparent and clear that it never coloured or obstructed the thoughts and words of his characters" (116), and Frank Thakurdas remarks that to read Shakespeare is to educate oneself into the knowledge and understanding of this world and nothing more (122). In addition, Chopra's note on the origin and growth of the Shakespeare Society of India is worth reading.

The second section gives information about the stage and the film. Indian theatre has become a melting pot of various cultures and themes. We hear that there are over 2,000 translations and adaptations in India. The Indians very much like *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello* and *Hamlet*, whose paintings and theatrical photographs are included in this book. The artist Samita Basu regards Lady Macbeth as the image of the Goddess Kali who is not only the icon of devastation but also the destroyer of evil. In *Crossings* directed by Vikram Iyengar, four female characters explored the different facets of Lady Macbeth. This experimental play received rave reviews in India and UK.

Maya Krishna Rao presented Lady Macbeth's character through a very imaginative and aesthetic fusion of art, dance and music. *Romeo and Juliet* was presented in ballet form in the Kathak style. The modern version of the play, however, was performed by Anuradha Kapur, the Director of the National School of Drama; she wished to emphasize the contemporary significance of the play.

Taking scenes from *Othello* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Arjun Raina combined Shakespeare with Kathakali in his "Magic Hour in 'Khealkali'" Chopra says, "His humanistic approach towards the black and his resentment against the discriminatory and exploitative

attitude of the imperialists towards the colonial world, is understandable, even commendable” (209). In addition, Roysten Abel’s *“Othello in Black and White”* received a wide acclaim at the Edinburgh Theatre Festival. In 2010, Ranjit Kapoor staged *“Hamlet – The Crown Prince,”* in which the vast world of *Hamlet* was explored through the eyes of the clown.

Cinematic adaptations of Shakespeare’s plays are popular among the Indians. Especially *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *Othello* have attracted the attention of the film directors. For instance, Vishal Bhardwaj’s *Maqbool* interweaved Scotland with the contemporary underworld of Mumbai, and his *Omkara* transformed Venice and Cyprus into the crime world of Western Uttar Pradesh.

The third section includes two essays on the stage: “Staging *King Lear* in Indian Context” (241-57) by Amal Allana, Balwant Gargi et al., and “Shakespeare on the Indian Stage” (284-96) by J. N. Kaushal. Moreover, there are two essays on paintings: one is “Shakespeare in the Pre-Raphaelite Painting” (385-96) by S. N. Roy, and another is on Eric Fraser’s paintings by Prema Nandakumar (339-53).

Scholars discuss the process of artistic creation and the various devices used by Shakespeare. Considering marriages in *The Tempest*, Bhim S. Dahiya remarks that Shakespeare’s view of marriage is neither conventionally Elizabethan nor radically feminist (264-71). Ruth Vanita examines the Mariological phenomenon in the human, social and political situations of Hermione, Paulina and Perdita in *The Winter’s Tale*, and Catherine, Anne and Elizabeth in *Henry VIII* (402-22). R. W. Desai asserts that Duncan is politically shrewd and calculating though he appears to be a benign and gracious king (275-83). This awareness will help us recognize the dimensions of Macbeth’s tragic stature. Besides, Shweta Khanna points out the similarities between the witches’ rituals in *Macbeth* and the Indian Tantric rites (298-307).

K. Ayyappa Paniker tries to understand the treatment of evil in *Measure for Measure* in relation to the metatheatre technique on the Kathakali pattern (362-69). S. Viswanathan also discusses Shakespeare’s use of the metatheatre technique (423-33). S. Nagarajan considers closely and carefully the last lines of *King Lear*, and ascribes them to Albany rather than Edgar (354-61). Moreover, he emphasizes that the motivation for the return of Cordelia to England should be reconsidered.

Discussing the literary relationship between Keats and Shakespeare (258-63), Bhabatosh Chatterjee concludes that Keats “sees Shakespeare not merely as the poet of human suffering, but as the poet who understands *his* suffering” (263). Urmilla Khanna writes about the impact of the Bard on Iris Murdoch (308-16).

In the beginning of the fourth section, Chopra mentions Kaplana Chawla, the astronaut who died in the crash of the spacecraft Columbia in 2003. He calls her “Shakespearean daughter” of humanity. Readers will find that this section includes essays on Shakespeare’s universe and humanity. Regarding *King Lear* as a cosmic tragedy, Visvanath Chatterjee asserts that Lear who climbs the height of spirituality after the storm gains his self-realization through his renunciation (452-61). In his opinion, this process corresponds to the two great ideas of India, spirituality and renunciation.

Analyzing Goethe’s *Faust*, Marlowe’s *Faustus*, and Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, R. A. Malagi explains the tragic dilemma each character tackles in his risky journey from microcosm to a willed macrocosm (531-45). Sukanta Chaudhuri asserts that Macbeth as usurper, regicide and even villain is an anti-tragic hero (462-70). Moreover, Ram Bilas Sharma, a poet and critic of Hindi literature, says, “A tragedy is the story of human suffering. (...) The intensity of suffering is such that it transports the sufferer beyond himself.(...) The ecstasy is for a moment or a few moments but the agony is stretched out” (564). He thinks every tragedy is an effort to

understand man's nature and his place in the world. Exploring the philosophic depths of Shakespeare, Mulk Raj Chilana considers him as the pragmatic philosopher of life (471-77).

William Jones is an English philologist of the eighteenth century who liked both Shakespeare and Hafiz, a Persian poet. R. K. Kaul emphasizes the similarity of thought and expression between Shakespeare and Hafiz (511-14). S. C. Sen Gupta writes that Shakespeare makes a vertical division of "beauty versus ugliness" in *The Winter's Tale*, instead of representing the interaction of good and evil (558-63). Furthermore, Amaresh Datta presents a comedic vision of life (478-88). In his opinion, as Shakespeare became deeply interested in the basis of human existence, his attitude became more and more filled with a sense of exultation at the joy of life. He reaches the conclusion that both tragedies and comedies were part of Shakespeare's "musings" on life (487).

Sikander Lal's essay, "Lear's 'Pelican Daughters' and the Feminist Critics" (515-30) issues a warning against the feminist and non-feminist critics who have a prejudicial and unfair attitude towards Goneril and Regan. But Sarup Singh's essay, "Double Standard in Shakespeare" (571-86), may attract feminists' attention. Discussing the problem of chastity in *Othello*, he says that the society debar women from enjoying sexual freedom while men are allowed to. In his opinion, this double standard, apart from the status of women, reflects man's innate fear of female sexuality.

The final section includes essays on the interaction between Shakespeare and Indian culture, aesthetics, politics, religion, and so on. R. W. Desai displays Shakespeare's Indian connection, the sixteenth-century commerce, politics, religion and international relationships in his enlightening essay, "England, the Indian Boy and the Spice Trade in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*" (609-21). He discusses not only the East India Company and colonialism but also the historical, social and political background of the play.

S. Anand discusses nuances of eroticism in *Antony and Cleopatra*, a love-tale of an East-West encounter (593-600). He says, "There is no gainsaying the fact that just as Kalidasa is considered the Shakespeare of the East, Shakespeare is the Kalidasa of the West" (593). Kalidasa is a poet and dramatist who wrote *Abhigyan Shakuntalam* in Sanskrit in the fourth century. Bankimchandra Chatterjee, a great Bengali novelist of the nineteenth century, compares Kalidasa and Shakespeare (601-78). S. R. Swaminathan imagines that Kalidasa converses with Shakespeare in Elysium (720-27).

K. N. Iyer, a specialist in Vedic-Upanishadic literature, asserts that Shakespeare fulfills all the requirements of a Brahmajñani the Truth-knower (622-29). S. Ramaswami characterizes Shakespeare's works in Upanishadic terms (704-12). He says, "Shakespearean drama is wrought out of a penetrating exploration of the inmost recesses of the human spirit. It has in it a power, as of a live electric wire. Touch it and it sends through your entire being a thrilling awareness of reality" (707). Pointing out the affinity of essence between Shakespeare's tragic ethos and the key element in Indian scriptures, he remarks that all tragedy is an essay in the art of dying.

C. D. Narasimhaiah regards Shakespeare as the *Hiranyagarbha*, the primordial creative energy (663-72). In *Macbeth*, C. Rajendran discovers the beauty and utility of *Vakrokti* which is considered an essential ingredient of the poetic art in Indian aesthetics (673-79). Moreover, Krishna Rayan examines Shakespeare's plays in the light of the concepts of Sanskrit poetics (713-19).

According to Malati Ramratnam, *King Lear* which has Christian implications may also be more comprehensible in its religious scope for Hinduism and Buddhism (692-703). Shweta Khanna finds echoes of Indian philosophical thought and yogic elements in Shakespeare's plays (648-57). Considering that Shakespeare lived a multidimensional life in his thought and imagination, Tulsi Ram calls him the creative yogi (765-73). He writes that Shakespeare comes

closest in spirit to the Indian mind when he gains cosmic awareness. In addition, V. Y. Kantak remarks that the Indian mind instinctively responds to Shakespeare's peculiar authentic *openness* (639-47).

Two informative essays on the stage and the films attract our attention. One is Poonam Trivedi's essay, "Play[ing]'s the thing: *Hamlet* on the Indian Stage" (728-41), and the other is Rajiva Varma's article, "Shakespeare in Hindi Cinema" (742-58). Trivedi gives a comprehensive account of the various presentations of *Hamlet* on the Indian stage until quite recently. Her concise historical sketch of the performances helps us catch how freely Indian directors have made adaptations of *Hamlet* in order to perform ingenious experimentations. Varma writes on Shakespearean films in India from the era of silent movies to the present. He reliably reports the development of the film industry, referring to the main stream Bombay-cinema.

"*Karuna* in *King Lear*" (775-802) by Vikram Chopra concludes the collection. He tries to bring out the supreme importance of *Karuna* in the play. *Karuna* is the most sublime and the quintessential part of love in Sanskrit literature. He considers that "compassion" is identical with the Buddhist concept of *Karuna* which never cares for recompense. He analyzes the play in the light of the Buddhist philosophy, and arrives at the conclusion that Lear, Gloucester, Kent, Edgar and Cordelia render the play an apt illustration of the various stages of *Karuna*. He says, "Of all the tragedies of Shakespeare, *King Lear* is perhaps the most convincing portrayal of this beautiful truth" (792).

As mentioned above, this book adequately conveys how the Indians have accepted Shakespeare and reacted to him in the academic world, the theatre world and the film world. Readers will realize clearly that the relationship between the Indians and Shakespeare is solid and unique. The Indians have found a significant correlation between their thought, ethos and humanist moral aesthetics, and Shakespeare's multidimensional and multilayered world. Chopra as editor is successful in his efforts to show that the Indians have long cherished great admiration for him.

India, which has had a long history of growth as one of the cradles of ancient civilization, is now putting forth a great effort to promote economic development as one of the so-called BRICs. This desirable tendency is shown in various fields. For instance, the Shakespeare Society of India holds an international seminar almost every year to exchange ideas about the Bard with foreign academics, and sponsors intercollegiate drama competition every year in order to activate the theatre. Besides, the National School of Drama organizes every year the great theatre festival in which directors and players from all over the world participate.

Thus the Indians welcome "the gentle Shakespeare" as a cultural hero. He is fortunate that he still gets the privilege of living in India. In the past he has been present there as a result of colonialism, and now he exists as a product of Indian culture. It is fairly definite that readers will be aware of this uncommon phenomenon associated with the Indians' love for the immortal Bard.