Review

Bücherschau
in: Shakespeare-Jahrbuch | Shakespeare-Jahrbuch 155
30 Pages ([249] - 278)

Bücherschau

Shylock's Jewish Experience

Edna Nahshon and Michael Shapiro eds, *Wrestling with Shylock: Jewish Responses to* The Merchant of Venice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. xxiv, 431 pp. – ISBN 978-0-5118-4578-9 – £ 105.00 (hb.).

Sara Coodin, *Is Shylock Jewish? Citing Scripture and the Moral Agency of Shakespeare's Jews*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017. xv, 256 pp. – ISBN 978-1-4744-1838-6 – £ 75.00 (hb.).

In 1880, the historian Heinrich Graetz, well known for his monumental *Geschichte der Juden* (1853), published a long essay titled "Shylock in Legend, in Drama and in History". Half a century later, in 1937, the theatre scholar Hermann Sinsheimer wrote a monograph that would be published in English translation as *Shylock: History of a Character* (1943) in London, where the author had lived as a refugee since 1938. Simply put, as Abigail Gilman explains in far greater detail, Graetz blamed Shakespeare for the anti-Semitism of *The Merchant of Venice*, while Sinsheimer praised him for forging a Jewish character capable of eliciting sympathy: "Shylock served both writers largely as a screen upon which they could project their own experiences of degradation, as they struggled to understand why [in Sinsheimer's definition]: 'The Jews […] are still looked upon as Shylocks, or rather, Shylock still stands for the Jews'" (p. 52). The antithetical interpretations by two German Jewish intellectuals illuminate the larger paradox lying at the heart of *The Merchant of Venice*. In this Shakespearean comedy that history has turned into a tragic play, the protagonist Shylock, who has long displaced the titular merchant Antonio as the pivotal figure, has concurrently functioned as the most dramatically effective compendium of anti-Judaic and anti-Semitic stereotypes *and* as a vehicle of understanding of and empathy with the Jews. Gilman's essay is part of Edna Nahshon and Michael Shapiro's rich collection, which looks at how the competing antisemitic and philosemitic potential of Shylock has been explored by the people who have been the most directly implicated in the social and political consequences of a fictional character uncannily real in its power to operate well beyond the boundaries of theatre stages. *Wrestling with Shylock* illustrates the impressively broad historical and geographical range of responses to a play that, as Nahshon puts it, "has been a flashpoint that activates the sensitivities, fears, memories, and hopes encompassed in the Jewish experience as a minority group within a larger, primarily Christian society" (p. xxii). Opened by Michael Shapiro's survey of the sources and cultural materials that went into the making of Shylock, the book examines famous personalities, texts and productions alongside lesser known episodes, showing the centuries-long

engagement of Jewish intellectuals and theatre practitioners with Shakespeare's Jewish play. The essays touch on Germany, England, Israel/Palestine and the United States, from the time of the emancipation of European Jews to the present day. The Holocaust is predictably a watershed moment, changing forever the perception of Shylock, as demonstrated by the comparison between Weimar and post-war *Merchants* in Germany, variously treated in essays by Jeannette R. Malkin, Sabine Schülting and Gad Kaynar-Kissinger. The Yiddisch world (analyzed by Nina Warnke and Jeffrey Shandler) also plays a major role in this strenuous effort to negotiate between the singularity of Jewish identity and the cultural capital afforded by Shakespeare. Efraim Sicher and Miriam Gilbert look at how Jewish playwrights, directors and actors grappled with Shylock in twentieth-century England. Edna Nahshon's analysis of the use of the Shylock trope in the American press and the literary responses by early Jewish-American writers and Richard Weisberg's survey of legal scholarship on the trial scene are excellent case studies of the extra-theatrical resonance of Shylock. The adaption of the play in opera and painting is the subject of the chapters by Susan Chevlowe and Judah M. Cohen, while Mark Hodin looks at a specific American production from the 1920s. The other epoch-making event, the creation of the state of Israel, also strongly reconfigures *The Merchant of Venice* and it is very instructive to compare productions in Mandatory Palestine and in Israel (as done by Shelly Zer-Zion) with Arab productions and interpretations in different phases of the Zionist movement and after 1948 (in Edna Nahshon's postscript).

In his introduction, Shapiro notes that Shakespeare's chief Italian source, Giovanni Fiorentino's *Il Pecorone*, "shows little interest in any idea of the Jew, whether as diabolized 'Other', sinful usurer, or alien presence" (p. 6). He is probably right insofar as the tale, which ends up with the defeated Jew tearing up the bond in anger but keeping his Jewish identity, takes for granted the anti-usury position but also the familiarity that Italian Christians had with their Jewish neighbours. Historically, the first Jews who inhabited the Venetian Ghetto and were licensed to lend money (3 ducats, not 3,000) were German Jews, who had come as refugees. It is this condition of exile and alienation that invites many Jewish intellectuals to identify with Shylock.

An ideal sequel to this anthology could look at Jewish critical responses in contemporary Shakespeare studies (from Harold Bloom to Stephen Greenblatt, from Janet Adelman to James Shapiro to Kenneth Gross), of which Sara Coodin is a recent, brilliant example. Her book reminds the modern reader that Shakespeare's age was certainly more hostile to Jews than our own, but was also more alert to "the multivocality of Hebrew Biblical narratives" (p. 17) and, more or less adversarially, familiar with Jewish textual and exegetical preoccupations.

From this premise, Coodin raises the question: "What new meanings might be made available if we considered Shylock and Jessica as Jewish characters in a way that sourced Jewishness not only through interpolated ethnic stereotypes, but via distinctively Jewish traditions and practices?" (p. 7). She asks that we see the characters not as ethnographic objects but as hermeneutical and ethical subjects, who interpret the world from a Jewish perspective. "I consider the moral agency of Shylock and his daughter Jessica by inquiring into the habits of mind evidenced by their words and actions in the play, some of which, I argue, reflect recognisably Jewish patterns" (p. 9). Investigating the important role of Hebrew learning in Renaissance England as the necessary background, Coodin revisits Shylock's use of the Jacob and Laban episode in Genesis from the exegetical point of view of *midrash*, and then offers a very compelling reading of Dina and Rachel as Biblical templates for Jessica.

Both books confirm that Shylock has remained a foil, a rite of passage, in the never resolved negotiation between Jewish intellectuals and a cultural mainstream that calls itself secular but is still marked by its Christian matrix. The paradox thus remains: Shylock continues to travel through history as a repository of anti-Semitism and an open gateway to Jewish culture. These two complementary volumes come symbolically together in Coodin's last chapter "Rebellious Daughters on the Yiddish Stage" and in Michelle Ephraim's essay "Jessica's Jewish Identity in Contemporary Feminist Novels": if both books enshrine the Jewish male protagonist in their titles, they show that some of the most original reinterpretations of the play have come from the feminist effort to reclaim, on stage and page, the silenced Jewish woman's voice.

SHAUL BASSI (VENEDIG)

On Quoting Shakespeare

Julie Maxwell and Kate Rumbold eds, *Shakespeare and Quotation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. xii, 312 pp. – ISBN 978-1-107-13424-9 – £ 75.00 (hb.).

Regula Hohl Trillini, *Casual Shakespeare: Three Centuries of Verbal Echoes*. Routledge Studies in Shakespeare. New York: Routledge, 2018. xiv, 200 pp. – ISBN 978-1-138-71014-6 – £ 115.00 (hb.).

These two books appear at a moment when to use and recognize Shakespeare quotations no longer requires anyone to remember his work or even to read it. In *Shakespeare and Quotation*, Julie Maxwell and Kate Rumbold have assembled essays that cover an extraordinary range – from Shakespeare's own quoting practice to quotation by contemporaries and successors, to quotations at several removes from the original, to verbal games that question the practice itself. Regula Hohl Trillini follows a similar chronological progression in *Casual Shakespeare*, but she focuses largely on *Hamlet* and on the discoveries that can be made through internet searches.

The first section of the essay collection focuses on Shakespeare's own lifetime. He is quoted in anthologies as early as 1600 – during the so-called Poets' War, when, as James Bednarz says, writers constantly quoted and parodied each other. He also quoted others: Douglas Bruster, who highlights the extent of quoted discourse in *Hamlet*, notes that the plays with the most quotations belong to the period during which the anthologists were collecting material. This is also the period of the Falstaff plays; Beatrice Groves shows how Falstaff's numerous Scriptural allusions are understood and built on by Hal.

People who quote Shakespeare look silly when their moral generalizations turn out to come from Iago, but they are simply behaving like Renaissance anthologists who removed their selections from the original context to make them universally applicable. Kevin Petersen thinks that the quotation marks in *Lucrece* mean that "Shakespeare wants you to quote him" (p. 46), but he also argues that the moralistic *sententiae* are undermined by the story itself. Perhaps Shakespeare came to distrust moral generalizations; certainly, there are fewer in the later plays. In Act 1, scene 3 of *Othello*, when the Duke of Venice offers "a sentence" to make Brabantio feel better, the senator reacts by parodying his *sententiae*, then rejects them as "equivocal".

In the book's second section, authors examine (and sometimes race through) the rich material on literary quotation before the internet age. Quotation, in both authors and their characters, becomes revelatory. Rumbold's introduction

notes the importance of Dodd's *Beauties of Shakespeare* (1752), while her essay argues that the fact that Richardson's Lovelace apparently quotes Shakespeare at second hand reflects on him rather than on Richardson. Brean Hammond shows that Pope's index to his Shakespeare edition provides some of the headings that Dodd used. Fiona Ritchie and R. S. White differentiate the ways in which the Romantics used Shakespeare – e.g., Byron "aggressively appropriating Shakespeare's words for his own use" (p. 128), and Shelley absorbing them to the point of near-plagiarism. Frans De Bruyn, Gail Marshall and Ton Hoenselaars provide mini-chapters on the political uses of Shakespeare quotation (respectively) in Parliament, in the Civil Service and education, and by both England and Germany in World War I.

Daniel Pollnack-Pelzer's entertaining essay on nineteenth-century novels comments on a curious quoting practice in Dickens and on the frequent appearance of Shakespeare in conversations between Bertie Wooster and his valet Jeeves in P. G. Woodhouse's "Jeeves" stories. Craig Raine riffs on a large range of twentieth-century writers, and Toby Malone writes about filmic quotation ("Regardless of audience knowledge, Shakespeare means *something* on film", p. 206). While the relevance of Shakespeare to creative writing classes might seem limited, Julie Maxwell's chapter includes an interesting discussion of the sophisticated Shakespearean allusions in *Saturday* by Ian McEwan, a graduate of such a class.

The internet age lends itself to the most complex theorizing. Christy Desmet discusses the issues raised by, e.g., the "anagram generator" and "remixes" and "mash-ups" of the plays. Peter Kirwan offers a sensitive discussion of "constrained" works, notably Ben Power's *A Tender Thing* (*Romeo and Juliet* scrambled with authorial pastiche), and Paul Griffiths' *let me tell you* (where Ophelia uses only the limited vocabulary given her in the play). Graham Holderness, on Shakespeare in advertising, offers a surprisingly full defence of an H&M commercial based not on *Romeo and Juliet* but *West Side Story* – quotation at one remove.

The final chapter is written by three members of the team that created the website *HyperHamlet*. Stephen O'Neill takes a more general approach to internet possibilities, comparing early modern commonplacing with the "cut-and-paste" facility that makes direct quotation easier than paraphrase, and quotes from blogs on which Shakespeare is made to say things like "the trouble with quotes on the internet is that you can never know if they are genuine" (p. 284). *HyperHamlet* draws on available databases to show, line by line, how the play's language resurfaces elsewhere. Margreta de Grazia suggests in her brief afterword that "'Shakespeare and Quotation in Translation' also deserves a volume" (p. 297). *HyperHamlet* makes a start in that direction by including some examples in other languages. Balz Engler and Regula Hohl Trillini collaborate on a final section

summarizing some of these results. Unlike Sayre N. Greenfield, whose "Quoting Hamlet in the Early Seventeenth Century" (*Modern Philology*, 105 [2008], 510–534), not mentioned here, is one of the earliest uses of databased research, they are not concerned to distinguish possible from unlikely Shakespeare echoes, preferring to let their readers decide how to use the data.

Engler and Trillini distinguish academic quotation, requiring "verbatim repetition, with quotation marks and full information on author and work", from "allusion" and "literary quotation", which, "whether casual or full of referential intent, is excused from both precision and full information" (p. 293). Trillini's own book, *Casual Shakespeare*, is concerned only with the second and third kinds of quotation, which she further distinguishes according to whether writers "mark" a quotation (sometimes simply by "as the man says"), assume knowledge or quote at second hand. Using *HyperHamlet*, she includes not only quotation but parody of Shakespeare's most famous line, which spawned so many (mostly bad) variations on "to verb or not to verb". The survey ends as Shakespeare quotation reaches its peak in the period between the mid-1770s and mid-1830s, which she calls Romantic Routine. Jane Austen is suspicious of quotations, but Scott, in his historical novels, recognizes that his characters have "a different relationship to Shakespeare from that of their narrators and readers" (p. 135).

Despite its statistical method, tables and graphs, Trillini's book is lively and often witty (though she says, twice, that puns are embarrassing; has anyone thought so since Addison?). It's unfortunate, however, that a book so grounded in cutting-edge technology should be so full of errors. Since most would not have been picked up by spelling and grammar checks, they demonstrate the continuing importance of human attention to the editing and proofreading of books. The omission of words is particularly confusing: the worst case is on page 33, where a quotation is followed by a sentence that clearly requires a "not". There are a few other errors: a line from *Love's Labour's Lost* is attributed to Boyet instead of Armado on page 39, and on page 40, the Virgil of Jonson's *Poetaster* is said to quote his own works, whereas the point is that *others* quote him everywhere. Though scholars are now quite frank about their use of internet searches to save years of research, Trillini's knowledge seems mostly first-hand. Both her book and *Shakespeare and Quotation* do, however, leave me wondering whether there will soon be any place for the thrill one feels when, without technological help, one remembers another person's words that fit a situation perfectly. As Christy Desmet writes, "quotation is a deeply embodied and powerfully affective act that has within it something beyond language" (p. 246).

LOIS POTTER (LONDON)

Shakespeare's Times

Lukas Lammers, *Shakespearean Temporalities: History on the Early Modern Stage.*
Routledge Studies in Shakespeare. London: Routledge, 2018. ix, 226 pp. – ISBN
978-1-138-47747-6 – £ 115.00 (hb.).

Lauren Shohet ed., *Temporality, Genre and Experience in the Age of Shakespeare:
Forms of Time.* Arden Shakespeare. London: Bloomsbury, 2018. xiv, 328 pp. –
ISBN 978-1-3500-1729-0 – £ 75.00 (hb.).

Studies of the construction and interaction of multiple temporalities in post-
colonial studies (Chakrabarty), in anthropology (Fabian), as well as in feminist
and queer studies (Felski, Halberstam) have recently prompted inquiries into the
construction, performance, differentiation and hybridization of temporalities in
early modern literature, often with a view to respective historical, ideological
or performative-aesthetic concerns and at the intersections of performance,
materiality or periodization, as exemplified by Jonathan Gil Harris's important
book on *Untimely Matter* (2009). Within different theoretical and methodologi-
cal frameworks, Lukas Lammers's monograph and Lauren Shohet's essay collec-
tion extend and redirect this kind of investigation.

In *Shakespearean Temporalities*, Lammers is interested in the representation
and performance of the past in Shakespeare's histories. In particular, the focus
is on the presentation of history *as* history, on the performance of temporal dis-
tance. The book thus redresses and complements a dominant interest in the topi-
cality of the history plays, a side effect of a new historicism that puts a premium
on synchronic rather than diachronic analyses. The inquiry into Shakespeare's
"dramaturgy of historical temporality" (p. 16) ensues with a view to the double
temporality of theatrical representation, which can be variously utilized to gen-
erate temporal proximity and alterity, a "sense of the *pastness of the past*" (p. 3).
Lammers's aim is to analyze the "process of producing an experience of distance
and difference through the creation of multiple temporal layers" (p. 9). The study
is subdivided into four chapters, dealing with different plays and with their di-
vergent strategies of modelling temporal distance. In the first chapter, the author
reads *1 Henry VI* against the background of "rivalling collaboration", of history as
it was presented on the stage by other companies. Considering intertextual refer-
ences and performance history, Lammers suggests that *1 Henry VI* can be seen
as closing a "narrative gap" (p. 49) in English history as it was staged by rivalling
companies, a collaborative and competitive enterprise that enabled multiple and
non-chronological pathways through post-conquest history for playgoers. The
second chapter presents a reading of *Richard II* as engaging and alienating spec-

tators from "perspectives available from *within* the world represented on stage" (p. 59). For example, divergent temporalities are made tangible by means of the play's play with optics (anamorphism). In the third chapter, Lammers interprets *King John* as a recuperation of pre-Schism history as a response to revisionist Protestant historiography, foregrounding temporal alterity and encouraging audiences to "reconsider the rivalling traditions of the King John story" (p. 117). *Macbeth*, Lammers argues in the final chapter, writes history across the "rupture of the Jacobean moment" (p. 141). Pitting incompatible temporalities (circularity and progress) against each other, the play becomes a sustained investigation of the complexities attendant upon reconciling Stuart and Tudor pasts. Lammers's very nuanced, insightful and richly contextualized readings of the plays and their engagement with the past are an important contribution to the study of Shakespeare's history plays. Moreover, *Shakespearean Temporalities* frequently gestures (albeit often implicitly) to the larger theoretical questions revolving around the historiographical, ideological, performative and aesthetic effects of the construction and representation of multiple temporalities that also form the background for the second book under review.

The purpose of *Temporality, Genre and Experience in the Age of Shakespeare*, Shohet states in the introduction, is to study "the *operations* of forms' interventions in temporality, and conversely the transactional dynamics of temporality's impact on forms" (p. 5), whereby *form* is not restricted to genre, but includes media, social conventions, historiography etc. The book thus steers work interested in the representation of multiple temporalities in early modern texts towards a (timely) inquiry into the interaction of temporalities with genre, a heuristic that is habitually neglected in new historical work and that represents "one of the most familiar forms of palimpsested time" (p. 7). Reviewing relevant theoretical accounts of the construction of temporalities (Bakhtin, Nagel and Wood, Serres), recent work on Shakespearean temporalities (Kastan, Wagner, Harris), and approaches to early modern genres, the introduction charts the important reference points for the individual contributions. Interrelating "large-scale and small-scale aspects of both time and form", however, the essays are "[i]ntentionally eclectic" in how they "illuminate the different kinds of meaning that come about through gaps as well as overlays, dissonance as well as resonance, between various models of time and various kinds of form" (pp. 19–20). In the first section of the volume, "Illuminating", Kent Cartwright discusses strategies of modelling and reflecting time in Shakespeare's comedies; Raphael Falco highlights the temporal differences between dramatic direction and dramatic suspense in *Hamlet* and *The Changeling*; and Philip Lorenz investigates *Henry VIII*'s experiments with different conceptions of time in relation to sovereign power through the

lens of the Benjaminian *Trauerspiel*. The second section, "Synthesizing", comprises essays by Andrew Griffin on topicality and temporal alterity in *Henry V*, and by Shohet on the interplay of genre and temporality in *Troilus and Cressida* and *Pericles*. In the third section, "Misaligning", Matthew Harrison enquires into the temporalities of poetics in *Love's Labour's Lost*; Lucy Munro demonstrates how *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* simultaneously resists and inhabits its own moment; and Rebecca Bushnell shows how editorial intervention controlled the unruly, multiple temporalities of *Antony and Cleopatra*. In the fourth part, "Proliferating", William C. Carroll engages with the worrying of diachronic time in *Hamlet*; Lara Dodds examines the construction of affective counterfactuals for the contemplation of alternative temporalities in Cary's *The Tragedy of Mariam*; and Meredith Beales shows how *King Lear* hints at a future that ultimately retreats into the past. The last section, "Pleating", features essays by Robin S. Stewart on eschatological iconography and collective temporalities (in Memling, Signorelli, Foxe and Hobbes), and by Valerie Wayne on the temporal density generated by temporal dissonance in *Cymbeline*. Overall, this essay collection bursts with thought-provoking, frequently excellent work. The subdivision into five parts bespeaks the editorial desire to structure an otherwise rather heterogeneous volume. While such a structuring may work for some of the essays, it also bears the risk of curbing the creative and critical potential of the individual essays. Ultimately, the many different approaches and ideas that individual contributions bring to the study of equally manifold relationships between form and time is the major strength of the volume, and will thus no doubt stimulate and enrich future work. As indicated in particular by Munro's, Cary's and Stewart's contributions, this critical conversation will also benefit from a broader inclusion of non-Shakespearean texts and, one might add, from considerations of the interactions of genre and temporality in the antecedent medieval tradition.

WOLFRAM KELLER (BERLIN)

Einzelrezensionen

Sophie Chiari and Mickaël Popelard eds, *Spectacular Science, Technology and Superstition in the Age of Shakespeare*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017. 288 pp. – ISBN 978-1-4744-2781-4 – £ 80.00 (hb.).

Spectacular Science, Technology and Superstition in the Age of Shakespeare is an enlightening addition to research in early modern science, history and performance. Combining exploration of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century thinking, the book positions Shakespeare's plays securely within their cultural, social and scientific contexts. The introduction, written by co-editors Sophie Chiari and Mickaël Popelard, invites us to consider what we know about the theatre and science, and presents the opportunity to re-establish connections with influential thinkers.

The book is divided into four sections. In Part I, "Popular Beliefs", François Laroque and Pierre Kapitaniak examine Shakespeare's relationship with astrology and witchcraft. They successfully encourage us to question what we already know through the eyes of Shakespeare and the early modern theatre community. Laroque's exploration of *Romeo and Juliet* as an exercise of astrology re-contextualizes the events of the play, making it more starkly relatable, while Kapitaniak draws on influential texts, such as Reginald Scot's *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584), to give *Macbeth* new meaning.

Opening Part II, "Healing and Improving", Sélima Lejri's interesting work on hysteria demonstrates Shakespeare's balancing of fact and audience pleasure. Using examples from *Othello*, *Macbeth* and *The Winter's Tale*, Lejri showcases Shakespeare's ability to draw influence from science, magic and witchcraft, whereas Pierre Iselin discusses the interesting relationship between music and narrative in *Twelfth Night*. Here, Iselin highlights the capacity of music to function as meta-commentary, finding melancholy in it. Finally, Margaret Jones-Davies encourages us to think afresh about the role of alchemy in Shakespeare's work, drawing our attention to the relationship between religion and science.

Part III, "Knowledge and (Re)Discoveries", opens with Jonathan Pollock demonstrating the need to conduct close readings of Shakespeare's plays. Using evidence from across the period to understand the relationships between science and the theatre, he fruitfully demonstrates the interwoven philosophies of Epicureanism that are deeply rooted within Shakespeare's work. Next, *Love's Labour's Lost* and optics are explored by Anne-Valerié Dulac, who presents a valuable appreciation of a complex but compelling connection between Shakespeare's play and the development of optical science. Frank Lestringant and Mickaël Pope-

lard explore *The Tempest* and Shakespeare's purposeful use of scientific discovery to develop characters and fictional lands. Lestringant captivatingly argues that Gonzalo is a complete understanding of the subtleties of Montaigne's work, shedding light on the character's purpose and importance. Popelard promotes the complexity with which Shakespeare handles aspects of the world, importantly stressing how he embedded plays with up-to-date knowledge and learning.

In Part IV, "Mechanical Tropes", Sophie Chiari traces the creation of time pieces, noting Shakespeare's use of time as both a new creation and emblem of representation, and demonstrating the importance of time keeping in his plays. The audience are the focus of Liliane Campos's exploration of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* as she examines Stoppard's use of cosmological tropes from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

Collectively, this book opens new opportunities for discovery, and reminds us that there is always more to learn and consider, and greater connections between science and the theatre to establish. The real strengths of this book are the range of plays explored and the examination of the plays from different perspectives. The collection clearly demonstrates the wide-reaching knowledge and skill of Shakespeare, and the importance of scientific discovery to the plays. This collection perhaps misses some opportunities to explore how science altered the foundations of the early modern stage space, but it provides the ideal grounds for future explorations in this area.

LYNDSEY BAKEWELL (DE MONTFORT UNIVERSITY)

Andrew Hadfield, *Lying in Early Modern English Culture: From the Oath of Supremacy to the Oath of Allegiance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. 384 pp. – ISBN 978-0-19-878946-8 – £ 60.00 (hb.).

Andrew Hadfield's vibrant and wide-ranging study is a cultural exploration of lies and lying that stretches from the Oath of Supremacy (1534) to the Oath of Allegiance (1606) set down by King James in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot. He examines how lying – and related issues of speech, silence and oaths – shifted in complex ways over this period in response to the intellectual and cultural changes that followed the Reformation. By the early seventeenth century, lies had become "part of the intellectual furniture" and lying itself "more central to the imagination" (p. 309).

This substantial work should serve as a major reference point for anyone interested in language and truth across all elements of early modern English culture.

It adds to recent scholarly interest in related issues of truth and obligation in the period, joining studies on oaths and misleading rhetoric, such as, most recently, John Kerrigan's *Shakespeare's Binding Language* (2016). While Kerrigan's major monograph is ultimately focused on reading Shakespearean drama, Hadfield is concerned with wider cultural manifestations of lying and responses to it – from Richard Tottell's printhouse to the Thomas Overbury scandal to Shakespeare's *Othello*. As a result, the book draws on an impressive amount of material, and the wider chronological treatment of the topic is rooted throughout in illuminating close readings that are concisely and entertainingly drawn out in the space of several pages.

The book is split into two sections, with the first part treating the two oaths of its title via the trials of Thomas More and Anne Boleyn, the Jesuit Henry Garnet's experience as an apprentice printing *Tottell's Miscellany*, and the writing of Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson and George Abbott. These first chapters set up Hadfield's contention that "the Oath of Supremacy encouraged the proliferation of lies and lying" (p. 67) – a subject that is explored in the different "modes" of lying that spread across early modern English culture and that form the subject of subsequent chapters: religion, rhetoric and poetics, courtesy and politics, as well as testimony. Hadfield eschews a conclusion and finishes instead with a reading of *Othello* that positions the play as representative of the culture of lies developed in England by the first decade of the seventeenth century.

Given the book's breadth of primary material, Hadfield explores both elite and non-elite experiences of lying, turning from the figures of the court and doctrinal authorities such as Saint Augustine to the workaday urban sensorium that is William Baldwin's *Beware the Cat* – a text that "reveals men and women caught between a series of competing authorities" in which "it is not clear who tells the truth and who lies" (p. 135). The result is a truly interdisciplinary discussion of each sub-topic. Moreover, in his exploration of courtesy, Hadfield makes use of several genres (moral philosophy, courtesy manuals, poetry and drama) to consider the international influences on English culture (including Bodin and Gentillet). He shows how anxiety about truth arose from "a culture that placed significant emphasis on courteous speech and behaviour, but was also afraid of them, just as it both valued and feared the practice of rhetoric" (p. 204). In exploring questions of testimony, the book moves from an emphasis on eyewitness accounts (though not touching in depth on actual legal practice) to their popular articulations in accounts of Robert Greene's death, Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* (1594), and murder pamphlets: certainly no Lenten stuff.

This book is a major scholarly achievement that paints a full and vivid picture of the many different forms of lying at work – or feared to be at work – across

the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, as well as the varied attempts to understand, reshape, or define the truth. With its lively style and absorbing readings of such a range of texts, it is no lie to say it is also a pleasure to read.

<div style="text-align:right">CALLAN DAVIES (LONDON)</div>

Bastian Kuhl, *Verhandlungen von Kindlichkeit: Die englischen Kinderschauspieltruppen der Shakespeare-Zeit.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2018. 267 S. – ISBN 978-3-8253-6827-2 – € 45.00 (hb.).

Die vorliegende Arbeit widmet sich einem besonders spannenden Moment der englischen Theatergeschichte: der Wiedereröffnung zweier Theater in London, in denen sämtliche Rollen von Knaben gespielt wurden. In den Jahren 1599 und 1600 waren dies die Children of Paul's und die Children of the Chapel. Der Verfasser trägt zunächst umfangreiche Quellen zu den Begleitumständen dieser Theatereröffnung und des Theaterbetriebs zusammen, bevor er die ersten in diesen Theatern aufgeführten Dramen, John Marstons *Antonio and Mellida* und *Antonio's Revenge* sowie John Lylys *Love's Metamorphosis*, einem *close reading* unterzieht. Sein Ziel dabei ist es, "Verhandlungen von Kindlichkeit" sichtbar werden zu lassen (S. 47) und zu ergründen, "welchen – beispielsweise ästhetischen, politischen oder moralischen – Zwecken ihre Repräsentation zugeordnet oder unterworfen werden kann" (S. 47). Mit dieser Zielsetzung stellt sich der Verfasser in einen bewussten Gegensatz zu Edel Lambs Studie *Performing Childhood in Early Modern Theatre* (2009) und deren Suche nach einer spezifisch kindlichen Subjektivität im frühneuzeitlichen Theater (S. 45). Diese Abgrenzung erfolgt auch vor dem Hintergrund der Prämissen, dass Kinder im Mittelalter und in der Früher Neuzeit vor allem als "Besitz" verstanden worden seien (S. 26–27), dass die Institution der "nuclear family" erst im siebzehnten Jahrhundert aufgekommen wäre (S, 27) und dass Kinder als mit Mängeln behaftete Wesen definiert worden seien (S. 41); auch der bekannten These von Ariès von der Erfindung der Kindheit in der Aufklärung scheint sich der Verfasser anzuschließen (S. 43), obwohl ihm abweichende Konzepte bekannt sind (S. 28, Anm. 44) – angemerkt sei, dass die hier zitierten Shakespeare-Stellen (S. 41, Anm. 82 und 83) auch als Gegenbeispiele verstanden werden können: Florizel (nicht Mamillius, wie der Verfasser schreibt) und Young Martius besitzen gerade aufgrund ihrer Kindlichkeit Qualitäten, die den Erwachsenen ihres Umfeldes abgehen.

Überzeugend stellt der Verfasser anschließend Marstons für die Children of Paul's verfasste Dramen in den Kontext von dessen satirischen Werken und ar-

beitet detailliert die mannigfachen Funktionen heraus, die Kindlichkeit in diesen Dramen erhält. Zentrale Aspekte sind hierbei das Verständnis der Dramen als "'anti-mimetische' Experimente" (S. 67), die Instrumentalisierung von "'kindlicher' Unschuld" als Maske für satirische Invektiven (S. 80), die "kaum zu überwindende Metatheatralität" (S. 82) sowie die parodistische Infragestellung von Männlichkeitskonzepten und sexuellen Identitäten (S. 104–141). Auch die vom Verfasser vorgelegte Interpretation von John Lylys Cupid-Trilogie (bestehend aus *Sappho and Phao*, *Galathea* und *Love's Metamorphosis*) lässt vielschichtige Dramatisierungen von Kindlichkeit und Adoleszenz sowie uneindeutige Geschlechterrollen deutlich werden; die Dramatisierung von Cupido als dominanter Herrscherfigur in *Love's Metamorphosis* dient hierbei der Manifestation des besonderen ästhetischen Anspruchs der neugegründeten Children of the Chapel (S. 226). Mehr Verwirrung als Klarheit stiftet indessen das vorangestellte Kapitel zur Geschichte der Cupido-Mythologie (S. 153–177). Der Verfasser benennt eine Fülle heterogener antiker, mittelalterlicher und frühneuzeitlicher Quellen und zitiert zahlreiche gelehrte Abhandlungen. Den zentralen antiken Text zur Eros-Mythologie, Platons *Symposion*, scheint er jedoch ebenso wenig zu kennen wie die Neuinterpretation von Cupidos Blindheit durch Pico della Mirandola und Giordano Bruno. Angemerkt sei auch, dass Anteros bei Platon (*Phaidros*, 255d) nicht der "Bruder" (S. 162) des Eros ist, sondern dessen *eidolon*, 'schattenhaftes Abbild'.

Ein ganz großes Lob verdient der Verfasser für seine "Coda", die Vorstellungen der Edward's Boys, der 2004 gegründeten Schultheatergruppe der King Edward VI School in Stratford-upon-Avon, in der wiederum Knaben die für Knaben verfassten frühneuzeitlichen Dramen zur Aufführung bringen. Die besprochenen Inszenierungen von Middletons *A Mad World*, *My Masters* und *Galathea* machen nicht nur die Lebendigkeit der alten Dramentexte deutlich, sondern faszinieren durch ihre Inszenierung von Kindlichkeit und Adoleszenz, durch die "physicality and androgynous beauty" (S. 228) der schauspielenden Jungen und damit durch jene Qualitäten, die offensichtlich auch die ursprünglichen Zuschauer der Stücke Lylys, Marstons und Jonsons in ihren Bann schlugen. Schade nur, dass sich der Verfasser nicht veranlasst gesehen hat, seine eingangs vorgetragenen ideologischen Annahmen von einem angeblich noch nicht vorhandenen Verständnis von Kindheit und Kindlichkeit im sechzehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhundert zu revidieren.

THOMAS KULLMANN (OSNABRÜCK)

Anne Barton, *The Shakespearean Forest*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. 200 pp. – ISBN 978-0-521-57344-3 – £ 75.00 (hb.).

This is Anne Barton's final monograph, largely finished but unpublished at the time of her death in 2013. It has been edited from her papers by Hester Lees-Davies and book-ended with a foreword by Adrian Poole, an afterword by Peter Holland, and a substantial further reading section by Lees-Davies. As with Shakespeare, woodland spaces and cultures were a career-long interest for Barton, and this study extends her previously published lectures on the subject. Above all, this is a brilliantly learned and critically rewarding *envoi* by an eminent Shakespearian widely admired for her scholarly elegance.

Barton's approach to forests could be described as proto-ecocritical. She makes only passing reference to the present-day crisis of global forests, and she does not refer to ecocriticism of historical literature that began to emerge from the 1990s onward. Nonetheless there is much in Barton's astonishingly wide knowledge of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century drama and woodland contexts that will contribute to research of present-day ecocritics, cultural and theatre historians, and posthumanists.

The first chapter, "Into the Woods", sets up historical definitions of early modern forests and woods, related activities of hunting, silviculture and woodmanship, and their social and political contexts. In particular, Barton contrasts the varied identities and uses of English forests – as dense, dark, and/or romantic spaces in *Titus Andronicus*, for example; as legally independent royal domains in *Henry IV Part Two*; or as physical entities encompassing pasture, arable land and towns in *The Merry Wives*. Barton's forest becomes a meta-topos for the diversity of woodland roles and stories created by early modern dramatists.

Chapter 2, "Staging the Forest", explores stage representations of trees and forests in drama, pageantry and masques. More than decorative backdrop, the varied physical forms and symbolic values of theatrical trees challenge assertions that early modern stages were 'bare' except for a few emblematic props. And when representations became illusionist (e.g. Inigo Jones's stage flats), they were not simply mimetic but re-creative artworks. Chapter 3, "The Wild Man in the Forest", explores the popularity of the early modern wild man, adapted from the classical and medieval 'wood'-man, by revealing its undercurrents of nostalgic desire for a traditional woodland culture being killed off by deforestation and privatization.

"Like the Old Robin Hood of England", chapter 4, surveys entwined historical and fictional impersonations of the woodland outlaw. Plays such as George Peele's *Edward I* effectively juxtapose shifting ideologies of the Robin Hood

paradigm with early modern environmental controversies. Barton notes material intrusions of modern industry such as the "cole pit" in which the outlaws of Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London* (1600) hide the Earl of Bulloigne's body. Robin Hood figures in plays by Fletcher, Massinger and Shirley, Barton also argues, offered "undercover ways of commenting" (p. 89) on the Earl of Pembroke's contested mining of iron and coal in the Forest of Dean, which sparked violent local protests from 1612 onwards. The fifth chapter, "The Forest and the City", centres on representations of Waltham Forest in *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* and Beaumont's *Knight of the Burning Pestle* in ways that speak to London audiences' lived knowledge of their cultural and environmental entanglements.

The sixth and final chapter, "Let the Forest Judge", anticipates posthumanist perspectives in arguing that it "is entirely possible for the forest itself to listen, through its own ears, not through those of any human presence within it. [...] the forest [...] has a capacity, for better or worse, to remember what it has heard and even respond" (pp. 116–117). Barton discusses the forest's sentience in works ranging from *The Birth of Merlin*, to *As You Like It*, to Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood*.

Barton's last book richly explores the ability of early modern forests to reflect human values and attitudes towards the natural and social worlds, and to shape them physically, imaginatively and affectively. It also reminds us how the forest served as a self-reflexive metaphor for the generative vitality of her scholarly passions.

RANDALL MARTIN (NEW BRUNSWICK)

Nicholas Luke, *Shakespearean Arrivals: The Birth of Character*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 260 pp. – ISBN 978-1-108-42215-4 – £ 75.00 (hb.).

Character has once again become a reputable topic in Renaissance studies, and Nicholas Luke admits as much in *Shakespearean Arrivals* (p. 2). Yet readers who expect his book to contribute to the ongoing rediscovery of character in Shakespeare scholarship might be disappointed. Although Luke is ostensibly motivated by a frustration with the "postmodern scorn for 'character'" (p. 1), he is ultimately interested in that quintessentially postmodern category of 'the subject' and all it entails. The two terms, 'character' and 'subject', are insufficiently distinguished in his book, but this conceptual fuzziness serves a political agenda. Drawing on a host of theoretical sources that all present variations on the messianic leitmotif

that 'the subject' comes into being in a moment of violent disruption, Luke contends that Shakespeare's tragic characters similarly represent a "rupturing newness" (p. 2) that unsettles the fabric of the plays in which they appear (and which, by extension, also expresses an unsettling human subjectivity in general). This concern with 'character', then, is philosophical rather than theatrical: what Luke is interested in is a certain mentality in the real world, not how dramatic characters function, or are used, in plays.

The book opens with a discussion of the key concept 'arrival', which Luke discovers, in various guises, in the thought of a number of thinkers since the Renaissance; his real focus, however, appears to be the theoretical cosmos of Alain Badiou. This chapter documents how deeply the author is steeped in his theoretical sources, but readers unconvinced by their revolutionary utopianism, or Luke's esoteric idiom, might be equally unimpressed by this display of erudition. Readers might also question the overall applicability of this theoretical frame to the discussion of Shakespearean drama. Although Luke creates continuity between theory and theatre in the book's five chapters on *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, his readings become strained when considered from a *theatrical* perspective – an angle conspicuously absent from his framework. In fact, one wonders whether "existential urgency" (p. 5) is an appropriate way of describing a tragic hero at all. For Aristotle (who unfortunately is not part of Luke's philosophical pantheon, though he is likely to have provided a model for Shakespeare's understanding of drama and dramatic character), a tragic hero is neither exceptionally virtuous nor evil, and certainly not the source of radical change (*hamartia* being merely an error of judgment). Tellingly, although Luke initially appears to associate this subjectivity with "Shakespeare's *major* characters" (p. 2, emphasis mine), he eventually (with the exception of Romeo, Juliet and Hamlet) has to turn to minor or even marginal figures to find evidence of "arresting event[s] ripping the subject from its old identity in a moment of transfiguring intensity" (p. 29): Ophelia, Desdemona, Cordelia and *Macbeth*'s witches. But to depict even these characters as rupturing subjects requires more than a pinch of critical licence. Luke's contention that Desdemona is "given the dramatic impetus to […] propel a new, vulnerable subject into being" (p. 71), for instance, is not only characteristically elusive (who is this "new, vulnerable subject" meant to be: Othello or Desdemona?), but also factually incorrect. Desdemona is not a disruptive agent, and if the tragedy can be (has been) called hers (p. 71), this is because she serves as a screen for the projection of various male characters' desires. Indeed, *Othello* seems to be particularly unsuited to an investigation in terms of disruptive agency, since all characters are puppets dancing to Iago's tune and every word and deed is entangled in the resentful impresario's ploys.

Privileging character over plot, Luke reinforces a scholarly reference point from which he actually seeks to differentiate himself: the much scorned character criticism of A. C. Bradley. Yet like Bradley, Luke ultimately treats characters in plays as agents fully equipped with emotional and cognitive abilities rather than as theatrical devices whose moves are necessitated by the plot. Were he not to do so, of course, his own elaborate theoretical edifice would collapse. What would emerge from the rubble is the significant but far from momentous realization that the basic function of character in drama is to act and invite other actions in turn.

ANJA MÜLLER-WOOD (MAINZ)

Ewan Fernie, *Shakespeare for Freedom: Why the Plays Matter.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. x, 327 pp. – ISBN 978-1-107-13085-2 – £ 35.00 (hb.).

Ewan Fernie's book swirls with energy, and anyone embarking on it is in for a boisterous, if not at times reckless, ride through the various debates on what Shakespearean freedom may stand for and how best to interpret it. This sounds like a political approach, and to a degree it is. However, the author concerns himself with philosophy and psychology as much as politics, while historically his purview extends over cultural-political events dating back to the middle of the eighteenth century (Garrick's organization of the Stratford Bicentenary Jubilee).

Other telling occasions include the German Romantic movement, in which enthusiasm for Shakespeare as a liberating intelligence led initially to perceiving similar qualities in Napoleon. The Chartist movement in Great Britain, the Hungarian revolutionary Lajos Kossuth's exploits, and the challenge of the Stratford suffragettes in 1913 all made a similar impact in Fernie's eyes. Kossuth claimed to have been sustained in prison by reading Shakespeare, as later did the prisoners of Robben Island in South Africa. However, notions of inspired liberty tilt in a darker, more confused direction with the assassination of Lincoln by John Wilkes Booth. The point is that for every welcome advance of freedom a correspondingly daunting violation of its privileges is bound to occur. The key word is "Freetown", to which the Prince refers in *Romeo and Juliet* (1.1.100), as he harangues the warring families, but which acquires conceptual credit for Fernie as a place in which to debate the issues which Shakespearean drama necessarily brings alive.

What of actual readings of Shakespeare? Fernie sets out his stall in his analysis of Mark Antony's elegiac speech, beginning "Sometimes we see a cloud that's dragonish" (*AC*, 4.15.1–12). Traditionally, this is taken as a moving acknowledgment of the limitations of human experience viewed from the perspective of a

life that has tragically run its course. Fernie takes the lines beyond their speaker and regards them as exemplifying a dynamic of change which Antony cannot encompass but which represents "a new, modern era of subjective freedom" (p. 62). Tragedy as conventionally understood finds little place in such a concept. As Shakespeare is opened up to accommodate new understandings of freedom, the regular bases of interpretation are inevitably surrendered.

Hegel informs and inspires the middle sections of the book, which engage in a sustained debate with him, though one that is not altogether resolved. Fernie ends by invoking two powerful readers of Shakespeare (the argument proceeds all along as a dialogue with strong voices): the quirky Irish philosopher-mystic John Moriarty and the poet Ted Hughes (*Shakespeare and the Goddess of Complete Being*, 1992). Violence accordingly comes to occupy centre stage. Nothing normally threatens freedom as much as violence, but could it not (Fernie conjectures) in some ways be regarded as an asset, as when A. C. Bradley, an unexpected, incisive voice in this study, argues for the "good" in Macbeth (pp. 185–186)? The synaptic leaps connecting Shakespeare with investigations into freedom do not always come off, and the argument is frustratingly unclear at key moments. However, Fernie pursues his thoughts throughout with an appealing stylish vigour and engagement.

JOHN ROE (YORK)

Marlena Tronicke, *Shakespeare's Suicides: Dead Bodies that Matter*. Routledge Studies in Shakespeare 26. New York: Routledge, 2018. 208 pp. – ISBN 978-0-8153-8044-3 – £ 115.00 (hb.).

Are suicides gendered? Marlena Tronicke's monograph *Shakespeare's Suicides: Dead Bodies that Matter* convincingly shows that there is an entire set of gender discourses involved in Shakespearean negotiations of deaths, not only but especially in those that touch upon suicide and suicidal thoughts. These discourses range from concepts of agency and heroism to misogyny, religion, Roman and Renaissance values, genre conventions, madness and gendered representations of settings and weapons. The subtitle *Dead Bodies that Matter* references Judith Butler's discursive approach to gender, which Tronicke fruitfully employs for her discussion without, however, falling into theoretical jargon. *Shakespeare's Suicides* is an eye-opener especially concerning debates about female agency vs. marginalization in Shakespeare's plays, where female characters die more frequently offstage than male protagonists do, but where contemporary approaches may offer ways of rereading these offstage deaths as implicit critiques of gender norms.

Tronicke's most thought-provoking – and perhaps most controversial – suggestion is that female suicides in Shakespeare's drama sometimes function as acts of female agency. Take the case of *Hamlet*. Tronicke puts the spotlight not on Hamlet but on Ophelia, who is traditionally read as being silenced and eventually banished from court, and whose offstage death is symbolic of this marginalized status. Without losing sight of early modern stage conventions, which made onstage performances of drownings nearly impossible, Tronicke wonders in how far Ophelia's offstage suicide might be viewed as an "active decision or action" (p. 79), perhaps even an act of resistance against misogynistic practices at the Danish court. Such a reading also adds a gendered dimension to the gravedigger scene, which suggests – albeit in half-comic form – that Ophelia acted out of self-protection when drowning herself. In this way, Ophelia's suicide may be a way of criticizing male dominance by showing that suicide is the only action left for a woman who wanted to protect herself against male power.

Significantly, *Shakespeare's Suicides* always sets female and male deaths in relation to each other. Sometimes, incisive contrasts emerge and sometimes surprising parallels. Antony, for one, is perceived as a character who thinks that Cleopatra is outdoing him in terms of bravery in her (falsely reported) death, thus representing the woman as the most 'heroic' character in the play. Similarly, Lady Macbeth – who is never openly said to commit suicide but who is frequently perceived in this way – is seen as being spared the fate of her husband, i.e. an onstage exhibition of the severed head. Instead, she is allowed a "dignified, self-determined exit, fitting for the central role she takes in the play" (p. 143). In addition to these better-known discussions of suicides, *Shakespeare's Suicides* also reflects upon deaths that are less obviously suicidal, but which are nevertheless connected to the topic. A case in point is Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*, who is killed by her father but whose tragic fate might beg the question as to why she does not commit suicide in the first place. Also, Desdemona's comment in her death scene that she herself committed this deed yields insight into the sense of agency and the refusal of being victimized that gives a new interpretative dimension to the figure of Desdemona and female suicides in general. In this manner, reinterpretations of Shakespearean death scenes turn into entire reinterpretations of the plays. Even readers who know their Shakespeare will find valuable new ways of thinking about male and female deaths in *Shakespeare's Suicides*, and about the performance histories of the plays, including both stage and film performances, which are referenced throughout the book.

KIRSTEN SANDROCK (GÖTTINGEN)

Leah S. Marcus, *How Shakespeare Became Colonial: Editorial Tradition and the British Empire*. Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2017. viii, 168 pp. – ISBN 978-1-138-23808-4 – £ 115.00 (hb.).

The author offers an impressive and wide-ranging discussion of colonialism and the editing of Shakespeare, from the early nineteenth century to the present day. This book is a valuable read for those interested in Shakespeare studies, editorial theory or postcoloniality. Marcus's thought-provoking approach to the plays and editions that she discusses invites readers to reflect on the ways that editorial practices often preserve accretions of historical interpretations marked by colonialist worldviews and attitudes. The study begins with a useful overview of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Shakespeare criticism, empire and the rise of modern bibliography. The focus then shifts to an exploration in separate chapters of *Othello*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *As You Like It* and *The Merchant of Venice*, explicating how incipient ideas of colonialism or colonialist discourse function in these texts, and how they have been mediated by editors, both historically and in the present age.

Marcus engages with different aspects of the editorial process, such as the impact of choices about the status of variant texts, as well as the assumptions that often guided the processes of emendation, such as the 'scientific' approaches proffered by New Bibliography, which she situates alongside certain colonialist ideologies. *How Shakespeare Became Colonial* offers a wealth of insights regarding Q1/F constructions of race in *Othello*, the relationship between the dynamics of gender and the dynamics of colonial conquest in *The Taming of the Shrew*, the problematic embodiment of anti-colonialist conquest in *As You Like It*, and editorial tendencies to mask anti-Semitism in *The Merchant of Venice* by passing it off as no more than textual corruption to be rectified.

As Marcus points out in the preface, quite a few portions of the text have appeared elsewhere in one form or another. Gathering them in edited form in this book may explain why there are moments when links between certain sections seem slightly out of joint. Despite this, the overarching focus repeatedly links back to the opening chapter's discussion of how nineteenth-century idealizations of Shakespeare and British imperialism went hand in hand, elucidating the central paradox whereby "the more Shakespeare's texts became immersed in the project of civilizing conquered peoples, the less he was imagined as even incipiently complicit in the colonial project" (p. 4). The scope of this book is commendable, and it forms a vital part of a wider conversation that editors of early modern drama would benefit from having.

Although the title refers to "the British Empire", the focus on editing Shakespeare for colonial consumption is specifically on India, and could leave a reader wishing for at least a brief account of what was happening elsewhere in the British Empire. That said, the final chapter, "Editing Shakespeare for the Raj", offers a rich set of insights into how Shakespeare was enlisted as a means of propagating colonial values through the editorial process. Marcus eloquently discusses editorial strategies adopted in printed editions designed for use in Indian colleges as well as those that formed part of series such as Macmillan's English Classics for Indian University Students. Marcus demonstrates how these colonial editions tied in with editorial practice in England, given that some of the English editors and British colonials responsible for producing them later went on to edit for the New Cambridge and Arden series.

How Shakespeare Became Colonial is a timely book that contextualizes and puts into perspective a range of inherited paradigms that still exist in Shakespeare editing, as well as offering a number of general and text-specific ways in which these paradigms may be challenged. The issues that the book raises are important for helping editors and readers alike to recognize the colonial ghosts that, as Marcus demonstrates, continue to haunt editions of Shakespeare.

MARIA SHMYGOL (GENEVA)

Valerie M. Fazel and Louise Geddes eds, *The Shakespeare User: Critical and Creative Appropriations in a Networked Culture.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. xi, 257 pp. – ISBN 978-3-319-61014-6 – £ 67.99 (hb.).

The volume *The Shakespeare User: Critical and Creative Appropriations in a Networked Culture* should really be called *Shakespeare Users* or even *Shakespeare Uses*: it covers a remarkable range of materials, approaches and degrees of theorization. Of the ten essays, only Eric Johnson's autobiographical account of the Open Source Shakespeare website concerns straightforward 'users' as in "useful for researchers, yet friendly enough for casual users" (p. 192). The other 'creative appropriations' that are investigated involve "prosumers" ranging from "an online shopper, an Instagrammer, a patron, a student, a corporation, a search engine or a software program" to video game players and the "self-proclaimed fan" (p. 4). These "materials of Shakespeare" are mostly presented in fascinating, detailed readings which offer decidedly more than "a glimpse" (p. 9). Occasionally, the desire to present a full theoretical background results in a surfeit of summarizing quotations from secondary literature. Stephen O'Neill gives a perceptive account of how the potential laughs in Ophelia's mad scenes subvert patriarchal

logic in *GeekyBlonde's Hamlet* adaptation on YouTube (see p. 132) but also generalizes somewhat unnecessarily on how "participatory social media technologies imbue the user with agency" (p. 129) and how "using Shakespeare on YouTube is inseparable from the marketplace" (p. 139).

Matthew Harrison and Michael Lutz's "South of Elsinore" wears its considerable learning more lightly; their analysis of *Hamlet* videogames and novelizations demonstrates in instructive detail how these (re-)creations "reproduce Hamlet's original delay while humorously drawing attention to the player's own inability to do just what they want" (p. 32). The "unbridled exploration of a Shakespeare text" (p. 14) is less of an "illusion" in the fanboy/fangirl productions which Jennifer Holl discusses as the background of Joss Whedon's film adaptation of *Much Ado About Nothing*: fandom play obscures the boundary between amateur and professional modes in a liberating way. Similarly, academic and fan knowledge blur in the Twitter account @Shakespeare and the "William Shakespeare" Facebook posts which Danielle Rosvally looks at. Some general background on social media would have made statistical statements like "only 10.74 % [of @Shakespeare's tweets] were re-tweeted a single time" (p. 156) more meaningful (at least to the social-media-abstaining reviewer).

Two essays discuss written materials. Laura Estill's investigation of Shakespeare quotations in non-Shakespearean academic journals is a thorough and elegantly written account (see, for instance, the aphoristic phrase "Academics who draw on Shakespeare plays they have not read perform a modern kind of *sprezzatura*", p. 175) of how Shakespeare "helps us to communicate" (p. 186). More unconventionally, Nicole Edge's "Leveraging *Henry V's* Cultural Inheritance" discusses business manuals and presentations which employ Shakespeare to cover dodgy ethical positions in a really insightful way. At the price of a few thickets of jargon (and 89 endnotes), Edge's primary field of academic expertise, accounting, provides a genuinely cross-disciplinary angle, which makes her close readings of both Shakespeare and "Shakespeare" impressively insightful.

Wider political and social questions also inform two other contributions. Ruben Espinosa considers the "weight of identity politics" burdening video adaptations of *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* by Latinx students, who "look to Shakespeare and cannot find themselves therein" (p. 57). Espinosa calls for more academic analyses of "issues and understandings of immigration, assimilation, hybridity, and ethnicity", which will invite "Latinx users of Shakespeare to make him their own" (p. 57). Lehmann and Way, finally, ask important critical questions about the capitalist "attention economy" (p. 63) that operates in the "dangerous liaisons" (p. 76) between, for example, the Royal Shakespeare Company and BP.

REGULA HOHL TRILLINI (BASEL)

Katrin Suhren, *Shakespeares Charismatiker: Herrschaftsentwürfe in den Historien und Römerdramen im Blick Max Webers*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2017. 258 S. – ISBN 978-3-8253-6731-2 – € 46.00 (hb.).

In der 2016 an der Universität Hamburg vorgelegten Dissertation argumentiert Katrin Suhren, dass sich Shakespeare in seinen Historien und Römerdramen "auf die Suche nach einem neuen, den veränderten Voraussetzungen seiner Zeit gewachsenen Herrscherprofil begibt" (S. 232). Diese veränderten Voraussetzungen hätten, so Suhren, mit der sich in der Frühen Neuzeit vollziehenden allmählichen Ablösung eines auf Abstammung beruhenden durch ein an Effizienz orientierten Verständnisses von legitimer Herrschaft zu tun (vgl. S. 9–10). Suhren beschreibt diesen neuen Herrschaftstyp mithilfe von Max Webers Charisma-Konzept und wendet dessen zentrale Aspekte auf die Figuren Richard von Gloucester bzw. Richard III., Bolingbroke bzw. Heinrich IV., Prinz Heinrich bzw. Heinrich V. sowie Caesar, Mark Anton und Caius Martius bzw. Coriolanus an. Nach einer konzisen Vorstellung von Webers Kernkonzepten definiert Suhren den charismatischen Herrscher im Wesentlichen als einen aus einer Krisensituation hervorgehenden und mit einer ethisch wertneutralen Sendung versehenen Charisma-Träger, dessen Erfolg zudem von einem Gesinnungswandel bzw. der Neuorientierung einer Gefolgschaft abhängt. Zudem hänge das Gelingen des charismatischen Projekts davon ab, inwieweit es dem Herrscher gelingt sich zu bewähren, sein Charisma in den Alltag zu überführen ("Veralltäglichung", S. 23) und die Nachfolge zu sichern. Suhren zeigt, mit welch unterschiedlichem Erfolg es Shakespeares Herrscherfiguren gelingt, durch das charismatische Herrscherprofil Macht sowohl zu erwerben als auch zu behalten.

Die zentrale These lautet dabei, dass in den Werken eine Entwicklung von einer eher experimentellen Auseinandersetzung Shakespeares mit dem charismatischen Herrscherprofil (*Richard III*) über eine konsequente Umsetzung und Würdigung (*1* und *2 Henry IV.*) hin zu einem Verwerfen von Charisma als geeigneter Herrschaftseignung auszumachen sei (*Julius Caesar, Coriolanus*). Während sich Richard zwar bereits durch bestimmte charismatische Eigenschaften auszeichne, verliere er nach dem Machterwerb an charismatischer Wirkung. Bolingbroke und seinem Sohn in der zweiten Tetralogie hingegen gelänge es in weitaus größerem Maße, mittels charismatischer Techniken und Qualitäten zu herrschen. Allerdings bestünden auch zwischen Heinrich IV. und seinem Sohn Unterschiede. Obwohl sich Ersterer durch wesentlich mehr Eigenschaften eines charismatischen Herrschers auszeichne als noch zuvor Richard III. (z.B. auch nach dem Machterwerb erfreut er sich einer charismatischen Gefolgschaft), sei bei ihm eine "Rücknahme" (S. 156) der charismatischen Wirkung festzustellen,

die in Zusammenhang mit seiner Rückkehr zum Glauben an die Prinzipien der Erbmonarchie zu verstehen sei. Heinrich V. verstehe es hingegen, vor allem durch seine rhetorischen Fähigkeiten seine in Eastcheap erworbene Wirkung und Sendung dauerhaft in das Königsamt zu überführen. In den Römerdramen schließlich, so Suhren, werde das charismatische Herrschaftsprofil neben dem aristokratischen Herrschaftsmodell auch noch der Demokratie gegenübergestellt, mit dem Ergebnis, dass das Modell des charismatischen Herrschers letztlich verworfen und von Shakespeare als unzulänglich dargestellt werde.

Der Gewinn der Studie liegt zum einen in der stringenten und schlüssigen Übertragung von Webers Charisma-Modell auf die Herrscherfiguren, welches ein differenziertes Instrumentarium in der Analyse der Herrscherfiguren bereitstellt. (Allerdings ist nicht ganz nachvollziehbar, warum auf die Herrscher- und herrscherähnlichen Figuren wie Edward, Margaret, Joan und York aus der ersten Tetralogie und das Römerdrama *Antony and Cleopatra* "nicht näher eingegangen wird", S. 160.) Darüber hinaus beeindruckt die Studie durch die Anwendung des *close reading*-Verfahrens, mit dem einzelne Aspekte gezielt in den Blick genommen und illustriert werden. Es wäre allerdings wünschenswert gewesen, wenn die Analysen, so schlüssig und überzeugend sie auch auf der Figurenebene sind, die machtpolitischen Diskurse der Zeit noch stärker berücksichtigt hätten. Die Verweise auf "gesellschaftliche Veränderungen" (S. 9), "Entwicklungsprozesse[…]" (ibid.) und den "Kontrast zwischen mittelalterlichem und 'modernem' Herrschaftsverständnis" (S. 155) bleiben m.E. etwas zu allgemein.

ROLAND WEIDLE (BOCHUM)

Andrew James Hartley ed., *Shakespeare and Millennial Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. 269 pp. – ISBN 978-1-107-17172-5 – £ 75.00 (hb.).

Shakespeare's works, his words, his plots and characters pervade contemporary culture from the popular to the highbrow. There has been a lot of research on adaptation theory and presentism lately, and yet this volume is able to fill a gap: there has been comparatively little academic work on the use of Shakespeare in novels and short fiction. The volume is particularly interested in fiction in English after the turn of the millennium where we see a radical rewriting, reimagining and rethinking of Shakespeare. Its scope is both wide enough to provide a sense of the richness and strangeness of Shakespeare in fiction since the millennium, and narrow enough to form a coherent whole: it deals with "works

which seem to consciously engage with Shakespeare the man and/or his work, using direct allusion or other forms of evocation to recall the early modern component as, at the very least, a deliberate subtextual resonance, and frequently something fuller and more purposeful which inheres in the fiction's raison d'être." (p. 3). In adapting Shakespeare, many of these works shift the focus to minor and often to female characters, update the setting or language of the play, modify plots. They often use the original text at least as freely as Shakespeare used his own sources.

Why focus on fiction written since the millennium? Editor Andrew James Hartley argues that Shakespeare fictions written since then are essentially different from their predecessors. The chapters of the volume demonstrate that this claim is only slightly exaggerated. Hartley is right in pointing out how the internet has radically changed the writing, distribution and reception of fiction. The relatively new genre of 'fan fiction', for example, owes much of its rise to the internet as a platform for self-publishing and retrieving fiction in electronic form. The recent technological transformation of publishing has also helped hybrid genres and subgenres find thousands of readers. The genre of Young Adult fiction, for example – discussed in several chapters – did not exist in its present form until recently. Hartley also observes a diversification away from realism, towards more plurality in form and voice, in fictions adapting Shakespeare.

The volume demonstrates an impressive wealth and variety of appropriations which no single reader can survey. As Shakespeare scholars would expect, there is a chapter on the Hogarth Shakespeare series that features rewritings of Shakespeare by well-known authors of 'literary fiction' such as Margaret Atwood and Howard Jacobson. According to Douglas Lanier, the series is a reaction to the manifold popular and more genre-driven appropriations of Shakespeare felt to lack his 'literariness'. The volume devotes most of its pages to genres that find a broad readership worldwide but have received little scholarly attention. While Graham Holderness traces the evolution of the twenty-first century novel via a number of *Hamlet* novels, Rebecca Bushnell presents the genre of detective fiction focusing on lost Shakespeare texts. Ken Jacobson analyses evocations of Shakespeare's voice in fiction, Regina Buccola looks at fiction writing about the contested authorship of Shakespeare's plays. M. Tyler Sasser, Jennifer Flaherty, Emily Detmer-Goeberl and Erica Harteley all study fiction for young adults in which Shakespeare offers opportunities to address questions of gender. Another cluster of essays deals with Shakespeare adaptations that expressly address contemporary issues: Lisa Hopkins writes on *Macbeth* adaptations and Scottish nationalism, Sujata Iyengar on the subject of Shakespeare and cancer narratives. Christy Desmet analyses science fiction adaptations of *The Tempest*. A fascinat-

ing chapter on Shakespeare in fan fiction by Michelle Yost is followed by Laurie E. Osborne on Shakespeare and immortality: the fact that Shakespeare has become an undead creature in paranormal fiction is yet another proof that the Bard lives on as a cultural icon.

KAI WIEGANDT (TÜBINGEN)

Emily Oliver, *Shakespeare and German Reunification: The Interface of Politics and Performance*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2017. xiv, 292 pp. –
ISBN 978-1-78707-070-7 – € 69.95 (hb.).

Shakespeare has been so central to the repertoire of the German theatre that a history of his plays in performance can approximate a history of the theatre itself. This is substantially what Emily Oliver has achieved in her study of the function Shakespearean performance served in the years before and after the *Wende*. As a history of theatre's role in that conflicted time, it is a study of considerable value. The narrative is not determined by a retrospective politics of inevitability, and it captures well the unpredictability and the dynamic process in which East German theatre anticipated, partly facilitated, and then was changed by the path of reunification. But as a history of Shakespearean performance, its success is more limited, because Shakespeare's preeminence in Germany is assumed as an inevitable presence rather than interrogated.

History is the story of change, and Shakespeare's relevance and appeal has also changed; he meant something very different to the Berlin of 1989 than he did, say, to Weimar in the early nineteenth century. Oliver does not, however, identify the specifics of that meaning. Each of the five chapters offers a fund of judiciously researched information about the institution not only of the East Berlin theatre but of the East German theatre as a whole, about leading directors, actors, critics and audiences, and three of them include twenty-one case studies of Shakespeare's plays in production. With the exception of Heiner Müller's celebrated *Hamlet/Maschine* at the Deutsches Theater in 1990, no clear reason is given for selecting any of these productions. The documentary material for each production is carefully explicated and Oliver is generous in quoting critical judgements. Furthermore, she explains the devious and diverse ways of censorship in the East German theatre with considerable nuance and subtlety so we are made acutely aware of the institutional and political pressures brought to bear upon performance. However, as with so much theatre history written today, we gain little if any idea of the visceral impact of the performance on audiences. The theatre is

suspect, if not downright dangerous, to regimes such as that of East Germany, which are alert to any element of unpredictability in performance or of emotion magnified by the size of audiences, which may lead to disorder. Perhaps it is a tacit indictment of the East German theatre that such instinctively appealing productions were few and far between, but I doubt if that was the case. Oliver does not attempt to capture the grit, friction and sweat that make Shakespearean performance so compelling, nor does she specify how Shakespeare serves both as an advocate for the *status quo* and is powerfully subversive of it as well. In her final sentence Oliver hopes that the lifting of the Iron Curtain might offer a chance for Shakespeare to be liberated "from the burden of his historical function as an allegory for German politics" (p. 250). That may be a consummation devoutly to be wished, but exactly what that allegory was is never made clear.

This is an institutional history of German theatre during the *Wende*, not an artistic one and it is to be regretted that the two approaches could not be combined. But there is much here to interest the theatre historian. Oliver captures well the various ways in which the German theatre engages with the communities it serves; she is especially good on delineating the difference between the West German theatre, devoted primarily to the artistic freedom of *Regietheater*, and East German theatre, which was centred mainly on the needs of the community. And even though the publicly supported theatre throughout Germany has recently suffered a serious decline in audiences, her final comments on the rise of private theatres without subsidy, which are still focused mainly on theatre of quality rather than profit, are encouraging.

SIMON WILLIAMS (SANTA BARBARA)