

Interestingly, towards the end of the book, Kawachi gives her readers an opportunity to see these afterlives of Shakespeare in Japan from another perspective. In the third chapter of Part Three, “Shakespeare Business in Eighteenth-Century England”, Kawachi discusses how Shakespeare was “dis-covered” and re-created in the eighteenth century, as if to suggest that what Garrick and his contemporaries did for establishing Bardolatry is somewhat similar to what the Japanese translators and theatre practitioners did in bringing Shakespeare into Japanese culture. She does not mention “Shakespeare Business” when discussing re-creations of Shakespeare in Japan, yet the readers cannot but be aware of the business factor underlying the Japanese Shakespeares. I believe this is how Kawachi expects the readers to read her book and that this is how her book can be insightful.

At the end of the book is a list of the places where the chapters in the book were originally published. The names on the list include Moscow, New Delhi, Shanghai, Łódź, Prague as well as New York, London and Tokyo. This geographical diversity reflects not only the academic recognition she has received worldwide but the broad scope of her academic interests and activities. And this diversity is closely related to the basic concept of this book. Just as the Japanese title of the book, *Sheikusupia no Sekai*, can be also translated as “The Worlds of Shakespeare”, Kawachi shows us a variety of worlds that are created by and around Shakespeare. Towards the end of the final chapter, Kawachi writes: “In the twentieth-first century, language and literature studies should be advocated so as to promote international cultural exchanges” (297), and the readers will see that the worlds of Shakespeare have functioned as sites for such intercultural exchanges from the very time his plays were first staged. In other words, Kawachi successfully illustrates the life and afterlives of “Shakespeare” as a cultural icon. Considering the quality and range of the book, it is regrettable for non-Japanese readership that a third of the chapters are written in Japanese. Yet this book is one of the best guides available in English to the studies of Shakespeare in Japan.

<https://doi.org/10.18778/2083-8530.5.08>

***Shakespeare's Local Habitation.* Ed. Krystyna Kujawińska Courtney. Łódź: University of Łódź Press, 2007. ISBN 978-83-7525-035-0. Pp. 266. Price 25 PLN**

Reviewed by PIOTR MASZEWSKI

In his introduction to *Shakespeare's Local Habitations*, R. S. White compares William Shakespeare to a bird, which unlike dinosaurs, survived throughout the ages thanks to his ability to “move much” (7). Shakespeare, “rooted in

the history of his own age", to use the words of Werner Habicht, one of the authors included in this collection, compared to such writers as Beaumont and Fletcher, like a bird, or one bird in particular, the Phoenix, has performs "the capacity to turn and turn again" (5).

This collection of essays analyzes, in White's words, the process of a "transmutation" of Shakespeare's works, which throughout the ages have, "countless times over" acquired "a local habitation and a name" and investigates Shakespeare's plays' "glocality", to again extend White's words even further, who repeats the term "glocal" after Richard Burt, the author of "Shakespeare, Glo-cal-ization" (5). As Shakespeare is "not of an age, but for all time", as Ben Jonson quoted by Habicht states, this book examines how his plays work on "the global, the national, the ethnic," as well as "the individual" scale, focusing also on the "ubiquitousness in new media" (5). Far from attaining admiration and appreciation exclusively in the Anglo Saxon culture, Shakespeare, becomes both "local" and "global"; a "representative of that age... beliefs, ideas, imaginations, and material conditions," he is, like a bird, able to migrate to "congenial climes" and "turn into a central figure in non-English cultures" transmuting along the way into every possible artistic genre: song, painting, opera, poems, plays, novels, and most recently movies, becoming as Kott puts it, "our contemporary" (13).

The collection of essays is, conveniently, divided into three parts: "National Shakespeares", "Local Shakespeares" and "New Media and the Global Village". Each of them comprises a number of essays on various "transmutations" of Shakespeare's plays offered to the readers and audiences of "brave new worlds" and "local habitations" to appreciate and admire (10).

The book opens with Kujawińska-Courtney's "From Kott to Commerce: Shakespeare in Communist and Post-Communist Poland" (13ff). Krystyna Kujawińska-Courtney starts off by paying attention to the dual political role Shakespeare's plays acquired under the Communist regime. The audience could relate to the plays and many of their fragments which were often "spoken directly to the audience evoked standing ovation" (16). Thus, as Kujawińska-Courtney convincingly argues, Shakespeare became "a vent for the anger of a bewildering multiplicity of muted or suppressed voices" on the one hand, and a critique of the Soviet regime on the other (17). What seems even more important, however, is that Kujawińska-Courtney ponders on the process of "deliterarization" of Shakespeare on the Polish ground and the usage of his plays as a well of recognizable images to be used for the commercial purposes (e.g. brewery, Idea telephones) in the post-1989, democratic Poland, which "no longer produced valuable theatrical productions" (17). Here, Shakespeare was used more for linguistic games with words than as a means of political catharsis.

In his essay "Shakespeare, the Age of Shakespeare, and Shakespeare Reception" (33ff), Werner Habicht focuses on yet another bipolar aspect of the popularity of Shakespeare's works, when incorporated in a non-English environment. The author contemplates on the discrepancy between "past dialectics" and the "the new questions for the twenty-first century" that might arise. He therefore concentrates on both Shakespeare being "rooted in the history of his own age" and his status of being "for-all-times," to use Ben Jonson's words (33). Habicht examines the idolization and idealization of Shakespeare in Germany, starting from the eighteenth century, when he was perceived as a "genius" and his plays as "extraordinary cult objects" to the 1930s, when the appearance of a "new Germany" saw the Elizabethan period as the one which produced both real and fictional "exemplary heroes and leaders" to be looked up to, with Shakespeare himself being "proclaimed the Man of the past Millennium" (42). The author also pays attention to the various interpretations (Marxist, Freudian) that Shakespeare's plays have invited.

In his essay "Shakespeare and Mao, 1949–1966" (43ff), Murray J. Levith characterizes two "well-defined periods of Shakespeare activity" (43), the first being the times between the year 1949 and the mid-sixties and the second "roughly" from 1978 to the present, where the "in-between time is the era of the Great Proletariat Cultural Revolution in China" (43). In the first period, the author turns the readers' attention to two characteristics which influenced and modeled the way Shakespeare's works were interpreted. First of all, Mao Zedong's dictates shaped Chinese attitudes towards foreign literature. The other was Soviet Marxist criticism and the belief that in the Soviet Union, Shakespeare was held in higher esteem than in the English-speaking world. Further on, Levith goes on to name several Soviet Shakespearean scholars who praised Shakespeare's antibourgeois attitudes. As we learn from the essay, Mao Zedong's speeches had a crucial influence on the Chinese reception of Shakespeare, because he appreciated foreign art in his speeches. "Taking what is beneficial", he turned his back on the "elitist" works of art, and promoted more mass-oriented fine arts (44).

The African reception, admiration and appreciation of Shakespeare are the main focus of Laurence Wright's essay "Shakespeare in South Africa: 'Alpha' and 'Omega'" (57ff). Like Levith, Wright delineates two periods of Shakespeare's appreciation in Africa – the "Before" and the "After" – with "the liberation election of 1994 being the point of reference" (57). In his essay, Wright decides to look at two "chronological extremes" in the history of Shakespeare's productions in South Africa calling them "Alpha" and "Omega". The most important question that the author poses is apparently a very general one, "Why Shakespeare?" This is a pertinent question as Wright acknowledges that Shakespeare in Africa is "a side-show to a side-show" (57) because the South African

“creative traditions” come from its “history and tradition” (57). Wright confronts the African Shakespearean history with the appreciation of Shakespeare in Oceania. The author defines three phases of African reception of Shakespeare’s plays – apparition, a ghost, and a concrete event. The initial two refer to *Hamlet*. The third is the first recorded performance of Shakespeare in South Africa – *Henry IV, Part I*. The author then continues by enumerating several Shakespearean plays filtered through African historical events and experience.

Sukanta Chaudhuri’s “Shakespeare in India” (81ff), is an essay which revolves around the Indian interest in the works of Shakespeare. Because of “India’s long colonial history, and the presence of unusually receptive elements in the mother culture” (81) Shakespeare, “the appellation for a commodity”, “provided the biggest single channel for not only literary or artistic innovations but the underlying transformation of values” (81). As Indian writers repeatedly reached for Shakespeare’s works in the pursuit of inspiration, which resulted in everything from close translations to plays that “contain nothing authentically Shakespearean”, the Elizabethan playwright became the “major generative force” behind an “entire body of dramatic literature” (81).

The final two essays in the first part of the book entitled “National Shakespeares” might be analyzed simultaneously since they are both devoted to the discussion of Shakespeare in Australia. The first one, “Australian Shakespeare” by Alan Brissenden (99ff) is an insightful study of the history of both theatrical and cinematic productions of Shakespeare’s plays in Australia. R. S. White’s “Australian Shakespeare: Scholarship and Criticism” (119ff) offers a wide spectrum of critical works written on Shakespeare in Australia.

The next part of the book “Local Shakespeares” opens with Li Lan Yong’s essay, “Romeo and Juliets, Local/Global” (135ff). A recurring thought in the whole collection of essays is the juxtaposition of Shakespeare and his plays as representative of a given time and space with the universal significance of his works. This essay is yet another insight into the “paradigm of the relationship between popular and canonical Shakespeares” as Li Lan Yong states it (135). The universal truth of *Romeo and Juliet* gives rise to various adaptations and interpretations, more or less related to the original. The “groundbreaking” one, as Yang puts it is, however, the 1996 movie *Romeo+Juliet* directed by Baz Luhrmann (138). A further example may be the Singaporean film adaptation *Chicken Rice War*, which is the central focus of this essay. The author analyzes the way the original story was “transmuted”, to come back to R. S. White’s words, and was incorporated into the Singaporean history and cinematic traditions.

Paul J. C. M. Franssen’s main focus in his essay, “Arawks and Caribs: Shakespeare’s *Tempest* and the Indians” (155ff) is a departure from analyzing *The Tempest* as “a play primarily about colonialism”, since in recent years it has

become only “one layer among many” (155). Franssen warns the readers against a “simplified postcolonial reading”.

In his essay “All Our Tribe: The Maori *Merchant of Venice*” (165ff) MacDonald Jackson focuses on a Maori interpretation of Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice* directed by Don C. Selwyn. Jackson praises this cinematic production as it is not only “a notable enrichment of the culture of Aotearoa/New Zealand”, but because it also “makes an innovative contribution to the international history of Shakespeare on screen” becoming, as Jackson puts it, “a cross-cultural icon of exceptional interest and worth” (174). Although he points to some changes in the original version of the play, the author is especially fond of this production because it serves as a “bicultural mix” (174). Jackson surmises that Selwyn has managed to “transmute” and inscribe Shakespeare’s play into the Maori culture making use of its vast cultural heritage.

In the essay “Whose Dogberry? Or the Afterlife of John Barton’s ‘Raj’ *Much Ado*” (177ff), Herb Weil studies Dogberry, a character taken from another widely “transmuted” Shakespeare’s play *Much Ado About Nothing*. In his work Weil mentions two cinematic reproductions of this play – John Barton’s “Raj” and Kenneth Branagh’s 1993 production. This selection of movies seems particularly important for the author since Barton’s version “remains the most praised performance in any medium”, while Branagh’s is simply the most popular one (189). The focal point in Weil’s essay is the different approaches of the two directors to the character of Dogberry. The author’s defense to Hobson’s argument, quoted in this article, that this film was “widely applauded by the frustrated Imperialist audience” appears significant (178).

Whatever the main issues of the previously mentioned essays may be, they both present and investigate the changes various directors made to the original Shakespearean plays to give them a local character. Ian MacLennan, on the other hand, in his essay “‘Puzed hath bravely played her part’: National Sensibilities in English and Canadian Adaptations of Shakespeare’s *Henry IV* in 2002” (190ff) observes how “two different national sensibilities can create two radically different productions from the same basic material” (191). MacLennan studies in detail the “similarities as well as differences” between the two productions.

In her essay “Zootango’s Garden Shakespeare: Hobart 1992–1996” (197ff), which closes the second part of the whole collection of essays, Rose Gaby examines the appearance, function and eventual disappearance of a Tasmanian theatre company, Zootango. The central point of her essay is the study of a departure from Shakespeare’s works as containing “authentically Shakespearean insights and meanings” and a change “towards an analysis of the cultural work Shakespeare has been made to do” (197). Although, in its “eleven-year history” Zootang was often highly criticized, Gaby praises and appreciates such an initiative, as it opened Shakespeare to be “consumed in contexts beyond the

reach of well-known directors and institutions and outside the spaces normally reserved for 'highbrow' theatre" and places him, like in Tasmania, in open-air theatres (198).

More or less related to the original text, both the plays and the cinematic productions, however, share, one feature. None of them would have had been brought to life if it was not for Shakespeare's original plays. This aspect is, in turn, the crucial element of H. R. Coursen's essay "Shakespeare's Offshoots" (207ff) which opens the final part of this collection of essays entitled "New Media and the Global Village". The essay analyzes several cinematic and television productions which more or less closely relate to and depend upon the original Shakespearean plays. What seems decisive for the author is a statement which one can hardly oppose. As he puts it, "The offshoots that tend to fail are those that attempt to substitute 'current' language for Shakespeare's blank verse" (207). This process, inarguably, might only bring havoc and disorder.

Fiona Brideoake's essay "From 'Nobody' to 'The Author': Shakespeare in Love and the Rewriting of History" (227ff) talks about John Madden's 1998 film, *Shakespeare in Love*. This movie offers "a 'Shakespeare' as potentially challenging as the cinematic medium is, which he is reincarnated, and the critical trends that have shaped European studies since the 1980's" (227). What is also important is that author analyzes the way the real Shakespeare and his works merge.

The last two essays, "New Silk and Old Sack: Performing Shakespeare in New Media" (243ff) by Michael Best and "Writing Shakespeare" (255ff) by Heather Nimmo, may be grouped together as they seem to share a common feature. They depart from Shakespeare "the bard" and turn him into a practical tool both in contemporary cinema in Best's essay, and as an "inspiration" in Nimmo's work. One of the main elements of Best's essay seems to be an interest in the switch from the work of the actors to the work of the camera. Nimmo, who teaches Shakespeare has, on the other hand, discovered three important elements which influenced her as a reader, and still influence her as a writer and a teacher, which she calls – *the mystery of influence, the detail of his [Shakespeare's] work as a craftsman that remains to be discovered at close quarters in the theater itself, and the premise*.

The whole collection of essays may be easily inscribed in the ongoing discussion on Shakespeare. This book seems especially important as it offers a very wide spectrum of international "transmutations", an ample range of "congenial climes" which Shakespeare, this bird-like bard, has reached over the ages. It may easily be called a crucial reading not only for Shakespearean scholars, but also for those who appreciate and admire Shakespeare for his continuous popularity all over the world.