with respect and refers to many of them, but some books of paramount importance are obviously unknown to him. So, he bypasses the fundamental monographs of Mikhail P. Alekseev and Yurij D. Levin about Shakespearean appropriations in Russia. The information about Shakespeare productions on the Soviet stage is taken by the Czech researcher from such unreliable sources as the out-of-date brochure of Mikhail Morozov and a very superficial essay by Roman Samarin and Alexander Nikolyukin. However, all these shortcomings are outweighed by the essential merits of Zdenek Stříbrný's interesting book, which despite its laconic quality, covers wideranging facts and contains a number of original observations. It can initiate the Western scholars and students to East European Shakespeare negotiations and provoke further investigations.

Bibliography

Alekseev, M. P., *Pushkin i mirovaja literatura* [*Pushkin and the World Literature*], Leningrad 1987, Nauka.

https://doi.org/10.18778/2083-8530.2.15

Géher István and Kiss Attila Attila (eds.) *Az értelmezés rejtett terei* [*The Hidden spaces of interpretation: emerging shakespearean scholarship in hungary*], Kijárat Kiadó Budapest 2003, ISBN 963-9529-07-8. 157 pages.

Reviewed by *Katalin Tabi*, Department of English Studies Eötvös Loránd University (Elte), Budapest, Hungary, & *Jim Casey*, Instructor, English Department, Hudson Strode Program of Renaissance Studies, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA[1]

Arsing form the October 2000 Szeged conference on "Szó és Kép" ["Word and Image"], this collection represents the work of emerging young scholars from Hungary's two major centers for doctoral studies in Baroque and Renaissance English literature: Eötvös Lóránd University (ELTE) in Budapest and Jósef Attila University (JATE) in Szeged. Characterised by experimental rather than institutionalised academic scholarship, these articles epitomise the future of Shakespeare research in Hungary. As the editors emphasise in the preface, the essays do not belong to one single critical school; they are interested in "hidden spaces", areas which traditional

[1] All translations from the essays into English are by Katalin Tabi.

Hungarian Shakespeare scholarship has not yet discovered. Bacause none of the pieces is in English, the main goal of this review is to introduce each to the essays to a greater readership by providing short evaluative summaries of each.

Ildikó Oroszlán, "Mikor 'Vig a Játék?: a Komédiás Sikertelensége a Lóvátett Lovagokban" ["What Makes a Comedy?: the Comedian's Failure in *Loves Labour's Lost*"] pp. 9–27.

Examining the semiotics of theatre and the actor-role-spectator trinity, Oroszlán explores how *Loves Labour's Lost* is itself intensely meta-dramatic, concerned with the "methodology of how theatre works" (p. 17). Using Robert Weimann's distinction between the symbolic, fictional *locus*, and the *platea*, from which the actor might "step out" of the perfo-rmance and make comments from within (1978: 211–12; 2000: 182), Oroszlán discusses Biron as a kind of outsider/insider who collaborates with the spectators in his asides. When watching the other men break their vows (4.3), he laughs at them as an outsider from the *platea* position, but is laughed at later in the locus position. Biron's ambiguous role, the two plays-within-the-play, and the ladies' exchanged masks all show that *Loves Labour's Lost* is more of a self-reflexive meta-theatrical piece than a failed comedy. The last scene, according to Oroszlán, should be read as a "struggle for concentration" (p. 23), in which the lords fail, and for which Biron, like all bad actors, blames the ladies, his audience (5.2: p. 747–51).[2] Oroszlán's own audience, unfortunately, is hypothetical, thus all her audience-response assertions are generalised and unsupported.

Ildiko Limpár, "Színjátszö Színdarab: Szerepek és Szerepzavarok a Szeget Szeggelben" ["Playing the Play: Roles and Mis-Roles in *Measure for Measure*"] pp. 29–41.

Limpár convincingly demonstrates that Shakespeare pairs well-known Biblical language with morally dubious situations as part of a strategy that confuses *Measure for Measure* textually and structurally. Limpár begins by

[2] All quotations from the play are cited from Wells and Taylor (1998).

drawing our attention to Isabella's ambiguous wording. While rejecting her would-be suitor, she simultaneously yields to him:

> That is, were I under the terms of death,
> Th' impression of keen whips I'd wear as rubies,
> And strip myself to death as to a bed
> That longing have been sick for, ere I'd yield
> My body up to shame.... (2.4: 100–4)

The reference to the marks made by the whip calls forth the image of her naked body, which is reinforced by the mention of stripping. The same unnerving effect occurs on the level of structure, with the most well-known example being Claudio's and Angelo's analogous scenes. The play's structural principle, according to Limpár, is to turn conventional points of reference upside down, making the audience question their emblematic black and white associations.

Veronika S c h a n d l, "A 'Bécsi Bácsi' a Legvidámabb Barakkban: a *Szeget Szeggel* Magyarországon, 1964–1985" ["the 'Viennese Vincentio' in the Happiest Barracks: *Measure for Measure* in Hungary, 1964–1985"] pp. 43–54.

Examining the critical reception of eight productions of *Measure for Measure* during the period of "goulash-communism" that followed the suppression of the 1956 revolt, Schandl tracks the reception and development of the play in Hungary when all aspects of culture were governed by Aczél György's 3T-principle – "támogatni, tqrni, tiltani" (endeavors "backed" by the government, "borderline" and so receiving no support, or "banned"]. Beginning with a 1964 university performance in which the bawdy comedy of the play was stressed, Schandl follows *Measure for Measure* full circle through the more daring and gradually darker interpretations of the 70s and the 80s, which map the shadows of the political system and dissect the function and responsibility of a leader in the society, to the newly sexualised 1985 production. Unlike the 1964 performance, however, which emphasised the sexual comedy to avoid political disapproval, Schandl argues that the 1985 play was produced by a people tired of politics and simply eager to enjoy life again.

Anna Szabó T., "Mit Jelent ez, Fölséges úr?: szó és Megjelenítés a *Hamletben*" ["'What Means this, my Lord?: Word and Presentation in *Hamlet*"] pp. 55–63.

Drawing on the origin of the epic, said to be born from action verbalised, Szabó T.'s essay focuses on the action of mimes and their (mis)interpretation within the play: the guards' description of Old Hamlet's ghost; Hamlet's interpretation of the ghost's words; Ophelia description of Hamlet's behavior and her father's subsequent misunderstanding; and the multiple readings of the mousetrap-mime. After the last, Hamlet makes it clear to Claudius that just as the action of the mime is followed by words, words will be followed by action. Thus, Szabó T. asserts, the connection between action and word is extended into an action-word-action progression. In her exploration of the interrelationship between utterance and representation, Szabó T. makes some remarkable observations, but the overall structure of the essay is rather clumsy. There are too many ideas and most of them are not fully investigated. After exploring the semiotic significance of mimes and verbal interpretation, for example, Szabó T. shifts to the connection between painting and depiction in *The Rape of Lucrece*, and then to a brief comparison of Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Hamlet*. Although her observations are sometimes intriguing, they seem only vaguely relevant to the topic of speech and interpretation.

Zsolt Almási, "Hercules Alakváltozásai: Hercules-Utalások Shakespeare Hamletjében" ["Hercules's Metamorphoses: Hercules-References in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*"] pp. 65–76.

In a playful and witty poststructuralist, psychoanalytical critique, Almási discusses the significance of the Hercules motif in *Hamlet* in relation to young Hamlet's search for identity. Almási notes that the recurring association of Hamlet's father with Hercules, coupled with young Hamlet's claim that Claudius is no more like Old Hamlet than he himself is to Hercules (1.2: 152–3), creates an unfortunate parallel relationship in which Hamlet is analogous to Claudius, rather than his father. Rather than exploring the implications of this "interesting subconscious magnetic field" (p. 67) however, Almási quickly moves on to other Herculean connections. For example, by comparing himself to the Nemean lion (1.4: 58–60), which falls to Hercules and then provides him with invulnerability through its hide, Hamlet situates himself subconsciously as both old Hamlet's prey and protector. Hercules

becomes a symbol then both for the paralysing father-image and for Hamlet's potential liberation. Noting the commonly held belief that the Hercules/Atlas allusion (2.2: 361–362) refers to the Globe and her actors, Almási shows how Hamlet corrupts the idea of Hercules as "the good actor" when he mocks Laertes in Act 5. Only by becoming "the bad actor" and alienating himself from his father's Hercules-image can Hamlet hope to act or gain independent autonomy. In the end, Almási rightly acknowledges that his examination ultimately brings us no closer to understanding the prince: knowing he is not Hercules/Old Hamlet still does not tell us who he is.

Ágnes M a t u s k a, "Ontológiai Határsértés: Jago Mint Puszta Reprezentáció" ["An Ontological Transgression: lago as Representation in Its Pure Form"] pp. 77–90.

Matuska examines the many similarities between Iago and the character of Vice found in the medieval morality plays: both act as the master of ceremony, both are dually spectators and participants in the performance, both interact with the audience, and both are simultaneously attractive and detestable. Iago differs greatly from Vice however, in that he refuses essentialisation – "I am not what I am" (1.1: 67) – and speaks with an unnerving moral relativism. Additionally, Shakespeare's Everyman, Othello, is not saved in the end. These and other differences, Matuska convincingly argues, mark not only an alteration in dramatic pattern, but the Foucauldian supplanting of the Classical world-view with an emergent Renaissance world-model.[3]

Kinga F ö l d v á r y, "'Félre Ezen Toldalékokkal'?: A Ruha és a Ruhátlangság Motivuma Shakespeare Három Tragédiájában" ["'Off, Off, You Lendings'?: the Motif of Clothing and of the Lack of Clothing in Shakespeare's Tragedies"] pp. 93–109.

In perhaps the simplest essay in the collection, Földváry discusses the connection between raiment and personality in *Hamlet*, *Lear*, and *Macbeth*.

[3] An English version of this article has been recently published in *The AnaChronist* 2003, pp. 46–64.

Her conclusions merely confirm conventional sartorial expectations: the wretched wear rags, the rich wear resplendent garments.

Natália P i k l i, "Lear. a Karneválkirály" ["Lear, the Carnival-King"] 111–128.

Tracing the play's medieval roots, Pikli competently compares and contrasts Lear with the carnivalesque Fool-king, or Carnival-king. In Lear, she notes, the traditional subversion of social ranks is missing – a real king becomes the Carnival-king – and this complicates Lear's role. While both the Carnival-king and Lear are deprived of their clothes, for example, in the carnival this trickery brings forth a release of positive energies, while in the tragedy it reinforces and amplifies the tragic tone. Unlike the Carnival-king, who symbolically dies and gains re-birth by the end of the festival, Lear cannot resurrect himself. Thus, Lear is transformed from Carnival-king to Death-king, the leader of a sort of *danse macabre*.

Gabriella R e u s s, "Viharos Sikerek, Sikeres Viharok: a Vigvégü és a Tragikus *Lear Király* Szin-Változási" ["Storm Successes, Successful Storms: Transformed Scenes of the Happy and Tragic *King Lear*"] pp. 129–142.

Through research at the Bodleian, Reuss has discovered a promptbook she believes to be the basis for Charles William Macready's 1834 *King Lear*. It was in this production, Reuss argues, and not the well-known 1838 performance, that Macready began the process of restoring the play from Nahum Tate's happy-ending Lear to Shakespeare's original text. Unfortunately, most of this essay simply summarises the Tate-version of the play (unavailable in Hungarian) and compares it to the Macready promptbook in light of Shakespeare's *Lear*. However, a more complete account of the textual/ bibliographic issues may be found in her previously published essay, "*Veritas Filia Temporis*, or Shakespeare Unveiled?: Charles William Macready's Restoration of Shakespeare's *King Lear* of 1834 According to His Unpublished Promptbook" in *The AnaChronist*, 2000: 88–101.

Tünde Incze, "Rejtett Terek a Macbethben" ["Hidden Spaces in *Macbeth*"] pp. 143–157.

In the least scholarly of all the essays, Incze makes some interesting observations regarding the "hidden spaces" within the play and the nihilistic nature of Macbeth, but her numerous tangents and extra-textual commentary detract from the overall scholarly goals of this perhaps overly ambitious article.

Bibliography

Wells, S. and Taylor, G. eds, *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1998.

Weimann, R., *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore-Maryland 1978.

Weimann, R., *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000.

Reuss, G., "Veritas Filia Temporis, or Shakespeare Unveiled?: Charles William Macready's Restoration of Shakespeare's King Lear of 1834 According to His Unpublished Promptbook," *The AnaChronist* 2000, 88–101.