

## Book Reviews

**Miola, S. Robert, ed. *Macbeth*. By William Shakespeare. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2004. Pp. xxiii + 384. [South Asian Edition]**

Reviewed by *Chandrima Das*\*

Although it was established way back in 1923, W. W. Norton & Company is a comparatively recent player in the arena of Shakespearean texts. Only in the year 2003 did it make a foray into a world which has been dominated by Arden, Cambridge and Oxford University Presses for more than a century. Fortunately, however this late entry has not detracted from the merit of the Norton Critical Edition series. In a publishing market already teeming with editions of Shakespeare of widely varying standards, the Norton Critical Editions have been able to carve a niche for themselves despite belonging to a higher price bracket, at least in the context of the Indian market.

The greatest merit of the Norton Critical Editions series in general is that they make available to the readers, in a single volume, relevant sources and secondary critical material along with an authoritative text. This edition of *Macbeth*, edited by Robert S. Miola, is no exception. The text of the play, which is based on the First Folio of 1623, is accompanied by a broad range of background material. The “Sources and Contexts” section which follows the text of the play is further subdivided into three separate segments—Sources, Cultural Controversies and Adaptations. Materials provided in these segments help the readers to comprehend the moment of the play’s origin, the cultural context it was embedded in, and its chequered afterlives, respectively. The “Sources” not only include the relevant parts of Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles*—which provided the basic outline for the plot of the play—but also excerpts from Medieval mystery plays, along with Seneca’s *Medea*, *Hercules Furens* and *Agamemnon* which throw light upon certain important images and ideas that recur in the play. This section effectively broadens the notion of derivation and influence by going beyond the obvious primary sources and including texts

---

\* Chandrima Das is Assistant Professor of English at Durgapur Women’s College, West Bengal, India.

which influenced the tone and the mood of the play in general. Evidently, special care has been taken in the proper arrangement of this section in terms of relevance and accessibility. “The Slaughter of the Holy Innocents and the Death of Herod” taken from the *N-Town Cycle* definitely postdates Seneca’s *Medea*, but has been placed before it. Thomas Newton’s edition of *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies, Translated into Englysh* was published only in 1581, indicating that the excerpts have been arranged not on the basis of the date of original composition but according to the chronology of their availability to the playwright. These excerpts provide a suitable point of entry into the particularly violent and gloomy verbal pattern of the text. Excerpts from the works of Martin Luther and Desiderius Erasmus, Reginald Scot and King James I, Juan de Mariana and Henry Garnet, provide the context for many of the most pertinent political and spiritual issues broached in the play. The section titled “Adaptations” again embraces a wide gamut of texts ranging from William Davenant’s bowdlerized version and nineteenth century travesties of the *Macbeth* to the immensely interesting contemporary appropriation of the play by the South African playwright Welcome Msomi. This section is a living testimony to the play’s endurance in cultural memory.

The “Criticism” section comprises seventeen critical essays and responses to the play—the first of which dates from 1611, and the last is a commissioned article specially written for the Norton Critical Edition. Along with the well-known Romantic responses to the play, the readers are also offered a variety of interpretations which range from the closely textual (Kenneth Muir, “Image and Symbol in *Macbeth*,” 1966) to the ones which engage overtly with the ideological content of the play (Janet Adelman, “The Construction of Masculinity in *Macbeth*,” 1992). The unbroken tradition of Shakespearean criticism of almost four centuries creates interesting moments within this section when later critical perspectives attempt to revise, supplement or complement the views of older critics. Harry Levin’s “Two Scenes from *Macbeth*,” for instance, revisits the Porter’s scene and engages with Thomas De Quincey’s famous reading of the very same scene, also included in the volume. The critical focus on the textual and the ideological aspects of the play however, does not undermine its status as a performance text. Sarah Siddons and Derek Jacobi’s experiences of performing *Macbeth*; and Peter Holland’s survey of the various cinematic adaptations of the play bring to the foreground the complex negotiations between the written and the performance texts. Another important feature of this particular edition is the substantial Introduction written by the editor. Usually, Norton Critical Editions come with a Preface which tends to serve as an introduction to the edition itself, and not to the text. Robert Miola has deviated from this standard practice and has provided an introduction which posits the play against Classical archetypes and focuses upon the questions of

moral and divine justice latent in the play. The Introduction should be regarded as a critical essay on its own.

However, unlike the Arden or New Cambridge Shakespeare editions, Norton editions of Shakespeare do not provide exhaustive annotations or textual commentary on the same page with the text. The annotations provided in this edition of *Macbeth* are more in the nature of brief elucidations of difficult or ambiguous expressions. An example will suffice—"hurly-burly" (1:1:3), in the Norton Edition is explained simply as "commotion" whereas the very same expression in the Arden Edition (Muir 2004) has been defined as "uproar, tumult, confusion, esp. the tumult of sedition or insurrection" and is supplemented by a detailed list of prior occurrences of the word, followed by the relevant observation by L. C. Knights on the possible implications of the expression. The wide-ranging general surveys of textual, contextual and critical background to the play to be found in the introductory material of the other standard editions are also absent from the Norton Editions. In its stead, the Norton edition provides a judicious selection of some of the best available critical perspectives on the play and a broader range of source material. The emphasis, in case of the Norton Edition, lies less on resolving the debates regarding the accuracy of the text and the date of composition of the plays, and more on its interpretive possibilities.

More than four hundred years after its first performance, the shortest and arguably the most intense of Shakespeare's great tragedies still resonates as an incredibly powerful depiction of ambition, power lust, guilt and human agency. The Norton Critical Edition of *Macbeth* makes an attempt to capture the complex and layered nature of the text and succeeds in its endeavour. Designed for advanced readers who come to the text already equipped with a basic knowledge of its background, it is an invaluable compendium for the reader who is looking for an edition which provides a wide range of critical perspectives along with a minimally annotated text of the play.

**Tiffany Ann Conroy Moore, *Kozintsev's Shakespeare Films: Russian Political Protest in Hamlet and King Lear*. Jefferson, North Carolina, and London: McFarland & Company, 2012. Pp. viii + 194.**

Reviewed by *Samrat Laskar*\*

There is no denying the fact that Shakespeare is the single most important author who continues to exert maximum impact in the field of performance, both on stage and screen. His influence has traversed the “shadow lines” of national boundaries and he has been embraced by writers, producers, directors and performers across the globe. Shakespeare in films has come a long way since 1899 when a scene of Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree’s *King John* was recreated in film for promotional purpose. In the following century, Shakespeare was recreated for films by major directors across the world—Laurence Olivier, Peter Brooke, Kenneth Branagh (in United Kingdom); Orson Welles, Franco Zeffirelli (in USA); Sergei Yutkevich, Grigory Kozintsev (in USSR); Akira Kurosawa (in Japan), Gulzar and Vishal Bhardwaj (in India). Expectedly, all these versions coming from diverse directors from different countries are coloured by their imagination and guided by their immediate concerns, be it aesthetic, political, cultural or personal.

Tiffany A. C. Moore’s book focuses on Grigory (or Grigori) Kozintsev’s film adaptations of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* and *King Lear* with reference to their implicit critique of the political repression in Stalinist and post-Stalinist Russia. Kozintsev (1905-1973) is a revered film-maker whose name is well known beyond the political borders of Russia. He has directed twenty one films, including three short films. His worldwide fame as a director, however, rests on his last three films—*Don Kikhot* (1957), an adaptation of *Don Quixote* and the two adaptations of Shakespeare, *Hamlet* (1964) and *King Lear* (1971). The Shakespearian films are easily available unlike some of his earlier films which have been lost. Interestingly, Kozintsev also wrote two books on Shakespeare—*Shakespeare: Time and Conscience* (1966) and *King Lear: The Space of Tragedy* (1973). These books have been translated into English and for non-Russian researchers these are major primary sources to understand Kozintsev’s relation with Shakespeare.

Moore’s book is one of a kind in English language. There is a great deal of information on Kozintsev available in a number of book chapters and journal articles but there was no single, authoritative work on Kozintsev’s Shakespeare films, especially in “a way of putting the Shakespeare films [...] into their

---

\* Samrat Laskar is Assistant Professor in English in West Bengal Education Service. He is presently posted at Krishnagar Government College, West Bengal, India.

cultural and historical contexts” (1). Moore’s target readers are those who want, as she asserts in the Preface, “to know more about Kozintsev’s Shakespeare, but perhaps [are] not inclined to attempt to locate and assimilate all this far-flung material” (1). The writer admits her linguistic incompetence to analyze other Russian directors like Jan Frid and Sergei Yutkevich, who were contemporaries of Kozintsev. She accepts her limitation and consequently focuses only on Kozintsev’s Shakespeare which offers the book the much-required concentration.

The finely written Introduction lays major emphasis on the “Aesopian discourse”, a prominent device of “double-voicing”. Moore quotes Lev Loseff (5) who defines Aesopian language as “a special literary system, one whose structure allows interaction between author and reader at the same time that it conceals inadmissible content from the censor”. In times, when artistic activities are subject to strict censoring, this tool of double-voicing becomes quite effective. As a write/director who worked both in Stalinist and post-Stalinist Russia, Kozintsev was smart enough to take recourse to this tool. Both *Hamlet* and *King Lear* are politically charged plays, intended to be subversive commentaries on the government and the Communist Party. The claustrophobic atmosphere in Elsinore and the general sense of betrayal and ingratitude in *Lear*’s world are presented with obvious contemporary resonance.

Moore also introduces the influence of Boris Pasternak and Dmitri Shostakovich on Kozintsev’s Shakespeare. If Kozintsev shares with Pasternak a certain degree of Christian influence, with Shostakovich the relation is more direct. It was Shostakovich who provided the original music for both the stage and film adaptations of Kozintsev’s *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. In the Introduction, Moore also declares in no uncertain terms that her analysis of Kozintsev’s Shakespeare is not guided by the aesthetic merits of the films or their degree of faithfulness to the original texts. She rather investigates how Kozintsev has identified “certain issues in the plays, out of a range of possibilities, and has made those speak to the Soviet experience” (13). As the book advances through the five chapters, we can understand that she truly remains faithful to her avowed objective.

In Chapter One, Moore goes on to offer a brief commentary of the history of translation, criticism and performance of *Hamlet* in the eighteenth and nineteenth century Russia. It is interesting to note how this play has always been under the radar of the political censors. We get the information that *Hamlet* was banned during the reigns of Catherine II and Paul I as the dubiousness of Paul’s succession could have been implied by the play’s performance. The chapter also introduces the concept of “Hamletism”, a German romantic view of Hamlet being a passive, ineffectual and effete hero, which became popular in the nineteenth and early twentieth century Russian artistic milieu. However, this prince of inaction would be mocked, vilified and rejected by major Russian writers since the late nineteenth century. Turgenev, Belinsky, Dostoevsky,

Chekhov, Tolstoy—all of them reacted against Hamletism. Chekhov loved the play itself, but hated Hamlet's interpretation. Tolstoy's moral perspective failed to find the genius of a writer whose moral affiliation is ambiguous, to say the least. Tolstoy was struck by *Hamlet's* lack of realism and the play's want of sympathy for the common people. Kozintsev was obviously influenced by all these critical stances. He realized that to make Hamlet relevant to the present times, he must be divested of all charges of philosophical inaction associated with him. Hamlet must be made contemporary: a voice of protest against the authority; he should address the voice of the common man.

Chapter Two continues to discuss the Russian adaptations of *Hamlet* from the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 to Stalin's death in 1953. The Shakespearean tragedy was re-contextualized with a predominant Marxist perspective. Interestingly, more than the prince of Denmark, it is Laertes who was projected as the champion of the proletariat. The chapter goes on to discuss the different productions of the play under Mikhail Chekhov, Nikolai Akimov, Sergei Radlov and others. Most of these productions are intended as a critique of Stalin's regime. If Akimov's production was bolder in its criticism, Radlov's tempered version is noted for its ambivalence. Stalin's government preferred banning all these plays as in most of them Claudius became the Stalin-figure whose succession to the throne/party is not endorsed by his predecessor. This chapter also discusses Kozintsev's stage productions of *Hamlet* which immediately follows Stalin's death. Kozintsev's attempt to revive Hamlet to an active role gives a positive valence to the reading of the play.

Chapter Three is a detailed analysis of Kozintsev's film production of *Hamlet*. By 1964 when the film was released in USSR, Khrushchev's "Thaw" was in its terminal stage. The initial notes of optimism associated with it were by then replaced by subtle forms of governmental repression. Before discussing *Hamlet*, Moore introduces a probing study of Kozintsev's film *Don Quixote* (1957). Quixote, a man of action, is apparently contrasted with the Hamletist Hamlet but Kozintsev also draws some not-so-obvious parallels between them. In her discussion on *Hamlet*, Moore goes on to show how Kozintsev's film version becomes an oblique commentary on contemporary Russia. If Elsinore is a place "of oppressive and labyrinthine grandeur where spies lurk, monitoring the Court's discourse and activity" (20), then Stalin's and Khrushchev's Russia is no different. As a true Marxist (not to be confused with a Stalinist), Kozintsev uses Hamlet as a voice of political protest. Hamlet's affinity with the players can be interpreted as his affinity with the *narod*, the common people. Moore discusses the play-within-play episode and the Graveyard scene at length and comes to the conclusion that Kozintsev's Hamlet is an artist, activist, a positive voice of protest and a symbol of resurrection.

Chapter Four uses a technique similar to the one used in the first two chapters while discussing the adaptations of a Shakespearean text from the

eighteenth and nineteenth century Russia to the end of World War II. This time the concerned text is *King Lear*. Moore traces the history of the performance of the play and the critical response to it in Russia with reference to major authors like Pushkin, Turgenev, Chekhov, Tolstoy and Alexander Blok. If in the late nineteenth century some progressives denounced *King Lear* for its pro-monarchy standpoint; in post-Revolution Russia, the tragedy came to be associated with the breakdown of old order and the advent of a new one. Moore also highlights the poignancy of the play during the World War II when Lear's identification both with Stalin and Hitler was not considered far-fetched. Kozintsev's *King Lear* was staged in 1941 when Russia was under immediate German threat. This adaptation is apparently a direct critique of Hitler's invasion but beneath these "screens Kozintsev's thematic emphases also point to the devastation and chaos that obtained in the Soviet Union before the [arrival of] the Nazis" (134).

The final chapter, the longest of them all, analyzes Kozintsev's film, *King Lear*. Moore emphasizes that it would be a mistake to consider Lear only as a Stalin-figure; in fact, she considers the play as a tacit critique of the Brezhnev era which was reenacting the terror and repression of the Stalin government. The anxiety of the Cold War and the threat of a nuclear holocaust during Leonid Brezhnev's tenure gave a definite urgency in tone to Kozintsev's *Lear* adaptation. The revolt against tyranny can be interpreted as a clarion call for social resistance overthrowing meek acquiescence by the people. The chapter deliberates in some detail on Shostakovich's close association with the film which goes beyond the role of a professional composer. His radical anti-authoritarian attitude coincides with that of the director's. The highlight of this chapter, according to me, is the section on the Fool. Kozintsev's Fool is not only inspired by Shakespeare's original and Pasternak's interpretation but also liberally borrows from the long tradition of Holy Fools in the Russian culture. The dialogic voice of the Fool not only criticizes Lear's folly; it also takes a distinct political stance in critiquing any repressive political authority. Shostakovich's music adds a certain degree of pathos to the character. The plaintive sound of the Fool's pipe opens and ends the film and by that, in Kozintsev's observation, "the voice of human suffering is accorded more significance than the roar of thunder" (qtd. in Hindle 40).

A brief Epilogue ends the book. The writer discusses how artists and writers become increasingly bold in the seventies and the eighties in their political protest. The "double-voicing" is partially withdrawn for more direct modes of criticism. Moore particularly mentions one stage production of Yuri Lyubimov's *Hamlet* at Moscow's Taganka Theatre in 1971. Lyubimov was exiled in 1984 and also lost his Soviet citizenship and it is obvious that his *Hamlet* production did not help his cause. Moore finds in the eventual collapse of the USSR the beginning of a new epoch. She does not mention any Shakespearean production after the collapse as if the need of political protest has

come to an end with the fall of communism. I, however, fail to share her note of optimism which is also partially guided by her political myopia.

Having said that, I must admit that Moore has done a commendable job in coming out with an entire book on Kozintsev's Shakespeare as an effective medium of political protest. There was certainly a lack of detailed analysis on this subject in English language and this book would definitely help the future researchers working on Kozintsev's Shakespeare adaptations. As a reader, I would have certainly liked to know more about Kozintsev's entire career, both on stage and film. An extra section dealing with Kozintsev's short biography in the Introduction would have made the book more informative. Despite her clarification on the political aim of the book, I would also have loved some commentary on the aesthetic appeal of the Kozintsev films and some comparative analyses with the works of his contemporaries like Welles, Zeffirelli, Polański or Peter Brooks in some detail. But as it stands now, Tiffany Ann Conroy Moore's book must be praised for what it is—a book marked by its singleness of aim and achieving its desired goal with a considerable degree of success.

#### WORKS CITED

Hindle, Maurice. *Studying Shakespeare on Film*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Sosnowska, Monika. *Hamlet uzmysłowiony (Sensuous Hamlet)*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2013. Pp. 201.

Reviewed by *Piotr Maszewski\**

Today, the range of academic approaches applied to the study of senses has reached beyond areas limited to psychological inquiry. Sensuality has become an object of study for scholars representing various academic disciplines, proving them to be both challenging and significant terrains for numerous, often interdisciplinary academic analyses. Senses have, therefore, begun to be seen as cultural formations which are subject to considerable changes in time and a topic which requires much broader attention and understanding. Senses, therefore, also constitute the fundamental topic of Monika Sosnowska's book *Sensuous Hamlet*, a study of cinematic versions of *Hamlet*, in which the author applies interdisciplinary perspective to examine the way in which senses are employed in one of the most famous Shakespearean plays and how these references to senses are used in a number of cinematic adaptations of *Hamlet*.

Significantly, the word "play" appearing in the title of the book may not only prove to be a linguistic challenge for even the most seasoned translators, but also reveal the twofold nature of the play. *Hamlet* is a play which requires the employment of our five senses. It is, according to Sosnowska, sensuous; filled with sensory imagery. In her book, the author seems to be achieving two goals at once. While making a vital contribution to the development of Shakespearean studies in Poland, she also succeeds in contributing to the discussion concerning sensory studies, an area which still remains fairly unfamiliar both to academics and non-academics dealing with theatre worldwide. Two core goals around which the author organizes her book are: to prove why *Hamlet* is sensuous by showing how Shakespeare uses senses and to show how late twentieth century film directors make use of the senses in their cinematic adaptations of the play. The author studies three most famous movie versions of the play: Franco Zeffirelli's 1990 adaptation, Kenneth Branagh's 1996 version and Michael Almereyda's 2000 film. Crucially, while conscious of the fact that it is inevitable that versions remain in constant dialogue with each other, the author makes sure she precisely pinpoints those aspects of the movies that render the versions different. It is these differences in the way senses are used in the adaptations that are of particular interest for Sosnowska.

Understandably, the scope of the research undertaken by the author makes it difficult for her to proceed immediately to analysis of particular filmic adaptations of the Shakespearean play. To make her theoretical apparatus

---

\* Faculty of Philosophy and History, University of Łódź.

academically legitimate, as well as to give the reader a much wider and more systematized perspective on the subject at hand, she decided to devote opening section of the work to considerations of the evolution of cultural understanding of the senses. It is by reading these initial chapters of the book that we learn to what lengths an inquisitive academic has to go in order to obtain a properly-crafted and necessarily interdisciplinary approach if she is to deal with the understanding of the role of senses in culture in the most wholesome manner. Therefore, well-thought through and clear division into chapters leaves even the most demanding reader of the book convinced that the author is conscious of a wide plethora of theoretical discussions concerning cultural studies and makes the ordinary reader well-equipped with theoretical background to understand what constitutes the second aim of the book, namely, analyses of filmic adaptations of *Hamlet*.

Especially noteworthy are titles of the chapters and the sub-sections. Demanding, and not entirely devoid of heavyweight academic terminology, they are at the same time, witty and encouraging for readers. They demonstrate great ease with which the author plays not only with language but also with literary tradition presenting, at the same time, a considerable problem for translators. Bearing in mind the fact that what she will be dealing with within her work is intertextuality, she infuses the titles of her chapters and sub-sections also full of word games and intertextuality. A perfect example is the title of the second subsection of the third chapter: "From theory to practice and back." With her linguistic craftsmanship, Sosnowska proves that while indulging in challenging academic dispute, she is still capable of keeping her rich academic language at bay, which makes it possible even for ordinary readers, rarely fluent in academic terminology, to find pleasure and interest in reading her book.

Already in the first chapter of *Sensual Hamlet*, "Cultural Architecture of Senses," dubbing academic theories concerning senses rebellious or disobedient, Sosnowska draws the reader's attention to the fact that the task lying ahead of her is not an easy one. It is in this chapter, however, that Sosnowska tries to make this "terra incognita" more approachable and understandable for her readers. A significant decision that Sosnowska is rightly conscious of is the choice between "the right" and "the wrong" adaptations of *Hamlet*.

In the second chapter, entitled "Traces of Sensual Life from a Distant Epoch," Sosnowska focuses on the role senses have played in literature over time. While emphasizing the intertextuality of the play itself, the author rightly puts forward the fundamental argument that each one of these cinematic versions of her choice is itself intertextual. The various adaptations constantly look at, borrow from, comment on and play with one another.

The third chapter of the book, "Senses in Theatre, Philosophy and Medicine in the Age of Early Modernity," is a well-crafted analysis of how senses became an issue of significant importance for the people of early

modernity. Especially interesting seems the fragment where, maneuvering through a wide range of philosophical theories, Sosnowska draws a clear vision of how early modern philosophy dealt with the growing interest in the senses. Throughout the chapter, with great precision and accuracy, the author cites passages of the play to prove how her theoretical discussion is reflected in *Hamlet*. She also confronts her findings with observations made by earlier scholars of the subject, which firmly grounds her work within the already established academic tradition.

Sosnowska starts the fourth chapter of her book, entitled “The Tragedy of *Hamlet* as the Tragedy of the Senses” with the question about ways to decipher the sensory code of the play. The author analyzes the role senses play in the creation of the main characters and in selected scenes. Again, Sosnowska engages in a great deal of close reading to show how different senses are employed in the design of supernatural phenomena that occur within the play or instances of espionage undertaken by its characters as well as the construction of the final scene.

The last, fifth chapter, is devoted to the three cinematic versions of the play which the author has selected for analysis. Sosnowska skillfully employs all the findings from her previous chapters to show how senses play an important role in the construction of these adaptations. For example, Sosnowska rightly observes, that the first take of a movie establishes the sensory atmosphere of the rest of the film. She also confronts the three cinematic versions of the final scene of Shakespeare’s play and analyzes how the directors employ senses to leave the viewers with a particular impression.

What renders Sosnowska’s work interesting and interdisciplinary is that she does not limit herself to mere enumeration of the senses viewers/readers have to be aware of to fully appreciate *Hamlet*; neither does she limit herself to analyses of how senses are employed in various cinematic adaptations of the play. She proposes a gender-oriented examination of the senses. As a result, she distinguishes between male and female ways of sensing and introduces a division into senses associated with either women (touch, smell and taste) or men (sight, hearing). Thus, the use of feminist perspective seems both inevitable and well-placed, adding yet another theoretical layer to a project already filled with theoretical considerations coming from different branches of the academia.

In the introduction of her work, while Sosnowska reminds the reader of a famous statement made by Horace Howard Furness who postulated the need to stop writing on *Hamlet*, she realizes that she is going to work against his words. “And yet each age, perhaps even each decade, can find some new aspect of a great writer, simply because being great, no one age, no one person, can see all of him,” writes Anthony Burgess (73) in a famous essay on William Shakespeare in his *English Literature*. The importance of Sosnowska’s work lies in the way it highlights the cultural significance of the senses. As the author

herself acknowledges, her work belongs neither strictly to the study of film nor to the study of text. Rather, it is an outcome of cultural anthropology on the one hand and feminist studies on the other. While Sosnowska's book discusses the film adaptations of *Hamlet* released in the nineties of the twentieth century, in a highly de-sensualized twenty-first century environment, studying the senses has become even more important than it was two decades ago. Sosnowska's work can become, therefore, a model for further inquiries into how Shakespeare might help in demonstrating the significance of the senses in contemporary culture.

#### WORKS CITED

Burgess, Anthony. *English Literature: A Survey for Students*. London: Longman, 1974.

Courtney, Krystyna Kujawińska and Monika Sosnowska, eds. *Shakespeare 2014—w 450. rocznicę urodzin (Shakespeare 2014—For the 450<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of His Birth)*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2014. Pp. 235.

Reviewed by *Grzegorz Sikorski*\*

*Shakespeare 2014—For the 450<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of His Birth*, edited by Krystyna Kujawińska Courtney and Monika Sosnowska, is an homage paid to the author on the 450<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his birth. The publication is a collection of essays presenting the influence of Shakespeare's art upon Polish literature, theatre, cinematography, criticism, art and painting. Some space is also devoted to the issues of translation, philosophy and psychology.

The publication comprises two parts. Part One, "Hamlet and *Hamlet*—A Companion of National History," emphasizes the influence of the play *Hamlet* and its main character upon the works of Polish artists in a diachronic way. Part Two, "Beyond Hamlet (and *Hamlet*)—A Metamorphosis of Shakespeare and His Works in Literature, Film, Art," shows the receptions and cultural appropriations of his other plays, e.g., *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest* and *The Merchant of Venice* in various media of Polish culture: theatrical productions, novels, movies, art history etc.

The essay "Step Aside and Look Again: The Anamorphosis of Hamlet" (23-34) by Małgorzata Grzegorzewska opens the volume. It links Shakespeare's way of writing to the painting method of anamorphosis, which is an intended distortion of an image so that one is able to see the intentional element from a particular perspective. This approach to Shakespeare's text highlights various aspects of the dualism of the text. It attempts to explain why *Hamlet* can be seen not only as a tragedy of revenge, but also as a picture of severe psychological anguish and disturbance, and a tale of morality.

"Hamlet or Settling National Accounts" (35-46) is a political reading of the play. Its author, Marta Wiszniowska-Majchrzyk, focuses on the reception of the play under the Communist regime in Poland. She opens her work with the presentation of *Polish Hamlet: The Portrait of Aleksander Wielopolski* (1903), painted by Jacek Malczewski (1854-1929), which constitutes an introduction to the Polish political appropriations of the play over the centuries. In her work Wiszniowska-Majchrzyk demonstrates political readings of *Hamlet* in film—mainly in Andrzej Wajda's *Hamlet* (1965), and in various dramatic adaptations written by such eminent Polish playwrights as Bohdan Drozdowski (*Hamlet 70*, published in 1971), Jerzy Żurek (*After Hamlet*, 1981), and Janusz Głowacki (*Fortynbras Got Drunk*, 1983).

---

\* Grzegorz Sikorski is an independent scholar.

A different way in which Hamlet (and *Hamlet*) alludes to Polish history is presented in the essay “What a Kerfuffle: Post-war Poland in Jerzy Skolimowski’s *Hamles*” by Magdalena Cieślak and Agnieszka Rasmus (47-57). The authors analyze a one-reel silent film, which connects the situation of Polish citizens under the Communist regime to *Hamlet*. The names of the main characters are used in diminutive forms to show not only their Polishness but also to present how the young Polish generation reacted to the Communist regime. Cieślak and Rasmus rightly classify the movie as an example of a subtle subversion of the political status quo.

Aleksandra Budrewicz’s study, “To Play Hamlet, and to Die: Artur Schroeder’s *The Last Hamlet* in the Context of the Theatrical Novel” (59-79), is a different viewpoint on the reception of the Shakespearean character, where Hamlet is used as a pretext to show personal drama. The article is an analysis of the literary work by the writer, art historian and critic Artur Schroeder (1885-1934). Part of the essay is devoted to the theoretical aspects of the genre, classified as a theatre novel. *The Last Hamlet* (1910) tells a story of Józef Waracz, a failed actor, who, as an accountant, dreams about playing Hamlet. As a heartbreaking presentation of unfulfilled hopes, the novel explores psychological aspects of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, seeing it in the context of the tragedy of character and the tragedy of moral choices. Budrewicz introduces an unknown literary work as she believes that Schroeder deserves attention. Hence she presents another proof of how significant Shakespeare has always been.

“Opheliac State of Madness in Three Polish Translations of *Hamlet*” (81-93) is a detailed, comparative study devoted to selected translations of the play. Its author, Monika Sosnowska, focuses on Ophelia’s madness expressed in both her monologues and in the her behavior described by other characters. Sosnowska compares the translation by Józef Paszkowski (1862), Władysław Tarnawski (1953) and Stanisław Barańczak (1990). It allows her to conclude that over time Ophelia has become a cultural archetype of female madness which has inspired many other literary and cultural presentations of women operating under social and psychological duress.

The second part of the publication opens with Kujawińska Courtney’s essay, “Maybe Shakespeare Did Not Write Shakespeare?” (94-114). The author raises the question of the authorship of Shakespearean plays as addressed by the film *Anonymous* (2011) directed by Roland Emmerich. The article is, to a certain extent, a polemic study on “historical facts” versus its “artistic rendition”.

In the following essay, “On the Polish Character of Selected Interpretations of *The Winter’s Tale*: Literary Criticism, Translation and Theatre” (115-128), Olga Mastela presents the history of *The Winter’s Tale* in Poland. She traces and comments on the play’s possible sources in Polish history. The number of similar facts between the play and Polish past—even if they are

only coincidences (which we will possibly never find out)—is surprising. Mastela shows how this supposed Polishness could affect the play's translations. Some space is devoted to two twentieth century theatrical renditions of the play directed by Leon Schiller (1924) and Krystyna Skuszanka (1974).

In her study, "Retrospective Images of the Storms in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in Selected Polish Translations" (129-52), Anna Pietrzykowska-Motyka focuses on the function of the storm/the tempest in the translations by Władysław Tarnawski (1958), Maciej Słomczyński (1980), Stanisław Barańczak (1991) and Piotr Kamiński (2012). The structural, verbal and theatrical role of the tempest are also analyzed, interpreted and evaluated in a detailed study of the play under discussion.

Jacek Fabiszak's essay, "Shakespeare on Polish Television: Tradition and Challenges" (153-71), presents the history of national adaptations of the Bard's plays on Polish television. Tracing the historical outline of the process (began in 1959), Fabiszak classifies Shakespeare's productions according to the nature/technological development of Polish television theatre, and delineates their impact on Polish culture. Fabiszak exhausts the topic in a scrupulous way, describing selected periods of presence of television theatre.

"Pre(-)text—Maja Kleczewska's Shakespearean performances," written by Tomasz Kowalski (173-83), is devoted to the presentation of Maja Kleczewska's theatrical career. The essay presents her adaptations of Shakespeare's three plays: *Macbeth* (2004), *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2006) and *The Tempest* (2012). Kowalski uses the phrase "pre(-)text" to show that Kleczewska treats the original Shakespearean texts as an excuse to evaluate and comment upon the current Polish political, social and cultural problems.

The next article by Michał Haake, "'... for his favour, He presently become a Christian ...'—The Iconography of Aleksander Gierymski's painting *The Merchant of Venice*" (185-200), delineates the interpretation of Shylock in Gierymski's work. Despite the prevalent belief that this work has nothing to do with the Shakespearean play, in Haake's opinion, it depicts scene 1 from Act 4. Haake proves his proposition through references to a number of reviews of the nineteenth century performances of the play. These productions and their reviews, Haake argues, could have affected Gierymski's picture.

"Shakespeare in Daniels Chodowiecki's works" by Agnieszka Szwach (203-12), presents a seventeenth century illustrator, printmaker, and etcher, who also etched selected plays of the Bard's beginning with his *Hamlet* (1778). He illustrated selected scenes from *The Tempest*, *Macbeth*, *Coriolanus*, *Henry V* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and it is believed that thanks to his works Shakespeare's plays became even more popular. The author's aim in the study is to show the presence of the Bard in the Enlightenment Era. Szwach introduces the artist by his biography, inspirations and description of his works.

Unfortunately, there are no illustrations which would give readers more information.

The publication of *Shakespeare 2014—For the 450<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of His Birth* is an important contribution to Shakespearean studies in the world as it considers the reception of the Bard's plays in Poland. It belongs to the latest trend of illustrating how his plays have influenced Poland and what non-Anglo-Saxon cultures try to say using translated phrases of the Bard. It demonstrates some aspects of Shakespeare's reception in Polish culture over the centuries. At the same time, the monograph also celebrates the 450<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Shakespeare's birth.

Anyone who is interested in Shakespeare will find not only facts about his plays, their possible sources and presentations in various art forms, but will also benefit from other areas of knowledge. The aim of the book was to introduce the Bard in Polish translations, literary criticism, theatre, television, film and painting. Therefore each article concerns different area and describes it extensively by means which are typical for the particular field. The publication—showing how Shakespeare has been used and transformed—lets the reader observe how Poland has changed.

**Laura Estill, *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century English Manuscripts: Watching, Reading, Changing Plays*. Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 2015. Pp. xxviii+255.**

Review by *Anirban Bhattacharjee*\*

Citation haunts the word. It disorders and phantomizes the text. Since it appears as traces, it risks the act of reading. Excerpts or extracts attest the unbearable circulation of literature's being. They imagine proximity. They magnify alterity. Extracts excite amnesia and a response. Throughout the seventeenth century, early modern play-readers and play-goers used to copy dramatic extracts (selections from plays and masques) into their *commonplace* books. Laura Estill's *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century English Manuscripts: Watching, Reading, Changing Plays* (2015) is the first to examine these often overlooked texts, which reveal what early modern audiences and readers took, literally and figuratively, from plays. Estill's archival evidence puts forward the idea that the play-readers and play-goers viewed plays as malleable and modular texts to be altered, appropriated and used. These records provide information which is not available in other forms about the popularity and importance of early modern plays, the reasons the plays appealed to their audiences and the ideas in the plays that interested them.

Tracing the course of dramatic extracting from the earliest stages in the 1590s, through the prolific manuscript circulation at the universities, to the closure and re-opening of the theatres, Estill gathers these micro-histories to create a comprehensive overview of seventeenth-century dramatic extracts and the culture of extracting from plays. *Dramatic Extracts in Seventeenth-Century English Manuscripts* explores new archival evidence (from John Milton's signature to unpublished university plays) while also analyzing the popularity of perennial favorites such as Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1610-11). The study of dramatic extracts is the study of variable particulars: particular readers, particular manuscripts, particular plays/masques, and particular historic moments. Indeed, different readers bring the text to life in different ways. By providing careful analyses of these rich source texts, Laura Estill argues that active play-viewing and play-reading/extracting could lead to changing the plays themselves, both through selecting and manipulating the extracts and placing the plays in new(er) contexts.

Extracting from professional plays was a newly-minted art. The manuscripts revealed the varied ways in which people copied dramatic extracts.

---

\* Assistant Professor at Santipur College, West Bengal, India; Doctoral Fellow at Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta, India.

Aristotle called them *koinoi topoi*. Cicero called them *communes loci*. The English speakers call them *commonplaces* or sentences—*sentential* (Moss 1-23). Commonplaces are rhetorically well-phrased sayings that express an accepted insight. For Seneca, copying commonplaces allows an individual to create new ideas by harvesting the best of what one has read. Seneca himself demonstrated the value of gathering “nectar” from other works. He borrowed the “bee” metaphor from Virgil, who said, “pack close the flowing honey / and swell their cells with nectar sweet” (qtd. in Hollingsworth 135). Stallybrass and Chartier (45) point out that “the analogy between the reader and the bee is, in the positive sense that the Renaissance reserved for the term, the commonplace of commonplacing”. Commonplacing offered a concrete way to internalize the canons of rhetoric, from finding phrases to copy (*inventio*), arranging them under headings (*dispositio*), mimicking their style (*elocutio*), memorizing them (*memoria*), and presenting them (*actio*). Mary Thomas Crane (53-92) in her “Educational Practice in Seventeenth-Century England” has noticed that although the acts of gathering, copying, classifying, and elaborating are not much lauded in today’s pedagogy, in the early modern period they were considered crucial tools for developing a person’s writing, speech, cognitive ability and creativity.

Dramatic excerpting or extracting is the practice of copying selection from a play, either at a performance or from a print or manuscript-source. These extracts appear in many types of manuscripts, including miscellanies, composite volumes, commonplace books and diaries. But the moot point is that while dramatic excerpting is easily defined, it can be more of a challenge to articulate what constitutes a dramatic extract. Laura Estill’s book makes a clear-cut distinction between extracts and abridgements or adaptations, although at times they can overlap. Dramatic excerpts are valuable for the study of early modern plays’ reception because they provide a glimpse into early readers’ and playgoers’ reactions through their choices. Peter Beals’s *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts (1450-1700)* lists hundreds of manuscripts compiled before 1700 that contain dramatic extracts from early modern plays written before the closure of the theatres in 1642. According to Estill, a careful reading of the dramatic extracts reveals that early modern readers and audiences did not make the same assumptions about “canon” and “authorship” as modern scholars, but instead enjoyed plays by anonymous authors and playwrights. Estill has argued that the study of dramatic extracts has its roots in literary studies, textual scholarship, and book history.

*Chapter One* demonstrates that dramatic extracting evolved from the long tradition of copying pithy and wise sayings from classical and religious sources, a practice known as “commonplacing”. In this chapter she addresses the related question of when dramatic excerpting began in England, why manuscript compilers began selecting dramatic extracts in the 1590s, and how dramatic extracting evolved over the early seventeenth century. The chapter makes a

detailed study of the individual manuscripts and instances of dramatic excerpting, while also offering patterns and connections. It includes an analysis of William Briton's extracts from *Gorboduc* (1561), a new way of considering the selections from *Titus Andronicus* (1588-93) in the *Longleat* manuscript, as well as the discussion of a newly rediscovered writing guide, "The Modell of Poesye". It also investigates the material contexts of dramatic extracting by considering the increase in play-publication, typographical conventions such as commonplace markers, and writing technologies such as the table-book.

The overarching argument of *Chapter 2* is that the act of excerpting from a masque or entertainment creates meanings distinct from both the moment of performance and from the complete print or manuscript version. Estill argues that we can no longer consider masques as purely performed or occasional texts; instead we need to recognize them as cultural and literary currency whose meaning and value changed over time. Estill has shown how masque extracts were de-contextualized from their full-text sources and re-contextualized, in state papers, to highlight their status as political texts, or alongside classical authors to add literary *gravitas*. She has investigated the popularity of Nicholas Breton's "In the Merry Month of May", examined John Milton's not-yet-discussed self-quotation from *Comus* ("—if vertue feeble were/ Heaven if selfe would stoope her"), and considered Jonson's *The Gypsies Metamorphosed* in relation to a scandal that involved adultery, cross-dressing and expatriation. Again a section of this chapter focuses on songs and other self-contained extracts from masques in order to demonstrate how these extracts circulated separately from the masques and were taken as complete units unto themselves, de-contextualized from the full masque and its performance. The chapter concludes by offering a vivid example of how changing historic circumstances can alter the meaning of a dramatic extract. By considering a range of texts including those by Ben Jonson, Nicholas Breton, John Lyly, Francis Bacon and anonymous writers in a variety of manuscripts—such as *commonplace* books, miscellanies, songbooks, and composite volumes, the chapter provides an overview of the many ways in which the masque extracts functioned and were part of early modern manuscript culture.

The third chapter titled "Theatrical Nostalgia" establishes dramatic extracting as a major means whereby theatrical activity persisted after the closure of the theatres testifying the veracity of the French saying, *plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose*—"the more things change, the more they stay the same". This chapter first treats Abraham Wright's (1611-1690) *BL MS Add 22608* and John Cotgrave's printed *English Treasury of Wit and Language* (which contains more than 1,500 extracts from plays) in relation to the complex political situation of mid-century England. The chapter introduces a major development in seventeenth-century dramatic extracting: the dramatic miscellany, a book or manuscript primarily comprising dramatic extracts. Again by taking into account the complicated political valences of the mid-seventeenth century, Laura Estill

analyses how early modern responses to drama were personalized and contingent. Laura argues that if the advent of dramatic excerpting in the 1590s marked drama's arrival as a *form* of literature, the mid-century development of dramatic miscellanies shows that theatre began to be seen as an important *genre* in its own right.

*Chapter 4*, "Re-Presenting and Re-Reading the Renaissance," explores how revivals, adaptations, and re-publications contributed to the continued extracting from Renaissance plays during the Restoration. The re-opening of the theatres was a momentous event that in many cases altered how readers and play-goers perceived earlier plays by juxtaposing them with the new drama predicated on different aesthetic values. This chapter shows how songs from Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (particularly, "Where the bee sucks") circulated alongside songs from the John Dryden-William Davenant and Thomas Shadwell adaptations. The manuscripts discussed in this chapter offer concrete evidence of Restoration attitudes toward earlier plays. As these manuscripts demonstrate, *commonplacing* remained a crucial part of education in the late seventeenth century. Estill demonstrates that re-searching dramatic extracts does not necessarily contribute to a monolithic theatre history, but rather considers these varied and nuanced responses in order to demonstrate the polysemous meanings of early modern plays.

William Sancroft (1617-1693), the well-known Archbishop of Canterbury, was a prolific manuscript compiler who copied hundreds of extracts from Renaissance plays. His manuscripts include previously unnoted dramatic extracts that exemplify many of the trends in dramatic extracting: the circulation of extracts as separate entities, their inclusion as poems in verse miscellanies, their appreciation as rhetorical utterances, the construction of dramatic miscellanies replete with selections from plays, the de-contextualization of dramatic material and particularly, the Restoration expression of nostalgia for Renaissance theatre. Interestingly, Sancroft copied most of Iago's speeches in Shakespeare's *Othello* (1603) which were visually distinguished from the surrounding "printed" text. His extracts disconnected Iago's speech from the context of the complete play. Again, the independence of Sancroft's selection was doubly demarcated by the extra spaces around the speech. In Sancroft's manuscript the dissenting female voices were absent, leaving only the conclusion of Iago's misogynistic rant. By skipping Desdemona's almost-hostile interjection, Sancroft shaped Iago's words into one unit. Re-formatting of the speeches thereby removes the polyvocality inherent in all dialogues. The omission changes the reception. Sancroft's extracting demonstrates how a dramatic excerpt takes on new meaning outside the context of the play, particularly when they are trimmed into poems. His *verse miscellany* shows how poetry and dramatic excerpts can converge.

While the previous chapters establish the importance of attending to one manuscript or one compiler, the final chapter demonstrates the value of studying

the transmission of a single extract by tracing the path of one particular dramatic extract that appeared in multiple print and manuscript sources over the seventeenth century: for instance, Shakespeare's "fat paunches have lean pates, and dainty bits / Make rich the ribs, but bankrupt quite the wits" from *Love's Labours's Lost* (1598). The chapter investigates the proverbial nature of commonplaces in relation both to playwriting and to dramatic extracting. Laura Estill has deftly analyzed that the "fat paunches" extract is a prime example of how dramatic extracts were not always taken from the plays themselves and could be copied from "intermediate" sources. The diverse intermediate sources show how extracts were not just parts of plays; they were parts of early modern textual culture. The wisely varied contexts for this couplet reveal how dramatic extracts circulated beyond their source texts, accruing new meanings in new contexts. In "Proverbial Shakespeare", Estill foregrounds our contemporary inheritance of Shakespeare as a cultural commodity which began in the eighteenth century with the rise of bardolatry and grew with the acceptance of the Romantic notion that presented authors as inspired and individual geniuses. She blithely observes: "A quotation by Shakespeare is not always a quotation *from* Shakespeare, although in early modern culture, it still sounded as sweet" (216).

Dramatic extracts show how theatrical texts circulated in everyday life, not as full-text artistic works, but as phrases to be used in conversation, as songs and poems, and as snippets of wisdom and advice. The act of watching a performance or reading a play was never ever passive: audience-members scribbled notes into table-books just as readers jotted down their impressions or copied lengthy passages. The dramatic excerpts challenge the received perception of plays as whole artistic units and instead project the texts as works that could be fragmented and changed. Reading Estill's book, one gets the impression that the more dramatic extracts are uncovered and examined, they will undoubtedly reveal valuable information about early responses to plays, early modern reading, writing, play-going, and ultimately, the plays themselves.

Examining dramatic extracts allows us to find polysemous and variable meanings instead of narrowing the text to one possible reading. The study is one way of "un-editing the Renaissance" (Marcus). Changes in a text reveal the energy of the culture interacting with the source-text. As fragmented, altered, reconstructed and re-contextualized; dramatic excerpts form a matrix of "iterable" and recursive structures. Constant re-deciphering unsettles any ontological ordering. The program of citation—the promise of re-writing and re-acting—basically illustrates the "haunted condition of literature as *possibility*" (Derrida 31). Estill's book playfully welcomes the specter of the literary and generates an uncanny effect within the program of reading. The book is a re-turning to the origin that awaits the coming of the other. The book is strangely homeless, strangely free. Estill's archive is a tangible evidence of what the plays themselves have told us: early modern plays were written for you to make of them "what you will" and to take them "as you like it".

---

**WORKS CITED**

- Beals, Peter. *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts* (CELM). 2005-2013. <http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/01.014.2015>
- Crane, Mary Thomas. "Educational Practice in Sixteenth-Century England." *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*. Ed. Mary Thomas Crane. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997. 77-92.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Psyche: Inventions of the Other". In *Reading De Man Reading*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Eds. Lindsay Waters, Wlad Godzich. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989. 25-66.
- Hollingsworth, Christopher. *Poetics of the Hive: Insect Metaphor in Literature*. Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 2001.
- Marcus, Leah. *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Moss, Ann. "Ancient and Medieval Places." *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Ed. Ann Moss. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996. 1-23.
- Stallybrass, Peter and Roger Chartier. "Reading and Authorship: The Circulation of Shakespeare 1590-1619." *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text*. Ed. Andrew Murphy. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007. 35-56.