Early Theatre
25.2 (2022), 89–114
https://doi.org/10.12745/et.25.2.5246

Review Essay

Vanessa I. Corredera

Premodern Critical Race Studies and the Question of History

Urvashi Chakravarty. *Fictions of Consent: Slavery, Servitude, and Free Service in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2022. Pp 312. Hardback $65. ISBN: 9780812253658. https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812298260.

Matthieu Chapman. *Anti-Black Racism in Early Modern English Drama: The Other 'Other'*. Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2017. Pp 200. Paperback $45.56. ISBN: 9780367140304. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315559544.

Ruben Espinosa. *Shakespeare on the Shades of Racism*. Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2021. Pp 194. Paperback $18.36. ISBN: 9780367183004. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429060618.

Ayanna Thompson. *Blackface*. London: Bloomsbury, 2021. Pp 144. Paperback $13.45. ISBN: 9781501374029. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781501374043.

Since at least its second wave in the 1980s and 90s, literary historians have placed what has come to be recognized as premodern critical race studies (PCRS) in a defensive position regarding differing theorizations of history. Scholarship by figures working on premodern race, such as Margo Hendricks, Kim F. Hall, Peter Erickson, Arthur L. Little, Jr, Ania Loomba, Joyce Green MacDonald, and Ayanna Thompson, crafted rigorously historicized archival analyses that considered questions of power, identity, and culture, but with a particular focus on race and England's nascent imperial endeavors. Despite this historicization, their works' emphasis on race created a seeming historical tension, with prominent voices in the field asserting such investigative endeavours are anachronistic.[1]

Vanessa I. Corredera (correder@andrews.edu) is chair and associate professor in the department of English at Andrews University.

PCRS has worked to move beyond this supposed impasse, as effectively encapsulated by RaceB4Race and the topics of its first two symposia, the first simply called RaceB4Race, a nod to the suggested tension created by considering race in the premodern world, and the second being Race and Periodization, a symposium likewise pushing against temporal boundaries that gatekeep the production of knowledge about race's long historical presence.

I rehearse this familiar and exhausted (also, exhausting) story because as many strides as PCRS has made in its move from the margins to the centre of academic inquiry, we still witness a puzzling return by voices outside the field to contentions about PCRS and its relationship to historicity. In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Race*, Thompson evocatively asserts when addressing the concept of race and fluidity, 'Let me be clear, critical race theory has slain this dragon'.[2] Yet if I may extend Thompson's fantastical formulation, the dragon may be slain, but a different mystical beast, a hydra, remains, namely the still contested relationship between race in/and the premodern and modern worlds. I conceptualize this contestation as a hydra because no matter how much PCRS scholars attempt to move on, it continues to pop up in different forms — new heads if you will — in an effort to keep the field on the defensive. Take the online vitriol accompanying virtually every anti-racist Shakespeare presentation by the Globe, where non-specialists attest that scholars with no understanding of history are imposing their 'wokeness' on Shakespeare's brilliant, universal works. Or consider how concerns over 'cancelling' premodern authors in the curriculum, most especially Shakespeare, are tied to their replacement by contemporary multicultural/multiracial literary voices. Another head pops up when a premodern scholar takes to a Facebook forum and accuses a colour-conscious Shakespearean production of 'Black Lives Matter casting'. And one more head can be seen in the concern recently articulated that 'theoretical categories arising from political engagement in the contemporary U.S. are applied, without a great deal of critical reflection, to the production of race in the Middle Ages and early modernity',[3] leading to the assertion 'that we scholars of literature must historicize'.[4]

As a scholar whose work focuses on the afterlives of premodern texts in the contemporary world, and who must therefore both historicize and regularly consider the relationship between past and present, I find such calls to historicize puzzling. In the face of the vast and diverse historical work undertaken by PCRS scholars, I would suggest that people expressing a concern over the field's historiography are not really engaging with the scholarship. They are instead establishing a critical race theory (CRT), woke straw man with which to contend, an approach that leaves PCRS scholars defending methods and tactics that the vast majority are

not employing. Such claims negate the fact that the foundational works of PCRS have historicized, and as this review demonstrates, so do the field's current offerings. Bringing together the interrelationships amongst culture, oppression, literature, racial representation, and national identity, Urvashi Chakravarty's *Fictions of Consent: Slavery, Servitude, and Free Service in Early Modern England* (2022), Matthieu Chapman's *Anti-Black Racism in Early Modern English Drama: The Other 'Other'* (2017), Ruben Espinosa's *Shakespeare on the Shades of Racism* (2021), and Ayanna Thompson's *Blackface* (2021) reveal not only how tired and inaccurate assertions about PCRS's lack of historicity are, but also what is lost by subtle and explicit attempts to silo discussions of race in the premodern world away from considerations of race in modernity. These monographs build upon and expand the field-transforming work undertaken by PCRS scholars as they continue interrogating the centrality of whiteness to early modern literature and the era's stage, the broader systems of power in which early modern racial formation was imbricated, and the literary and social legacy of this epoch's racial habitus. They thereby contribute powerfully to PCRS through the excavation of new archives, the advancement of under-utilized methodologies, and the continued unearthing of white supremacy's long historical arc. Thus, despite unrelenting accusations of poor historical engagement, PCRS refuses to allow shallow assertions about its relationship to history to stymie projects that build upon the field's vital past, establish its vibrant present, and open up exciting avenues for its future.

Christina Sharpe movingly observes of history following the wake of the slave ships, 'In the wake, the past that is not past reappears, always, to rupture the present'.[5] Chakravarty's book uncovers a piece of this reappearing and rupturing past, masterfully pulling together archival work, literary analysis of dramatic and non-dramatic texts, and engagement with the classical past to follow one of the paths that would make England a central player in the transatlantic slave trade — its pervasive, complex, and ever-shifting culture of service. Although early modern England imagined itself as a place where slavery 'could not exist',[6] Chakravarty's elegant and wide-ranging analysis traces the various and fluid forms service could take, some approximating almost a family member, others much closer in nature, if not in name, to slavery. Slavery and service, however, were understood in distinction to one another, though as Chakravarty demonstrates across her five chapters, 'repeatedly coarticulated'.[7] To be in service, whether to God or a guild, was, somewhat paradoxically, equated with rather than opposed to freedom and liberty in early modern culture, Chakravarty reveals. Indeed, 'the only condition that authorized bondage was — ironically — masterlessness'.[8] Chakravarty adeptly uncovers how this freedom was all too often based

on 'persistent and pervasive fictions of consent', fictions that 'organized different forms of early modern service and labor'.[9] As Chakravarty follows these ideas at play across the 1500s and 1600s, she expertly establishes how fictions of service and slavery developed another type of fiction — that of racial essentialism. Chakravarty thereby 'posits the *collusion* of early modern fictions of consent … with the fictions of race'.[10] As she investigates this collusion, Chakravarty confronts numerous contradictions and paradoxes — the shifting distinctions between servant and slave, the freedom supposedly found through service, and the instability of manumission, to name but a few. To compensate for the knottiness of her topic, Chakravarty provides a clear organizational roadmap for each chapter to assist her readers in grasping the strategic slippages operationalized in premodern beliefs about and depictions of service and its racialized components. *Fictions of Consent* elegantly uncovers how, as the dynamics and limits of service were worked out across early modern households, schoolrooms, families, and literary works, so too were the 'futures' of the 'racial and rhetorical strategies of Atlantic slavery'.[11]

Fictions of Consent's first two chapters explore the relationship between service and slavery, two categories imagined as mutually exclusive on an English soil that was supposedly 'Too pure an air for slaves to breath in',[12] but that in fact were in tenuous relationship with each other. Maintaining the fictional separation between these categories meant being able to demarcate servant from slave through visual markers such as livery. Chakravarty explains, however, that livery was a slippery 'technology of identification'[13] between 'consenting service on the one hand and bondage on the other; between the capacity and the compulsion to serve',[14] as she explores in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, John Cooke's *Greene's Tu Quoque*, and Thomas Dekker's *The Second Part of the Honest Whore*. In comparing these plays, Chakravarty reveals anxieties concerning 'the limitations of livery in a mercantile economy of credit',[15] as well as livery's unstable social demarcation. This chapter is the most muted in its discussion of racial formation, but the connection exists as livery trained the 'beholder to read for bondage',[16] a bondage that eventually moved from clothing to the body. The schoolroom educated boys to identify both the fixity and heritability of this racialized bondage, Chakravarty argues in Chapter 2. She focuses on enactments of Terence as well as Thomas Ingelend's *The Disobedient Chile* and William Cartwright's *The Royall Slave* to articulate how these plays reified the idea of 'English and strange' as separate,[17] in which the English could 'both participate in and be redeemed from slavery', an ideology in turn 'justify[ing] the enslavement of *other* people'.[18] In reality, this binary was much more complicated. Early modern society almost always already associated schoolboys with service and strangeness,

including bondage and violence,[19] and not only did it generally conceptualize children in relation to service, but as Chakravarty's close reading of apprenticeship documents exposes, it often relegated them to positions that 'deeply disrupt[ed] the boundaries between pedagogy and bondage, service and servitude'.[20] The redemption of slaves in the narratives of Terence's and Plautus's Roman plays pedagogically quelled potential worries about these contradictions by reinforcing associations between faithful service and liberty. This chapter therefore exposes how crucial 'disorient[ing] and disrupt[ing] the space and places where we search for the archives and genealogies of slavery' is,[21] as Chakravarty contends, for her analysis convincingly establishes the English schoolroom was a vital site for 'the pedagogy and performance of early modern race'.[22]

The following three chapters destabilize the already insecure demarcations made between masters and servants and servants and slaves. Chapter 3 takes up the relationship between family and slavery as explored in Ben Jonson's *Volpone*, Thomas Middleton and William Rowley's *The Changeling*, Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, and William Heminges's *The Fatal Contract*. The intimate connection between family and service is perhaps unsurprising given that 'the family owes its etymology to the Roman *famulus* and thus to slavery',[23] with family members often understood as servants of the house. As characters like Mosca, De Flores, and Malvolio and Maria demonstrate, the embeddedness of servants within family life meant that the 'foreign familiar, the parasite, the stranger within' constantly challenged the boundaries between the family of blood and the family of service. Just as service was constituted within and against the family,[24] so too was racial distinction, particularly Blackness, constituted within and against England's whiteness, Chakravarty argues.[25] Chakravarty thus makes clear that to have family in the premodern world meant to have slavery. To stop potential slippage between the two, Chakravarty notes the increasing importance of the links between slavery and natality in what turns into the 'biopolitics of bondage',[26] meaning that bondage becomes heritable and legible. This concept of the 'stain of slavery' resides at the heart of Chapter 4, where Chakravarty pairs in-depth analysis of indentured servant contracts with extended, incisive close reading of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* to expose how 'the indentured servant marks the terrain where each category must, for the first time, *explicitly* impinge on the other'[27] by depending on the necessity of 'absolute corporeal ownership'.[28] This chapter more than any other lays bare how much both liberty and consent were fictions, whether because contracts were intentionally vague, filled with 'strategic lacunae',[29] or because children were often indentured yet decidedly unable to consent.[30] Chakravarty uses this context to read slippages in the poem's language

that position Milton's Adam and Eve as indentured servants. In turn, for the pair, 'It is childbearing and reproduction … that is the site of the Fall',[31] which explains why both Adam and Even take an anti-natalist stance, a kindness to future generations that would prevent them from passing on the burden of sin, and with it, seemingly irrevocable bondage. Eve's bleak language racializes future natality, Chakravarty reveals. In *Paradise Lost*, Adam and Eve, thus, shift from indentured servants to slaves, and in this shift, the mark of slavery is passed along and inherited, 'anticipating the imperial projects of racial capitalism'.[32]

Terence and Shakespeare reappear and are put in conversation with one another in Chapter 5. As Chakravarty closes the book, she addresses one final fiction — that of a servant's eventual freedom by manumission. Chakravarty threads together consideration of the relationship between freedom and faithful service, the tenuousness and potential revocability of manumission, and the ways the Roman 'stain of slavery' (*macula servitutis*) 'anticipates the racialized register … that attaches to the supposedly manumitted servant'.[33] By placing Terence's *Andria* as an intertext for interpreting *The Tempest*'s Caliban, Chakravarty demonstrates how unstable potential freedom could be for a servant, for freedom is conditional and based on a 'perpetual obligation' that the freed servant must continue to articulate toward that master.[34] The 'Roman conceptual frameworks', thus, offer a 'calculated contingency' associated with bondage and freedom, one that 'authorizes but also comes to render legible both the discursive underpinnings of perpetual indebtedness, and … the somatic markers of enslavement'.[35] To close this chapter, Chakravarty turns to the case of Adam Saffin, John Saffin's 'negro man',[36] brought to the Americas and almost prohibited his freedom at the end of his years of service. Chakravarty thereby exposes how forms of service used in the classical past and redeployed in early modernity not only led to the delimiting of a servant like Ariel, but also to a form of bondage more akin to slavery, such as that experienced by Caliban, and ultimately, underpinned England's imperial futures. To solidify this point, *Fiction of Consent*'s epilogue traces how both Terence and Shakespeare, as well as the logics and fictions of service and slavery Chakravarty addresses throughout the monograph, reappear in the Atlantic world during the nineteenth century.

Fictions of Consent exemplifies the rigorous, powerful, deeply historical work PCRS offers premodern studies by vitally expanding our literary and historical comprehension of how early modern England's culture laid the groundwork for racialized servitude, as well as how it disseminated that ideological groundwork through its literature, particularly its drama. *Fictions of Consent* therefore invites reconsideration of influential new historicist conversations about demarcations of

difference in early modern culture, such as Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass's *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*.[37] Not only does Chakravarty further our understanding of the social importance of clothing in early modern England, but she also newly establishes the racial legacy of this signification. Similarly, Chapter 2 indirectly extends Lynn Enterline's discussion of early modern pedagogy's social consequences in *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion*[38] by analyzing the ubiquity of the discourse of slavery in the early modern English classroom. Chakravarty's book also pairs beautifully with current discussions in PCRS, such as Patricia Akhimie's consideration of race, class, and service in the second and fourth chapters of *Shakespeare and the Cultivation of Difference: Race and Conduct in the Early Modern World*,[39] which explore similar themes in *The Comedy of Errors* and *The Tempest*, respectively. At the same time, she demonstrates the importance of extending considerations of race into epochs not always sanctioned as potential areas for such scholarship, like classics. This extension has been a fundamental aspect of RaceB4Race's contributions to the field since its inception in 2019, and as the first book in the RaceB4Race series for University of Pennsylvania Press, Chakravarty's monograph sets an impressive standard for analyzing relationships between the racial histories informing the premodern world, racial formation in the Renaissance itself, and the racial legacy of early modernity.

In a discussion of the rhetoric of race, Chakravarty asks, 'How do we understand early modern blackness when the languages used to denote black people … served both to delineate identity and to demolish fixity, and comprise even different kinds of black people: Indians, Africans, Moors?'[40] Chapman's methodological intervention in *Anti-Black Racism in Early Modern English Drama* provides an answer to this question. Like Chakravarty, Chapman roundly rejects assertions that premodern race is anachronistic, directly contesting the claim 'that contemporary notions of race cannot be retrofitted into Early Modern England'.[41] He does just that by employing Afro-pessimism to radically reorient understandings of race, specifically Blackness, in early modern culture and drama. Most significantly, Chapman asserts that while Moors, Africans, Turks, Native Americans, and more were all defined by difference, too often, scholarship has conflated these identities, leading to the assumption 'that the English gaze interpreted and defined all of these groups as equals', which 'flattens the vast differences among the groups'.[42] Chapman moves attention from examining identity to examining subjectivity, arguing that 'representations of black characters, regardless of the conventions used, established a dichotomy between human and nonhuman',[43] so that the 'English subject defined his very humanity through racialized differences

between white and black',[44] in turn 'incorpor[ating] all non-English Others into human subjectivity in opposition to notions of black abjection'.[45] Chapman's monograph thus intervenes in and advances numerous important PCRS conversations about the relationship between terms like Ethiop, Moor, and Blackness, the depiction of various Black identities on the early modern stage, and the identification of racial capitalism's dehumanizing tenets in the premodern world. At the same time, *Anti-Black Racism in Early Modern England* establishes broader interventions, such as when Chapman forcefully combats the continued claim that anti-Black racial formation, and with it, racism, are a particularly American phenomena. Chapman contends, 'The English who began the chattel slave trade would have had to engage in "selective recognition" for the slaves to be placed on the ships to begin with, thus making the English psyche, not the American psyche, the point of origin for notions of selective recognition'.[46] By recognizing the importance of anti-Black sentiment in early modern England, Chapman expands Afro-pessimist scholarship by Orlando Patterson, Frank Wilderson, Saidiya Hartman, David S. Marriott, and Jared Sexton, who focus on the United States, by extending their established chronology from the hold of the slave ship to 'the civilization that created the slave ship'.[47]

Chapter 1 demonstrates the wide scope of Chapman's analysis, moving from a reading of the Manichean influence on Christianity as represented in medieval cycles and pageants, to the staging of Blackness in Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* and Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost*, and ending with the significatory function of Blackness in Restoration portraits. In doing so, he traces early representations of Blackness in devils who 'embodied incarnations of preexisting blackness',[48] but those devils eventually disappeared, giving way to blackface characters on the English commercial stage whose embodiment and depiction positioned them as ontologically different and 'lacking the capacity for interlocution with civil society'.[49] By the Restoration, Black people in double portraits 'perform the ontological difference between the subject and the black by subverting the expectations of identity established through sumptuary laws'.[50] In this chapter, then, Chapman chooses breadth over depth as he moves across centuries to demonstrate how Blackness as ontologically distinct from whiteness became established and entrenched in premodern England. Reading brief, interrelated interrogations such as these, I wonder if such instances across PCRS risk being selectively singled out in the call for further historicization. Such engaging readings did leave me wanting further analysis of the Chapman's examples because I was so struck by the reorienting implications of his readings. But to attack such scholarly moments of brevity seems uncharitable when PCRS scholars, like

Chapman, are working to lay new approaches to the past that at times necessitate broad strokes in order to establish patterns and historical arcs.

Chapman, in fact, traverses much more streamlined historical ground in subsequent chapters, especially as he moves to what I would suggest are the most challenging pieces of his argument: distinctions between the various others in early modern England, specifically, what he articulates as the separation between Moors and Blacks. That the term Moor is incredibly fluid in the identities and meanings it encompassed has long been a mainstay of PCRS — as work by Emily Bartels,[51] Michael Neill,[52] and Ambereen Dadabhoy[53] addresses. PCRS scholars have also shown that designations such as Moor, Blackamoor, Ethiop, and even Indian were used interchangeably, sometimes with intentional precision, or with strategic vagueness. Yet Chapman posits instead that 'Many characteristics of Early Modern English drama, including narrative, character, speech, and others, reveal a stark divide between Moors and blacks in the psyche of the early modern subject'.[54] The former were racialized, Chapman concedes, but only 'at the level of identity' rather than 'at the level of subjectivity'.[55] Early modern subjects thus still considered Moors human whereas they understood Blacks as 'the abject of humanity' and constructed ontologically in a way that fits within the 'conception of Slavery as a form of social death' put forth by Patterson.[56]

In his longest chapter (Chapter 2), Chapman compares Moors and Blacks by analyzing Muly Muhamet, a Moor described as Black in George Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar*. Though barbarous, initially Muly occupies 'the structural position of the human',[57] as can be seen by his capacity for filial relationships, a capacity denied the slave. Peele's characterization of Muly, Chapman argues, indicates that the Moor can become Black — an abject, inhuman figure — but a Moor does not start off as Black structurally. Chapman then turns to the depictions of madness in Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, in which human subjectivity does not extend to the African Marsilius, who is never conceived as Orlando's rival but rather gives up his land and daughter to Orlando, thereby becoming the only character 'to suffer submission, natal alienation, and social death'.[58] Chapman closes this chapter by turning to *Mr Moore's Revels*, contrasting the depiction of the Moors — whom the audience can 'make' white in their minds — with that of the apes who, according to Chapman, represent Black Africans. While the Moors thus have the capacity for subjectivity, the inhuman apes can only '[attempt] to imitate humanity'.[59] Chapman therefore emphasizes that Blackness cannot simply be reduced to skin colour; rather, if understood through an Afro-pessimist lens, Blackness is an ontological state of abjectness both in society and in art.

How, then, would such a conceptualization inform our understanding of Shakespeare's most (in)famous Black character, Othello? Chapman tackles this question in Chapter 3, which he provocatively entitles 'Othello is a White Man'.[60] Chapman advances the seemingly paradoxical claim that though Othello 'may be aesthetically different, [he] cannot be read as a black character'.[61] Othello, he asserts, is structurally positioned as a subject by the Venetians, as can be seen by his deliverance from slavery, his ability to assert his own identity (including Blackness), the fact that he enacts rather than experiences violence, and his access to 'both a discourse and a justice system unavailable to the Slave'.[62] Because Othello can turn into the slave rather than being one from the outset, he did not begin the play as ontologically Black.[63] This fact, Chapman contends, creates a philosophical problem for Iago, the only character who always sees Othello as the Black abject or the 'black imago'.[64] Chapman thus challenges most readings of race in *Othello*, expressly stating that conceiving of Othello as Black in this play is a mistake.[65] In *Othello*, Chapman instead stresses, Shakespeare is working through anxieties about rather than depicting abject Blackness.

If characters can move from subject to slave, then can they likewise move from slave to subject? Chapman addresses this possibility through *Titus Andronicus*'s Aaron in Chapter 5, my favourite chapter in the book. *Titus*'s structure and language demonstrate what Chapman calls the 'semiotic dissonance' Aaron causes the characters within the play, and likely those reading/watching it.[66] For, if figures like Muly Muhamet and Othello start off as subjects and become Black, Aaron takes the opposite trajectory, entering the play as a slave but ending it as a subject.[67] However, Aaron's 'incorporation into civil society coincides with the collapse of that society'.[68] Chapman ably threads together the emphases on interlocution, family, and violence in previous chapters as he details how Aaron manipulates the systems employed to marginalize him. Chapman ultimately argues, the semiotic dissonance Aaron causes is most provoked by his and Tamora's child, a being who raises the fundamental problem: 'if the Slave can now be born a subject, then how does one know what is a subject?'[69] Chapman thereby demonstrates how the 'text and staging of the play work together' to displace anxiety over this epistemological instability onto Aaron, making him 'the impetus for a failure of civil structures'.[70] What this blame papers over, then, is the possibility that Aaron and his son raise — the possibility of a new racial world order.

While most of Chapman's book traces distinctions between Moors and Blacks, in Chapter 4, he compares descriptions of Native Americans with those of Africans in John Hawkins's travel narratives and William Davenant's *The Cruelty of*

Spaniards in Peru. Hawkins's retelling positions Blacks as inhuman by describing them as an 'undefined collective',[71] subjugated by force specifically for the purpose of enslavement, and as having no 'recognition of the capacity to possess property'.[72] Hawkins thus attempts no relationality between himself and Blacks. Chapman also considers how Hawkins's narrative — as well as other early modern authors' texts — suggests that Blacks lack the capacity for gender.[73] Here, Chapman especially builds on Hartman's work to assert that the slave has no gender because they have no individual identity and, relatedly, no right to their body.[74] This lack of gender affects relationality, for no gender means no family, with man, woman, and child losing meaning so that 'all three exist equally as sentient flesh'.[75] Turning to a concept likewise explored by Chakravarty, Chapman notes how natal alienation becomes a part of the Slave's body, produced 'by ungendered black flesh'.[76] Conversely, his close reading of Hawkins's descriptions of Native Americans reveals that Hawkins grants them specificity, gender distinction, the ability to feel shame and even empathy for the violence enacted against them by the Spaniards,[77] a subjectivity similarly afforded in William Davenant's private masque *The Cruelty of the Spaniards*. This contrast therefore advances Chapman's assertion that even as there were various racial others in early modern England, Blacks held a particular abject place in early modern thought and culture.

Fundamentally, Chapman's book necessitates a paradigm shift regarding how to analyze Blackness in early modernity and its texts. Chapman in fact repeatedly emphasizes how his methodological reorientation reframes existing PCRS scholarship, which I imagine will foster healthy debate. His claim about the totalizing distinctions made in the premodern world between different Black identities — such as Moors and Black Africans — will surely invite further scrutiny. In her third chapter, Chakravarty traces slippages in language used to demarcate Blackness that suggest a less clear distinction between structures of Blackness than Chapman asserts, for instance, as does Dadabhoy's reading of Blackness and the term 'Moor' in *The Battle of Alcazar.* Chapman, moreover, attests that 'within the paradigm of both Early Modern England and Modern America, a black Othello is an impossibility'.[78] Yet if 'Moor' is not a common identity in modernity, then what would Othello be if not Black, and how might historical changes complicate such a claim? Miles Grier's upcoming *Inkface: Othello and the Hidden History of White Interpretive Community*[79] and my own *Reanimating Shakespeare's Othello in Post-Racial America*[80] may serve as helpful pairings to further consider cross-historical overlaps and distinctions of Black abjectness across time. Chapman himself asserts that his book does not necessarily 'settle' but rather offers 'new interventions' into ongoing scholarly discussions, 'illuminat[ing] problems

rather than solv[ing] them',[81] thus expressly inviting these future discussions and deliberations.

To be productive, however, these conversations likely necessitate filling in pedagogical gaps. While reading Chapman's compelling arguments, I realized just how little Afro-pessimist work I had been exposed to in my training. Chapman's book could help its audience, especially those filling in lacuna from outside premodern studies, by starting with a clear overview of Afro-pessimist methodology and framing instead of having its concept spread out across chapters. At the same time, *Anti-Black Racism in Early Modern English Drama* demonstrates the continued need for interdisciplinarity in the anti-racist classroom, which Ambereen Dadabhoy and Nedda Mehdizadeh's *Anti-Racist Shakespeare* likewise stresses.[82] The problem, then, may not be historicizing but rather being afforded the opportunity to do so with the most effective tools. Chapman's monograph truly does offer 'new beginnings' for PCRS scholarship as he establishes the cultural, philosophical, and, importantly for my framing of this essay, historical antecedents to the characterization of Blackness as abject so characteristic of the Enlightenment and beyond.[83]

While Chakravarty's and Chapman's books deeply invest in rethinking the racialized literary history of premodernity, Espinosa's *Shakespeare on the Shades of Racism* takes an unabashedly presentist approach. In a text whose imagined audience sits in the interstices between academic readers and the general public, Espinosa embraces temporal fluidity 'to engage Shakespeare not only to see what his works offer in the way of understanding the various forms of racism in our present moment, but [also] to see how the various forms of racism in our present moment allow us to reconceive of Shakespeare's value anew'.[84] To do so, each of Espinosa's seven chapters and an afterword function like individual essays tied together by the through lines of Shakespeare and racism. This structure makes the book not only eminently readable, but also eminently teachable, a powerful, moving, transformative monograph that beseeches for new understandings of race and Shakespeare to lead to more just actions both within and outside of the field. Chapter 1 focuses on whiteness, the overbearing power shaping racism in premodernity — as both Chakravarty and Chapman expose — and today — as Espinosa and Thompson reveal. Opening with Billie Holiday's 'Strange Fruit' establishes how the anti-Blackness Chapman identifies lingers into the present. Espinosa interweaves readings of *Titus Andronicus* and *Othello* with modern adaptations and appropriations like *American Moor* and *Desdemona* to direct unceasing attention to 'the brutalized bodies of Black individuals' as well as the reader's own relationship to that subjugation.[85] In *Othello*, for instance, the 'disembodiment'

of the Black body — which Espinosa characterizes as a 'kind of terrorism'[86] — occurs across characters and moments, from Desdemona's language to the Duke's backhanded praise to Iago's more express violations. And these violations linger, whether in the painful, decidedly not benign racist laughter elicited when *Othello* is performed, or in the just as malignant 'racism at the highest level of our democracy … [a] malignancy on par with the evil that Iago exhibits'.[87] Dramas created by artists like Cobb and Morrison contest this erasure. Chapter 1 thus demonstrates the hope that can be found in Shakespeare's work and its afterlives, but also the 'desecration' and grotesqueness of white supremacy that they expose.[88]

Espinosa tackles the relationship between Christianity, racism, and immigration in Chapter 2, drawing a line from 'What would Jesus do' to 'What would Shakespeare do' to, the most imperative issue for him, 'what *we* need to do in the face of such vile injustice'.[89] Espinosa is unyielding in his efforts to have readers hold themselves accountable for either propping up or dismantling social injustices present today whose long-standing natures appear across Shakespeare's canon. For instance, recent transnational debates about immigrants have led people to turn to 'The Stranger's Case' speech from *Sir Thomas More* as evidence for Shakespeare's approbation of the immigrant. But, Espinosa demonstrates, the question of nation and belonging in Shakespeare is much more complicated, as seen when characters in *The Merchant of Venice* liken both Jews and Black people to the devil, or when Portia works to 'make an example of that ambitious Jew'.[90] What Shakespeare's plays make visible, then, is a 'vicious whiteness' that constructs itself as superior and exclusive,[91] as Espinosa uncovers through his reading of *Henry V*, in which outsiders experience marginalization rather than kinship. Thus, 'To be kind and natural is to belong, and not all citizens — in Shakespeare's England, in his plays, and in our world — are thought to belong',[92] especially 'those not fair of skin' and/or 'not Christian'.[93]

Issues of brutality and immigration join together in Chapter 3, for me Espinosa's most moving and emotionally challenging chapter, as he 'considers how images and voices of children both today and in Shakespeare reveal 'the horrors of tyranny'.[94] *The Winter's Tale*'s Mamillius demonstrates how children offer 'the promise of a better future' that is broken when children die.[95] Vulnerable children in Shakespeare's dramas and in daily life force us to 'recognize our failings from generation to generation'.[96] Such failings often result from systems, Espinosa argues, as seen in *Macbeth*, in which children become increasingly unsafe as the world becomes progressively nightmarish,[97] or in the United States, where Black and Latinx children are constantly in peril. In this way, then, Espinosa meditates on the relationship between race, family, and natality that both Chakravarty and

Chapman consider, connecting concerns from the early modern world all the way to the present moment. Focusing on the humanitarian crisis at the United States/Mexico border, Espinosa launches a searing attack on the Trump administration's unjust and 'inhospitable ethos against brown and Black children',[98] using a range of sources that give voice to the traumatized children 'devalued beyond belief in our nation'.[99] Where does Shakespeare fit in all of this? Shakespeare may point to 'inhumane structures', as seen in Macbeth's destruction of Macduff's children,[100] but ultimately, when one confronts a racial reality that results in the abuse of Black and brown children, Espinosa stresses that Shakespeare offers 'Nothing', no 'universal truth to spotlight that horror'.[101] Espinosa thus continually prompts readers to contemplate their own 'level of complicity within this awful system'[102] as well as how they can use Shakespeare to 'cast a light on the shades of racism that surround us'.[103] Macduff poignantly cries out in pain for 'All my pretty ones,' all the children who suffer, Espinosa observes.[104] Who, he hauntingly asks, is crying out for all the pretty ones now?

In Chapters 4 and 5, Espinosa addresses the racial divisions that thwart solidarity and community. Chapter 4 centres white women's perpetuation of white supremacy — Espinosa calls them an 'essential facet of [its] foundation'[105] — most often at the expense of Black women. The role of white women appears in Shakespeare through figures like Portia, Desdemona, or Rosalind in *As You Like It*. The play establishes Rosalind's superiority, for instance, through various references to Celia/Aliena's brownness, so that Celia in brown face serves as 'the proverbial prop in the way so many Black servants served as diminutive props in Elizabethan portraiture',[106] and in Restoration portraiture too, as Chapmen asserts. Espinosa places such moments in conversation with works like Sharon Patricia Holland's *The Erotic Life of Racism* and Claudia Rankine's *Citizen: An American Lyric* to demonstrate how 'Confidence, when it comes from Black, Indigenous, and people of color, is often seen as a threat to the privileges that whiteness affords'.[107] In reality, however, white women use Black women to centre and elevate whiteness, as Espinosa reveals Desdemona does with Barbary,[108] a power dynamic further explored in Djanet Sears's moving play *Harlem Duet*. Solidarity is also at the heart of Chapter 5, where Espinosa advocates for coalitions and communities that undertake 'a praxis of solidarity for Black and brown people'.[109] Otherwise, the weight of exclusion created by being cast out by white supremacy 'is a burden too heavy for any of us to bear'.[110] Espinosa opens this chapter by revisiting *Henry V* to stress how English nationalism rejects full inclusivity.[111] This inherent dependence upon marginalization, creating both others, but as Chapman notes, other Others, often creates pressure for the assimilation in

and approximation of whiteness, which, Espinosa argues via John Márquez, divides Black and brown identities.[112] Espinosa, like Chakravarty, then undertakes a sustained reading of *The Tempest* to reiterate how whiteness uses inhumane and racist methods to shore up its power and turns to Caliban, the figure who 'faces the harshest oppression in the play' and has therefore garnered identification with a wide range of multicultural and multiracial people.[113] Espinosa closes with Indira Karamcheti's engagement with Caliban to stress how Black and brown bodies are especially vulnerable and would therefore more effectively achieve antiracist aims if working in concert with one another.

Chapters 6 and 7 each focus on a respective affect: indifference and pain. In his criticism of the Duke and courtiers, *As You Like It*'s Jacques asks the men to 'consider their own roles in the exploitations of those they are displacing',[114] and, Espinosa suggests, he invites readers to do the same. Espinosa moves from the tongue-in-cheek treatment of Trump by comedy sketch show *Saturday Night Live* to Gloria Anzaldúa to the crisis at the border once more to articulate how easily we can become numb and indifferent to the pervasive and persisting atrocities surrounding us. But as *Measure for Measure*'s Barnardine demonstrates, 'active resistance'[115] is vital to shedding light on the violence of unjust policies and systems; resistances sometimes as uncomplicated as 'a simple, "no"'[116] signal a commitment to 'paying attention, speaking up and out, and looking to forge a community committed to antiracist efforts'.[117] But as Espinosa traces in his concluding chapter, for Black and brown people, this speaking out often comes with pain, the same type of suffering invoked by *King Lear*'s evocative howl amidst the storm. Analyzing James Baldwin, Espinosa returns to the fact that brown and Black people will likely have a very different relationship to Shakespeare, thereby rejecting the long-held idea of universal Shakespeare. He argues that 'we can use Shakespeare as a vehicle but not as a source of some sense of universal truth'.[118] To stress how engaging with Shakespeare uncritically is a more circumscribed version of the distinct pain Black and brown bodies feel in a nation that breaks their hearts,[119] Espinosa focuses on Kim F. Hall's presentation at the 2019 meeting of the Shakespeare Association of America. He recounts how Hall's research sought to recuperate the voices of enslaved Black men in an archive that preserved 'the memory of these white slave owners'.[120] It is no wonder, then, that like Lear and Edgar, people of colour in the United States. must confront profound grief and pain, howling as they struggle against various forces, from Shakespeare to the archives to the government itself, that refuse them belonging. In his brief afterword, Espinosa considers how COVID-19 exacerbated the injustices his book

confronts, but he also notes how the 2020 defeat of Donald Trump offers some hope that 'for those of us committed to antiracist efforts, our time is now'.[121]

Shakespeare on the Shades of Racism demonstrates just how far PCRS scholarship has come. Espinosa can take as a given many of the arguments he makes about race and difference in Shakespeare's work because, as his analysis, endnotes, and 'Further Reading' section show, he builds on the incredible foundation of and recent contributions to PCRS. For this book, Shakespeare rather than early modern culture serves as focus of historical inquiry, yet, as it does across Chakravarty's, Chapman's, and Thompson's monographs, the relationship between race and whiteness, servitude, family, and identity all reappear. Together, these books uncover the *longue durée* of white supremacy, one, Espinosa incisively exposes, that makes its way into the Shakespearean works we read, stage, and teach. I understand that for some Shakespeareans, a presentist approach might seem to capitulate to increased pressures to make Shakespeare exciting and relevant for both students and the masses. But *Shakespeare on the Shades of Racism* reveals how powerful and meaningful such an approach can be, especially for encouraging different audiences to engage with Shakespeare and for encouraging existing audiences to engage with Shakespeare differently. Yet, despite the depth of Espinosa's book, and although he makes it clear that he employs literary texts from the past to shed light on the present, I wonder if works such as his are examples of what some identified and then criticized erroneously as poorly historicized applications of the present upon the past. Such a take would be a problem not with the monograph, but rather with a reader not attending carefully to methods and clearly stated aims. Indeed, I suggest that Espinosa does offer historicization, not of the past, but rather of the present — or at least the beginnings of such — by establishing the vital contextualization for our current historical moment that scholars in the future can turn to as they consider race in this particular epoch. In other words, just as Chakravarty, Chapman, and, more briefly, Thompson, probe premodern writings to assess how race was conceived of and operationalized in premodern eras, so can scholars of the future turn to a work like Espinosa's (and Thompson's) to conceptualize how race is conceived of and operationalized in our present moment.

In *Blackface*, Thompson bridges the engagement with premodern and modern worlds undertaken by the three texts discussed above as she tackles the contentious, pervasive, and disturbing topic of blackface for general audiences. Over her seven concise chapters, Thompson places herself in the reader's point of view, as indicated by the fact that almost each chapter has a title in the form of a question a reader would likely ask, such as, 'Why Write This Book?' (Chapter 1) or 'What is

Blackface?' (Chapter 3). Though Thompson engages with historical context more than Espinosa, her book is no less personal, as indicated by her framing *Blackface* with a story about her son Dash confronting the issue in elementary school when classmates used blackface while dressing up as historical figures for a presentation. For Thompson, this incident crystalized 'American amnesia with regard to racism and racial violence',[122] a forgetting so common that she characterizes her book as 'a defiant and material act of remembering our collective American history'.[123] This history is also part of the present, as explored in Chapter 2 through public figures like Meghan Kelly, Justin Trudeau, and Ralph Northam (among others) who have each faced blackface scandals. Thompson focuses less on why these figures employ blackface and more on how they defend themselves once their blackface is discovered. Inevitably, they weaponize the shield of 'the inherent white supremacist logic of white innocence' to explain, even excuse, their actions.[124] Thompson delves, here, into the ideology subtending England's view of itself as a nation that could not support slavery (*Fictions of Consent*), the depiction of characters like Portia who uncritically wield the power of their white femininity against characters conceived as non-Christian and non-white, and a system that deprives Black and brown children of innocence, offering them suffering instead (*Shakespeare on the Shades of Racism*). Thompson details how white innocence may appear as assertions of ignorance (I didn't know), supposed historical contextualization (It was okay back then), a focus on a lack of malintent (It was an homage), or perhaps a combination of these approaches. Yet whatever guise they take, such understandings of 'innocence' make it a state 'that is the sole domain of white people', as Thompson exposes across *Blackface*.[125]

But first, Thompson lays out what blackface is (Chapter 1) and why it exists (Chapter 2). Thompson defines blackface as fundamentally 'the application of any prosthetic — makeup, soot, burnt cork, minerals, masks, etc. — to imitate the complexion of another race'.[126] Treating blackface and brownface together as manifestations of the desire to 'perform, or appear to be, another race',[127] Thompson moves from early modern drama to nineteenth-century American burlesques to articulate how blackface 'was from the start a white endeavor', though it should be noted in an extension of Chapman's emphasis, not simply an American one.[128] How does such an undertaking get framed? Thompson reveals that many white actors turned to the assertion of verisimilitude to explain and justify both their use of blackface and accompanying stereotypical performances of Blackness.[129] Here, those familiar with arguments regarding history and racial representation can perceive the corollary to the common contention that people of colour cannot be depicted in historical renderings on page, stage, or screen because of historical

accuracy, which L. Monique Pittman's recent *Shakespeare's Contested Nations: Race, Gender, and Multicultural Britain in Performances of the History Plays*[130] addresses in depth. Thompson reveals, if they are depicted, the same appeal to verisimilitude excuses their caricatured representation by whiteness. Thompson continues weaving together the cross-historical patterns of racial performance in Chapter 4, where she explains that 'One must understand the history of performing blackness in earlier periods to understand how black minstrelsy came into being'.[131] Building on Dympna Callaghan, Thompson traces how depictions of the Black body in the premodern world were often either for exhibition or mimesis; but either way, they elevated whiteness, particularly emphasizing the protean nature of the white actor/impersonator. In the second half of the chapter, Thompson contrasts how people derided rather than celebrated the protean racial performances of Black actors like James Hewlett and Ira Aldridge, especially if/when they donned whiteface, because they defied exhibition, the 'performance mode that blacks had been locked into since at least Shakespeare's time'.[132] Thus, while 'white actors are often heralded as being virtuosos if they impersonate another gender or race,' for black actors, 'it is nearly impossible … to be read as virtuoso performers regardless of what they do'.[133]

Thompson delves into this assertion in Chapters 5 and 6. She begins by focusing on the relationship between white actors and blackface, turning to three 'Blacked Up' examples across Chapter 5: 1. comedians like Jimmy Fallon, Sarah Silverman, and Jimmy Kimmel who have all used blackface in comedy bits; 2. Laurence Olivier's and Anthony Hopkins's respective blackface performances of *Othello*; and 3. Robert Downey, Jr's, use of blackface in Ben Stiller's *Tropic Thunder* (2008). The first example resonates with Espinosa's consideration of the way laughter functions in *Othello*, while the second not only returns readers to Shakespeare's arguably most famous 'race play', but also demonstrates how Shakespearean performance history participates in contemporary racial formation. By probing Stiller's response to the problem of blackface, the third example stresses the themes of white innocence and white virtuosity that 'leave the performance of blackness firmly rooted as white property'.[134] What does the status of performing Blackness as white property mean for Black actors? Chapter 6 explores this topic as Thompson analyzes three performance modes in the twenty-first century that make it 'possible to see the legacy of these unequal horizons of expectations for black performers':[135] minstrelsy/imitation (explored through Tyler Perry's Madea), which circulates caricatures like 'The Tom, the Coon, the Mammy, and the Buck';[136] exhibition/trauma (examined through *12 Years a Slave*), the genre frequently rewarded by the film industry as it displays the abject Black body; and

anxiety/authenticity (analyzed through Kenya Barris's show *#blackAF*), a mode revealing how Black performers have internalized the idea of performing Blackness as white property.[137] Thompson laments how histories of racial performance, particularized through blackface, have instantiated a lack of diverse performances of Blackness in the twenty-first century.[138] She concludes with an epilogue pointing to the ubiquity of blackface in the current day across places (the United States, Japan, etc) and spaces (the fashion industry, on influencer's Instagram feeds). The scripts of Black performance have a long historical arc that remains both persistent and pernicious, Thompson's book reveals.

I have written on how Thompson has made impressive and necessary inroads into the rarefied set of scholars frequently asked to speak to the public on Shakespeare, scholars often male, white, and teaching at elite academic institutions.[139] *Blackface* elegantly demonstrates the necessity of her voice to diversifying that circle as she beautifully brings together historical contextualization with incisive attention to the relationships between race and performance in contemporary culture and media, all while balancing the difficult task of explaining perhaps unfamiliar historical and academic contexts while never talking down to her readers. I especially want to highlight how important I believe her consideration of current media to be, for even though she ably establishes the ubiquity of blackface, some readers may still wonder about the need to interrogate the practice. 'Haven't we all decided it's wrong and unacceptable?', one might ask. But Chapter 6 exposes how the ripple effects of the blackface tradition can and must be located beyond darkening up with makeup within the racial performances allowed and disallowed white and Black actors. Borrowing from the Thompson's own attention to performance, I used the term 'scripts' above, which reveals the important groundwork Thompson lays as she pushes for continued interrogation of racial performance, a topic Noémie Ndiaye addresses across the transnational premodern world in her new monograph *Scripts of Blackness: Early Modern Performance Culture and the Making of Race*.[140] Thompson thus underscores significant avenues of inquiry for PCRS while generously and effectively extending this conversation beyond academic circles. In doing so, she helps advance the possibility that in this post-George Floyd moment, 'there may be a new historical arc forming for performance',[141] one in which 'this particular historical moment' affords people,[142] including her readers, the opportunity to 'absorb this performance history in a new way, a way that inspires change'.[143]

Thompson's closing words express just how much an engagement with history is vital to both academic and more public-facing work by PCRS scholars. Approaching history through a PCRS lens may entail reconsidering established

archives or finding new ones that excavate subjugated voices, like those pressed into service, even servitude, as it became a racialized state. It may mean employing underutilized philosophical and methodological frameworks to trace a new literary history of racial, specifically Black, ontology. Perhaps it looks like a passionate weaving together of narratives from the past and present, a weaving that discloses how racial formation and subjugation both then and now share eerily similar and painful strategies that reverberate from dramas to governments. Or, PCRS historicizing may excavate the histories of racial performance in order to understand racial depictions and dynamics current culture has inherited and too often unquestioningly reiterates. I ended my overview of Thompson's *Blackface* very deliberately, because her intentional repetition of and therefore emphasis on history encapsulates how all four of the books I address here historicize in hopes of reconceiving the past, newly envisaging the future, or perhaps both. One can thus argue in good faith that PCRS should historicize new archives, different texts, or attend to unique or unconsidered areas of inquiry. Yet I would contend that PCRS scholars need not undertake the herculean task of battling the hydra of history, because to make the blanket claim that PCRS scholarship needs to historicize is altogether disingenuous, to suggest either tacitly or state expressly that its scholars are uncritically applying modern, 'woke' or critical race theory ideas onto the past. For even as the monographs I review here examine different eras, employ unique approaches, and are crafted for distinct audiences, they all nonetheless prove assertions about missing historicization to be facile and uninformed. As Margo Hendricks has made clear, not all scholarship on race in the premodern era can be called PCRS scholarship. PCRS creates 'connective tissue' between white supremacy in the past and its resurgence today while it decentres white subjectivity,[144] challenges anti-blackness, considers indigeneity, pushes back against racial capitalism, and strives for an activist commitment in its scholarly and pedagogical endeavors.[145] Thus, if the work is not historicizing, then the work is not really PCRS. In the face of decades of push back, true PCRS scholars nevertheless engage with, challenge, and disrupt history because they want to use it in hopes of crafting a better present and future, both for the field and the world they inhabit. To understand this, one need only do the reading.

Notes

1 See Barbara Bogaev, Ian Smith, and Ayana Thompson, '50: *Othello* and Blackface', June 2016, in *Shakespeare Unlimited*, produced by Richard Paul, podcast, MP3 audio 35:46, https://www.folger.edu/shakespeare-unlimited/othello-blackface. In this podcast episode Ian Smith and Ayanna Thompson share two specific instances that illustrate what I describe here where scholars confronted them regarding their respective work on race by turning to assertions about appropriate historicity and the problem of anachronism. Smith shares how a fellow panelist at a Shakespeare conference kept insisting that *Othello* was not about race, and in doing so, 'he was suggesting that race was not something that people thought about in Shakespeare's time, and the term "race" itself, he was suggesting, didn't have the kind of force that it has for us until the 18th century or so, that somehow we were misusing a term that was anachronistic. And so, he was correcting us and saying that we should not be deploying a term in such a careless fashion'. Smith counters, 'What is astounding to me is that that sort of very narrow thinking somehow did not and does not give due credence to the fact that there are patterns of behavior and sort of practices that Shakespeare was clearly calling attention to, to which we may give the term "race". But, the patterns of behavior are still very much recognizable. And so, to quibble over the term "race" itself in that very narrow way, I think, is to try to use historical accuracy as a kind of moral high ground from which to really delegitimize race work and to silence others from doing that kind of work'. Thompson likewise offers her own, similar experience, 'where an older white scholar turned to me, after I gave a paper about the uses of blackface in the early modern period … he turned to me, and he said, "And, you, you, how dare you use the world "blackface?" You know you're doing history a disservice". And basically, was trying to shame me and silence me. And also, police the borders of Shakespeare studies in a way that I think is very similar to what Ian described'.

2 Ayanna Thompson, 'Did the Concept of Race Exist for Shakespeare and His Contemporaries?: An Introduction', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Race*, ed. Ayanna Thompson (Cambridge, 2021), 1–16, 8, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108684750.001.

3 Feisal G. Mohamed, 'On Race and Historicism: A Polemic in Three Turns', *English Literary History*, 89.2 (2022), 377–405, 379, https://doi.org/10.1353/elh.2022.0014.

4 Ibid, 380.

5 Christina Sharpe, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being* (Durham NC, 2016), 9, https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822373452.

6 Urvashi Chakravarty, *Fictions of Consent: Slavery, Servitude, and Free Service in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia, 2022), 1, https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812298260.
7 Ibid, 8.
8 Ibid, 4.
9 Ibid, 6.
10 Ibid, 7.
11 Ibid.
12 Ibid, 1.
13 Ibid, 20.
14 Ibid, 19.
15 Ibid, 41.
16 Ibid, 43.
17 Ibid, 49.
18 Ibid, 47.
19 For more detailed discussion, see ibid, 52–5.
20 Ibid, 66.
21 Ibid, 11.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid, 92.
24 Ibid, 107.
25 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 99.
26 Ibid, 129, 130.
27 Ibid, 132.
28 Ibid, 133.
29 Ibid, 138.
30 Ibid, 150, 151.
31 Ibid, 166.
32 Ibid, 168.
33 Ibid, 173.
34 Ibid, 177.
35 Ibid, 187.
36 Ibid, 190.
37 Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge, 2000).
38 Lynn Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion* (Philadelphia, 2012), https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812207132.
39 Patricia Akhimie, *Shakespeare and the Cultivation of Difference: Race and Conduct in the Early Modern World* (London, 2018), https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351125048.

40 Ibid, 93.
41 Matthieu Chapman, *Anti-Black Racism in Early Modern English Drama: The Other 'Other'* (Oxfordshire 2017), 3, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315559544.
42 Ibid, 8.
43 Ibid, 10.
44 Ibid, 11.
45 Ibid, 12.
46 Ibid, 13.
47 Ibid, 19.
48 Ibid, 35.
49 Ibid, 51.
50 Ibid, 6.
51 Emily Bartels, *Speaking of the Moor: From 'Alcazar' to 'Othello'* (Philadelphia, 2008), https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812200294.
52 Michael Neill, '"Mulattoes", "Blacks", and "Indian Moors": *Othello* and Early Modern Constructions of Difference', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49.4 (1998), 361–74, https://doi.org/10.2307/2902233.
53 Ambereen Dadabhoy, 'Barbarian Moors: Documenting Racial Formation in Early Modern England', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Race*, ed. Ayanna Thompson (Cambridge, 2021), 30–46, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108684750.003.
54 Ibid, 9.
55 Ibid, 69.
56 Ibid, 74.
57 Ibid, 76.
58 Ibid, 90.
59 Ibid, 96.
60 Ibid, 106.
61 Ibid, 110.
62 Ibid, 115.
63 Ibid, 119.
64 Ibid, 121.
65 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 122.
66 Ibid, 161.
67 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 157.
68 Ibid.
69 Ibid, 173.
70 Ibid, 178.
71 Ibid, 132.

72 Ibid, 137.
73 Ibid, 139.
74 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 141.
75 Ibid, 142.
76 Ibid.
77 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 146, 147.
78 Ibid, 112.
79 Miles Grier, *Inkface: Othello and the Hidden History of White Interpretive Community* (Charlottesville, forthcoming 2023).
80 Vanessa I. Corredera, *Reanimating Othello in Post-Racial America* (Edinburgh, 2023).
81 Ibid, 183.
82 Ambereen Dadabhoy and Nedda Mehdizadeh, *Anti-Racist Shakespeare* (Cambridge, forthcoming 2022).
83 Ibid, 183.
84 Ruben Espinosa, *Shakespeare on the Shades of Racism* (New York, 2021), 7, https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429060618.
85 Ibid, 12.
86 Ibid, 14.
87 Ibid, 21.
88 Ibid, 27.
89 Ibid, 37.
90 Ibid, 48.
91 Ibid, 49.
92 Ibid, 50.
93 Ibid, 51.
94 Ibid, 56.
95 Ibid.
96 Ibid, 57.
97 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 60.
98 Ibid, 64.
99 Ibid, 67.
100 Ibid, 67, 68.
101 Ibid, 68.
102 Ibid, 67.
103 Ibid, 69.
104 Ibid, 70.
105 Ibid, 76.

106 Ibid, 81.
107 Ibid, 84.
108 Ibid, 91.
109 Ibid, 117.
110 Ibid, 115.
111 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 99.
112 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 101–4.
113 Ibid, 114.
114 Ibid, 121.
115 Ibid, 133.
116 Ibid.
117 Ibid, 141.
118 Ibid, 145.
119 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid.
120 Ibid, 153.
121 Ibid, 175.
122 Ayanna Thompson, *Blackface* (London, 2021), 3, https://doi.org/10.5040/9781501374043.
123 Ibid.
124 Ibid, 6.
125 Ibid, 18.
126 Ibid, 19.
127 Ibid.
128 Ibid, 21, 22.
129 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 27–32.
130 L. Monique Pittman, *Shakespeare's Contested Nations: Race, Gender, and Multicultural Britain in Performances of the History Plays* (London, 2022), https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003043065.
131 Thompson, *Blackface*, 35.
132 Ibid, 52.
133 Ibid.
134 Ibid, 73.
135 Ibid, 77.
136 Ibid, 80.
137 Ibid, 77.
138 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 95.
139 Corredera, *Reanimating Othello*, 312, 313.

140 Noémie Ndiaye, *Scripts of Blackness: Early Modern Performance Culture and the Making of Race* (Philadelphia, 2022), https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2gz3zr2.
141 Ayana Thompson, *Blackface*, 111.
142 Ibid, 112.
143 Ibid.
144 Margo Hendricks, 'Coloring the Past, Considerations on Our Future: RaceB4Race,' *New Literary History*, 52.3/4 (2021), 365–84, 370, https://doi.org/10.1353/nlh.2021.0018.
145 For a more detailed discussion, see ibid, 368–73.