

Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia (eds). *Native Shakespeares: Indigenous Appropriations on a Global Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Pp.ix, 257.

With so many books in the past decade addressing Shakespeare's position within global cultures, the study of Shakespeare appropriation has emerged as a sub-field of Shakespeare studies. *Native Shakespeares* contributes to this field by studying Shakespeare's role in a variety of global contexts, particularly aiming to address those appropriations that take place beyond the stage or screen. Many of the collection's authors address Shakespeare's nativist or postcolonial significance when appropriated into novels, ritual carnivals, pedagogical practices, ballets, and even prisons. In their introduction to the work, Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia state that the variety of forms of appropriation explored in their book sets it apart from other similar works of the past decade:

What distinguishes our collection ... is that it is not focused exclusively on stage productions or film, but rather it expands the category of appropriation to examine how Shakespeare is situated in a range of social practices: various educational, artistic, and political discourses, social rituals, and revisions in novels. (6)

Thanks to this wide range of topics, their book proves not only useful to researchers who are working within the field of Shakespeare appropriation but also engaging for readers who are not.

Native Shakespeares aims to clarify the language with which we speak about appropriation, asking where we can draw the line between an appropriation and an adaptation. In chapter one, Thomas Cartelli suggests that the word 'adaptation' fails accurately describe James Joyce's use of Shakespeare in *Ulysses* and turns instead to Jonathan Dollimore's term *creative vandalism* (19). Creative vandalism implies a pre-meditated act of pillaging Shakespeare's text and using it entirely to one's own advantage. Cartelli even elevates *Hamlet* to the same level as *The Odyssey* in Joyce's catalogue of creative vandalisms, calling it one of *Ulysses's ur-texts* (19).

While Cartelli argues that Joyce employs unconcealed appropriation, other authors in the first part of the book explore the many more subtle forms adaptation can take. In chapter three, for instance, John Carpenter discusses 'quiet appropriation'. Carpenter explains how one phrase, 'The forms of things unknown', was taken from Theseus's speech in *A Midsummer Night's*

Dream (5.1.15) to become a 'key phrase in critical discussions of African American literature and culture' (58). Carpenter admits that this example of appropriation contains some degree of *cultural* vandalism. The fact that scholars lifted Shakespeare's phrase from the context of the play and dropped it, uncredited, into a critical discourse creates what the author calls 'a loud silence' (59). Carpenter finds a significant difference between Shakespearean appropriations that are used in critical discourse and those that are used in fictional works such as *Ulysses* or 'Yorick' (a story discussed in chapter four). This difference, Carpenter argues, lies in the former's complete 'removal of Shakespearean language from its original dramatic context' (59).

The Shakespeare Mas, analyzed by Craig Dionne in chapter two of *Native Shakespeares*, provides an example of an appropriation of Shakespeare in which the bard's words are completely divorced from their original dramatic contexts. The Mas is an annual carnival event that takes place in small villages on Carriacou Island. The men of these villages challenge one another to recite as many speeches from *Julius Caesar* as possible, using the text of the play in a manner that 'does not pretend to offer an interpretation of *Julius Caesar*' (38). Dionne describes how the Mas originated from colonial teaching texts. Shakespeare is here appropriated from a source that uses snippets of his writing to form quotable, context-less units of text that function merely as empty signifiers (43). Dionne shows how the practice of the Shakespeare Mas adds signification to text that would otherwise not be meaningful.

Chapter four finishes the first part of the book by discussing Salman Rushdie's short story 'Yorick'. This chapter is particularly resonant when read alongside Cartelli's chapter, as both discuss appropriations of *Hamlet* into prose fiction and both particularly consider the effects of 'rewriting history' (73). Santiago Rodríguez Guerrero-Strachan and Ana Sáez Hidalgo argue that Rushdie's method of appropriation creates a hybrid text that takes into account both 'central and marginalized characters' (75) from Shakespeare's play. The authors are particularly successful in their close analysis of Rushdie's literary style. They focus on Rushdie's 'postmodern techniques' (85), particularly his use of a fragmented narrative, to show how 'Yorick' embraces hybridity. Taken together, these first four chapters explore how appropriations can take on a variety of forms, ranging from overt deconstruction and pastiche in Joyce and Rushdie's works to 'quiet' appropriations of Shakespearean phrases. All four chapters give particular consideration to text that is fragmented, reduced to phrases and allusions.

The second part of the book turns its focus to theatrical productions. Here, 'each essay localizes Shakespeare within a specific cultural, political, and national context' (11). In 'Jatra Shakespeare: Indigenous Indian Theatre and the Postcolonial Stage', Parmita Kapadia traces a history of Shakespeare's role in India from his early days as a 'colonial import' and the mandate that made Shakespeare part of the English language curriculum in 1835 until the present day (93). She argues that the key productions she discusses contribute to the 'reinvention of India and "Indianness" through ... appropriation of Shakespeare' (101). While the cultures of India are different from the Aboriginal and North American cultures explored by the other essays in this section, all four essays show how Shakespeare is used in a process of national self-fashioning. Jennifer Drouin argues that Shakespearean performance in Québec builds a sense of group identity (chapter six); she shows how Québécois Shakespeare is used to create a distinction between French and English Canadians. Maureen McDonnell takes up a parallel argument with respect to an Australian Aboriginal theatre company's staging of *As You Like It* (chapter seven). The section concludes with Niels Herold's juxtaposition of Shakespeare in corporate American leadership training and American prisons (chapter eight).

While all four essays in this section reveal that these postcolonial appropriations share a fundamental binary of self/other, they also ask the reader to consider multiple definitions of 'postcolonial Shakespeare'. India is a postcolonial nation, and Australian Aboriginal peoples have also been colonized and marginalized. Jennifer Drouin faces a harder task than her fellow authors when she strives to convince her readers to think of Québec as postcolonial. She helpfully outlines the critical standpoints that justify her study of Québécois theatre through a postcolonial theoretical lens (107). Herold's essay adds a further level of complexity to this subject. As he notes, correctional facilities are not nations and thus by definition cannot be colonized. He writes:

[i]f postcolonialist Shakespeare is about the complementary mechanisms of cultural inculcation and distancing, of imitation and resistance, then the institutionality of the 'correctional facility' ... is a subaltern culture that relates to the dominant as the fringe on the margins does to the center. (153)

His study of prisons from the standpoint of postcolonial theory, therefore, is based in analogy rather than historical fact.

The final section of the book groups together four essays that address transculturation and the ‘politics of translation’ (12). Transculturation, according to Mary Louise Pratt’s definition outlined by Frassinelli in chapter nine, is the ‘creation of new cultural products and phenomena by selecting and inventing “from materials transmitted to them by a dominant or metropolitan culture”’ (174). This process of taking source materials (for instance, Shakespearean works) and making them into something new often involves translation. All four authors who contribute to this section emphasize that translation is not simply about choosing the right words to convey the prescribed meaning but always involves some degree of adaptation.

In chapter nine, Frassinelli discusses *Une Tempête*, an adaptation of *The Tempest* by Aimé Césaire. Césaire’s adaptation came about because the author wanted to translate Shakespeare’s play but by the time he was done ‘realized there was not much Shakespeare left’ (174). Frassinelli’s essay shows how, in the process of translating, Césaire ended by transculturally repositioning the character Caliban to suit his Martiniquais narrative. Ameer Sohrawardy also explores the fine line between translation and adaptation (chapter ten). He discusses Solomon Plaatje’s play *Diphosho-phosho*, arguing that it is ‘best understood as a response to Shakespeare’s *The Comedy of Errors* — and not merely as its translation and adaptation’ (189). In chapter eleven, we see that Shakespearean appropriations need not be written but can also be acted or danced. In her discussion of several Cuban re-tellings of *Romeo and Juliet*, Donna Woodford-Gormley shows how Pablo Neruda’s ‘definitive’ translation of the play, the stage adaptation performed by the Grupo de Teatro Cheo Briñas (1981), and a ballet adaptation (2003) all engage in the transcultural process of making Shakespeare ‘Cuban and a revolutionary’ (210). The book concludes by exploring an adaptation of *Othello* in a novelized narrative of the Sudanese colonial experience: Salih’s *Season of Migration to the North*. The essays in this final section draw our attention to the complications and politics of Shakespeare translation.

Each chapter of *Native Shakespeares* relies on applying localized features to Shakespeare’s works. The experience of reading the book as a whole, however, does not feel constrained by these localized contexts. By breaking Shakespeare out of his limiting traditional role as England’s national poet, we learn to re-read him as a universal source text, endlessly capable of deconstruction and reconstruction within our international narratives. The word ‘native’ in the book’s title refers to Shakespearean performances adapted within the locality of different global cultures. As the editors explain

in the introduction, Shakespeare himself is ‘native’ to postcolonial art: ‘native — the place to which one returns’ (2) for those artists who find within his writing the inspiration to sink their teeth into a postcolonial dialogue.

YOLANA WASSERSUG

Will Fisher. *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Pp xii, 223.

Will Fisher’s study *Materializing Gender in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* contributes to the ongoing discourses surrounding materiality, the body, and the relationship between subject and object in early modern England. But rather than attempt to overhaul the way we read the early modern sex/gender system (à la Lacquer) or reframe the way we understand self-fashioning through the material world (à la Greenblatt), Fisher opts for subtlety, rooting his project in the minutiae of everyday life. He pursues this project by highlighting four ‘prosthetic parts’ (33) of the early modern body: the handkerchief, the codpiece, the beard, and the hair of the head.

To flesh out his study Fisher calls on an impressive variety of textual sources, from medical texts, political treatises, and dramatic texts and performances to diaries, painted portraits, sermons, and physical material artifacts. His referents include such canonical gratuities as Shakespeare’s *Othello*, Milton’s *Samson Agonistes*, and Bulwer’s *Anthropometamorphosis* as well as some pleasantly surprising choices such as the detailed prop list from the 1605 Oxford schoolboy performance of *Alba* and Henry VIII’s actual codpiece on display at the Tower of London. His theoretical framework is no less diverse; new historicism, feminist theory, queer theory, post-structuralism, and disability studies are particularly prominent influences. Though this expansive body of primary and secondary texts might threaten to open a veritable Pandora’s box of scattered possibilities, Fisher’s specific focus on the handkerchief, codpiece, beard, and hair of the head effectively limits the project.

As his book’s title suggests, Fisher borrows from Butler to show how gender ‘matters’ — that is, both comes into being (materializes) *and* gains significance (matters) simultaneously. As he asserts, ‘it is through the process