

and contemporary China. Hao conveys in chapter after chapter that the reading of Milton and Western literature has played a significant role in the development of Chinese literature, thoughts, and culture.

As the author proves his central thesis convincingly, the book stands as a case study of the original theoretical model put forward by Hao: cross-cultural knowledge production, based on Hans-George Gadamer's "Vorurteil" (prejudice) and William James's "selective attention" (52), focusing on cross-cultural texts, and aiming at cultural exchange between China and the West. Thus, the book may serve as a useful source of rare primary texts (collected from archives, chronicles, university syllabi, diaries, memoirs, and more), commented and contextualized with contemporary discourses, and listed in the appendix on Chinese translations of Milton's works from 1854 to 2019 and in the works cited, which is about thirty pages long. This book brings fresh air to the broader way we look at the meaning and significance of Renaissance and comparative studies.

The book is included in the Renaissance Studies Series published by the Center of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Zhejiang University, an associate organization of the Renaissance Society of America, in collaboration with Zhejiang University Press. As it embraces cross-cultural production, the book clearly expresses the hope that the Chinese perspectives it offers will prompt new avenues of inquiry and suggest directions for future research into the domain of early modern and comparative studies. This impressive book gives us a deeper, more varied appreciation of Milton's works in China, and is a valuable study for everyone interested in Renaissance and comparative literature.

Lian Zhang, *Zhejiang University, China*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.548

This work was supported by the National Humanities and Social Sciences Foundation, China (authorization: 21BWW046).

*Shakespeare in Succession: Translation and Time*. Michael Saenger and Sergio Costola, eds.

Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2023. 336 pp. CAD \$120.

---

*Shakespeare and Succession: Translation and Time* positions Shakespeare as both participant in and object of translative succession, fusing, as the editors Michael Saenger and Sergio Costola acknowledge, "some unfamiliar approaches" by looking at "theatrical and linguistic adaptation in addition to historical study" (1). The collection is divided into essays by practitioners and historians. Contributions to the first half of the volume "are not generally saturated in the typical citation style of academic essays" (27). Tonal disjunctions are accompanied by what feels like an *in medias res* narrative, as the first

essay, by José Francisco Botelho, offers insights into the task of translating Shakespeare's meter into Brazilian Portuguese. The volume might have benefited from more sustained scene setting, such as an early account of adaptive translation in relation to Shakespeare's grammar school education, for which *imitatio* and *translatio* formed bedrocks.

Niels Brunse tackles a question that chimes with the volume's tonal and narratological approach: whether "your version" should "be aimed at actors and audiences, or at the scholarly or pleasure-seeking quiet reader" (62). Brunse expands on an issue that many translators encounter when adapting Shakespeare's English into other languages: the proliferation of monosyllables in the originals. Single-syllable words such as *throat* tend to acquire two syllables or more, as in the Danish word *struben*, meaning that Laertes in Brunse's *Hamlet* becomes "marginally more deliberate and bloodthirsty" (67). Marcus Kyd writes about translating Shakespeare's narrative poem *The Rape of Lucrece* for the stage and the reasoning behind maintaining a "Narrator, who is centre stage, telling the story" (76–77).

Other contributions to the first half of the volume include Miguel Ángel Montezanti's account of translating Shakespeare's sonnets into standard literary and Riverplate Spanish. Iolanda Plescia writes of translating *The Taming of the Shrew* into Italian, with the major ambition of producing a text "that would engage, critically and phonologically, not only with the inherent difference of the source and target languages but also with the gaps in culture and language produced specifically by the passing of time" (103). Sarah Roberts roots thinking behind preparing and presenting a Johannesburg production of *Much Ado About Nothing* in a "critically informed cultural practice" (123) with an emphasis on the place of Shakespeare in South Africa. Zhiyan Zhang and Carl A. Robertson elaborate on the challenges of presenting *Romeo and Juliet* in the form of traditional Chinese *kunqu* opera. The first half of the volume therefore offers a remarkable survey of adapting Shakespeare for various cultural and social milieus, across numerous languages and forms, at once disparate and yet startlingly synergistic at times in terms of challenges and opportunities.

The second half of the volume "is written in the common mode of academic writing" (196) and begins with Zoltan Markus's chapter on Shakespeare as a "catalyst for nationalist-cultural mythologizing" (203). Markus stresses that translations of Shakespeare are not secondary or inferior to English Shakespeare: they ensure "survival" and provide a "celebration of the life of the original" (203). Michael Saenger focuses on Shakespeare and Ben Jonson's engagements with classical antecedents as a form of authorial paternity. Sergio Costola analyzes the ways in which the repertory of *commedia dell'arte* influenced *The Merchant of Venice*, with the figure of the Pantalone looming over the characters of Shylock, Antonio, and Bassanio. Hiromi Fuyuki gives us a reception history of Shakespeare in Japan beginning with the "first (fragmentary) Shakespeare translation" (259) that appeared in 1874: lines from Hamlet's fourth

soliloquy. Ransping Ji and Wei Feng offer a similarly enlightening account of the availability of the image of Shakespeare in China.

Alexa Alice Joubin rounds the collection off by adducing that “translational differences draw attention to the instability of Shakespeare’s text as well as their variegated terrains that are open for interpretation” (306). It is sometimes difficult to identify the warp and woof of a collection so wide ranging in tone and content. This renders the consistent lucidity with which the interpretative pliability of Shakespeare’s works is conveyed even more startling. Those works shine bright across time, place, and the pages of a brilliant volume.

Darren Freebury-Jones, *Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, England*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2023.551

*The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Race*. Ayanna Thompson, ed.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023. xiii + 293 pp. \$30.99.

---

Reading *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Race* is work. Prepare to fold back page corners and to highlight in high gear. From the outset, editor Ayanna Thompson audaciously challenges readers to “collectively learn to discern and analyze racecraft” that they might make the collection “seem as outdated as the way [she] was first taught Shakespeare” thirty years ago (10). Far from a banal sales pitch, Thompson’s hope offers a sobering reminder of the continued need for such publications and summons the audience into the authorship of the collection. In the present moment, the potent, insightful essays that the collection offers make it difficult to imagine such obsolescence on the horizon.

The contributors urgently immerse themselves in the weighty questions that undoubtedly flood the minds of readers when they see the words *Shakespeare* and *race* in bold type on a book cover. One such question forms the title of Miles Grier’s essay “Are Shakespeare’s Plays Racially Progressive?”—a question that seems to undergird the entirety of *Shakespeare and Race*. If any criticism may be levied at the collection, it is that it largely evades granular readings beyond the canon of race plays that might further hold Shakespeare’s racecraft accountable. But as Grier states in an addendum to Paul Robeson’s poignant identification with the character of Othello, activation of racial potentialities “is not guaranteed by Shakespeare’s text” (238) and “The Answer Is in Our Hands” (237). Overall, the collection thoughtfully embodies early modern critical race studies as “a product of the interaction among [Shakespeare’s] plays, the cultural prestige accorded them, and the racial regime of a particular time and scale” (238).

Loosely comprising four parts that form a sort of chronological arc, the book is a pedagogue’s dream and a critic’s mirror. Its exceptional pacing lends an eminent readability to difficult material that affords newcomers a way in and veterans a substantial yet engaging refresher. *Shakespeare and Race* can be said to move from the road map