

language derived from exchange and trade does not mean that they were presenting their audiences with discussions about economics.

The idea of illustrating *felix culpa*, loss and then gain, in the context of drama is intriguing. But there needs to be evidence showing the intersection of theology with English drama. Forman offers a slim discussion of the *felix culpa* with no reference to the history of its doctrinal permutations, nor how that “paradox” (15) came to bear on the making of the genre of tragicomedy. Forman recognizes that it was not English playwrights who invented tragicomedy, which explains why her discussion of the important allusions to tragicomedy in *The Faithful Shepherdess* by Beaumont and Fletcher, and their engagement with Guarini’s defense of tragicomedy in 1601, is relegated to an endnote. Forman asserts that “It might not be the case that all Renaissance tragicomedies follow the formula of producing a prosperous conclusion out of the averted tragedy exactly” (210 n. 26), but she then uses that formula in her analysis of the plays throughout the book. Otherwise, what is it that separates tragicomedy from “romance”? If all there is in the *felix culpa* is loss/fall and then gain/redemption, one wonders why the greatest Christian poem in the Western tradition simply goes by the title of *Comedia*? And in English, the greatest exponent of the *felix culpa* was Milton. Does *Paradise Lost* qualify as a tragicomedy?

There are many interesting observations in this book, especially in the context of the importance of economic changes in early modern England. But there is not enough supporting evidence to link them to the plays, which is why the author has to push her interpretation of the few passages in the plays that contain “economic” content to implausible limits. Are the frequent, and hilarious, allusions to castration in early modern English drama, specifically in *The Renegado*, really a reflection of anxiety over the loss of economic circulation (171)? Not if the genealogy of castration is taken into account in plays preceding Massinger’s: after all, Massinger drew on Cervantes for his *Renegado* (which the author does not take into account). That London viewers of *The Renegado* would have thought of the “loss” of economic exchange at the mention of castration, rather than join in bawdy laughter at the “gelded” English captive, is really pushing it.



Cross-Gender Shakespeare and English National Identity: Wearing the Codpiece. By Elizabeth Klett. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009; pp. 220. \$80 cloth.

doi:10.1017/S0040557410000402

Reviewed by Emily A. Rollie, University of Missouri

Although scholars have paid significant attention to the tradition of men playing women’s roles in Shakespearean performance, few studies have addressed the practice of female cross-gender casting. James Bulman’s

Shakespeare Re-Dressed and Alisa Solomon's *Re-Dressing the Canon* include essays on the topic, but neither text devotes its full attention to this gender-bending practice. Certainly, the custom of women playing men's roles in Shakespeare is not new, as Sarah Siddons, Sarah Bernhardt, and Charlotte Cushman were famous for their portrayals of Hamlet. However, according to Elizabeth Klett, there has been a recent "renaissance" of women's cross-gender performance in Britain (ix), a phenomenon her book examines more closely, ultimately providing an engaging, in-depth analysis of contemporary British productions that feature female actors in traditionally male roles.

Klett begins by introducing her primary argument and origin of her clever subtitle. When women literally and figuratively wear the codpiece (a Renaissance costume piece worn by men to "emphasize male phallic power") in cross-gender performance, they effectively "expose and dismantle the workings of masculinity, Shakespearean authority, and 'Englishness'" (3). Klett asserts that casting women in men's roles disrupts both cultural understandings of gender and the assumed authority of Shakespeare; considering Shakespeare's iconic position in English culture, this disruption subsequently upsets conceptions of English identity. Drawing on the work of Judith Butler and Elin Diamond, Klett also establishes here a strong theoretical foundation, eloquently and convincingly setting the stage for the case studies to follow.

The next five chapters are organized in a neat chronology and provide concrete examples of women's cross-gender performance in seven contemporary British productions. The most compelling chapters focus on individual productions that employed "selective cross-casting," meaning that women performed in only the central male role (28). Selective cross-casting, Klett posits, results in highly provocative, transformative performances that pose "substantial challenges" to gender construction and to "the equation of Shakespeare with Englishness" (28). Klett turns first to Deborah Warner's *Richard II* (1995–6), in which Fiona Shaw played the title role. Klett provides a remarkably comprehensive account of the production's staging, the popular and critical response to Shaw's performance, and the artists' approach to the production. Although Warner and Shaw professed that gender did not prompt the cross-gendering, Klett boldly disagrees, focusing on specific moments in Shaw's performance that highlighted questions of gender and sexuality. From Shaw's *Richard II*, Klett turns to Kathryn Hunter's 1997 performance of *King Lear*. Perhaps the most theoretically complex and richly layered portion of Klett's study, this chapter traces the contradictory identities of *Lear* as demonstrated by Hunter's performance and reveals "a highly personal, gender-inflected reading" (86). While the complexity of Klett's analysis could potentially render this chapter incomprehensible, she writes in a refreshingly accessible and coherent style, guiding her reader toward a greater understanding of cross-gender performance in *Lear*. Klett's final examples of selectively cross-cast performances are Vanessa Redgrave's Prospero (2000) and Dawn French's Bottom (2001). Although not as passionately argued as the previous chapters, Klett's discussion of these performances provides insight into the evolution of

selective cross-casting as well as their impact on English identity and, in the case of French (a beloved television star), British popular culture.

In contrast to the selectively cross-gendered productions that comprise the bulk of the text, Klett's final chapter considers cross-gender casting at its most extreme: The Globe's all-female productions of *Richard III* (2003), *The Taming of the Shrew* (2003), and *Much Ado about Nothing* (2004). In contrast to previous discussions, this one occasionally feels like a whirlwind tour, as Klett crams three production analyses into a single chapter. She asserts that these all-female productions "diminished the gap between actress and character that . . . challenge[s] entrenched ideas about gender," thus revealing her bias toward selectively cross-cast performances (140). Even so, Klett does balance her critique by acknowledging that Kathryn Hunter's *Richard III* and Janet McTeer's *Petruchio* did, to some extent, complicate gender roles and identity.

Clearly well-versed in theatrical practice, Shakespearean performance history, and the individual productions, Klett deftly employs a diverse array of sources including live performances, production promptbooks, newspaper reviews, video recordings, scholarly articles, and personal interviews. Her treatments of each play are meticulously documented, detailed, and authoritative, and she includes an extensive bibliography that is invaluable for scholars interested in cross-gender casting. Klett's timely, intelligent study addresses a decided gap in Shakespearean performance scholarship and identifies a new avenue of exploration in contemporary performance practices.



Shakespeare and Garrick. By Vanessa Cunningham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008; pp. 231. \$90 cloth.

Representing Shakespearean Tragedy: Garrick, the Kembles, and Kean. By Reiko Oya. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; pp. 244. \$99 cloth. doi:10.1017/S0040557410000414

Reviewed by Robert Sawyer, East Tennessee State University

Although work on Shakespeare in the Restoration and early eighteenth century has been plentiful, the later eighteenth century has not been explored to the same degree. Two new books attempt to fill that void: Vanessa Cunningham's *Shakespeare and Garrick* and Reiko Oya's *Representing Shakespearean Tragedy: Garrick, the Kembles, and Kean*. Of the two, Cunningham's is more accessible and especially solid on basic factual information, while Oya's book is a bit more complicated not only in its challenge to the recent spate of appropriation studies, but also in its organizational structure. That said, these two books will serve as solid introductions to the era of Garrick, Kemble, and Siddons.

Cunningham's book clearly states its aims early and often. In the first few pages, for instance, she notifies the reader that her intention is to rectify Garrick's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.