

The nature of the marionette and the existential questions it raises are prevalent themes in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries from Marinetti's Italian futurism to the deep symbolism in Massimo Bontempelli's and Giorgio de Chirico's automata. Numerous examples from Italian and Italo-American cinema show how puppets and marionettes were often used as narrative devices in film, opening up unique ways in cinematic expression, such as in Vittorio de Sica's *I bambini ci guardano* (The Children Are Watching Us) (1944), where the puppet show helps the viewer understand the world through a child's eyes (pp. 75–84). Roberto Rossellini, one of the representatives of Italian neo-realism, as well as Pier Paolo Pasolini, Sergio Leone, Bernardo Bertolucci and the avant-gardist Lina Wertmüller, was also deeply inspired by the world of puppetry, as Pacchioni goes on to illustrate (chapters 6–9). Puppet theatre sequences within the film function as instruments for sociopolitical analysis, as in Rossellini's *Paisà* (1946) or existential and metafictional references as in Pasolini's *Cosa sono le nuvole* (1968). This coexistence of artistic form is of relevance not only to the great masters of Italian cinema and their continuing influence, but also to contemporary film techniques and devices that draw inspiration from the world of puppetry.

Pacchioni explores the function and metaphor of the puppet in examples that range from Indonesian puppet theatre to stop-motion animation. *L'immagine del Burattino* is a great contribution to the field of puppetry, but also to Italian studies, cinema and intermediality. Pacchioni's award-winning work opens a dialogue between media, with the central role given to the performativity of the puppet and its aesthetic, political and philosophical significance.

Theatre Research International 47:1 (March 2022) doi:10.1017/S0307883321000560

Shakespeare and East Asia. By Alexa Alice Joubin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. Pp. 272 + 11 illus. £16.99 Pb.

Reviewed by Huimin Wang, University of Southampton, UK,
huimin.wang@soton.ac.uk

Shakespeare and East Asia is the first monograph on Shakespeare onstage and on-screen in East Asia in comparative contexts. Situated in the flourishing research field of Shakespeare in Asia, this book sheds new light on films and stage adaptations of Shakespeare, some of which are unknown or unfamiliar, and, most significantly, it reveals deep structural and narratological connections among Asian and anglophone performances. This work brings instantly to mind a previous collection with a similar title, *Shakespeare in Asia*, edited by Dennis Kennedy and Li Lan Yong (2010). However, the author reminds us of the nuanced difference between 'in' and 'and' as the latter can 'signal the interplay between the two condensed cultural signifiers and ... emphasize a shift away from the linear, one-way-street model of tracing the transplantation of a British "giant" into a colonial cultural context' (p. 6). Similarities found among distinct cultures can be revealing for understanding human cognition process and the meaning of humanity.

The four chapters innovatively identify Japanese formalistic innovations in sound and spectacle; reparative adaptations from China, Taiwan and Hong Kong; the politics of gender and reception of films and touring productions in South Korea and the UK; and multilingual, diaspora works in Singapore and the UK. Together they form the unique themes of post-1950s East Asian cinemas and theatres of Shakespearean adaptations and offer new theme-based perspectives for future studies in this field. The appendix provides a chronology of key historical events along with key performances, which is helpful for tracing historical, political, social and cultural influences of a production. These discussed adaptations not only reshape

debates about the relationship between East Asia and Europe, but also participate in the construction of a contested image of Asia for world audiences.

A strength of the book comes from its theoretical astuteness. In chapter 3, 'Polyphonic Reception', the author discusses the Korean film *The King and the Clown*, ignored by anglophone mainstream media, with the help of women's, gender and sexuality studies and the application of transgender theory. As a multi-lingual author, Joubin can access a wide range of further readings which have not all been fully studied by Western researchers. Additionally, the author is aware of the cognitive turn for theatre and cinema researchers, and adopts a multidisciplinary approach to analyse the adaptations. She studies the nuanced use of pronouns in *Throne of Blood* from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, and applies neuroscientific evidence to explain art's remedial function in chapter 2. However, due to the vast scope of the book, the author does not have enough space to elaborate cognitive evidences in her argument as the reader will expect.

Due to the limit of words, it is not always possible for the author to add explanatory notes for every term. For example, when she refers to the 'historicity of a play' (p. 21), experts will instantly recognize that what she has in mind is Louis Montrose's chiasmic formulation that New Historicism is concerned with the historicity of texts and the textuality of history. Beginners in this field, however, may stumble over the specialized vocabulary throughout the book; promisingly, one can always turn to the book's glossary and other academic resources to aid in understanding the theories and artistic genres discussed. Nevertheless, given the numerous misunderstandings of Aristotle, I think it is worth explaining what 'Aristotelian sense' (p. 87) means rather than using it as a shorthand. For terms without settled meanings, like 'metatheatrical' and 'metacinematic', I think it would be better for the author to acknowledge current debates, and offer her understanding of these terms.

What can be further hoped for is to include Mongolian and North Korean Shakespeare studies in topics on Shakespeare and East Asia. It should have been worth mentioning why Mongolia is omitted from the book given the fact that the study of Shakespeare in Mongolia has a history of more than forty years, since the Mongolian University was established. Hopefully this is a gap that might be filled in the future.

In sum, this book is a major contribution to the understanding of the history and value of Shakespeare and East Asian theatre and film industry, and I recommend it to anyone interested in theatre and cinema studies.