

# Exploring Shakespearean Criticism through an Indian Lens: A Review

NRD Dheeraj Kumar<sup>1</sup> and Dr. Rashmi Saxena<sup>2</sup>

Research Scholar, Department of English<sup>1</sup>

Research Guide, Department of English<sup>2</sup>

Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan, India

**Abstract:** *Shakespeare is the most scrutinized and exhaustively chummed-over ocean in literary criticism and research. The biography of William Shakespeare has evolved into an industry in the past 400 years. He has been greeted with fervor and ardent enthusiasm from the academic microphone. His stage presence spans the entirety of history. Amidst the sombre atmosphere of the study, the well-known and cherished pages of the "multifarious Shakespeare" have been revisited, and his verses have become an enduring subject of discourse. Scholars and critics have written ceaselessly about him. Annually, scholars contribute to the substantial accumulation of Shakespeare criticism, as noted by Louis B. Wright: "In the present day, the domain of Shakespeare criticism is so vast and encompasses a multitude of specialized matters, ranging from aesthetic appreciation to Freudian analysis, that even specialized literary experts are unable to discern the vital from the superfluous."*

**Keywords:** Shakespeare, Indian perspective, Criticism.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Beck, Ervin. 'Terence Improved: The Paradigm of the Prodigal Son in English Renaissance Comedy'. *Renaissance Drama* 6 (1973): 107–122.
- [2]. Cadman, Daniel. "'Constant in any Undertaking": Writing the Lipsian State Measure for Measure'. In *Shakespeare and Authority: Citations, Conceptions and Constructions*, edited by Katie Halsey and Angus Vine, 195–212. Springer, 2018.
- [3]. Cinthio, Giraldi. 'Hecatommithi'. In *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, edited by Geoffrey Bullough, 450–749, Vol. 2: The Comedies. Columbia University Press, 1973.
- [4]. Constantinidou, Natasha. 'Public and Private, Divine and Temporal in Justus Lipsius' *De Constantia and Politica*'. *Renaissance Studies* 26, no. 3 (2012): 345–364.
- [5]. Dowd, Michelle M. *The Dynamics of Inheritance on the Shakespearean Stage*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [6]. Eccles, Mark. *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Measure for Measure*. Modern Language Association of America, 1980.
- [7]. Edmondson, Paul Matthew. *A Critical Edition of the London Prodigal*. Diss. University of Birmingham, 2000.
- [8]. Fitzmaurice, Andrew. *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500– 1625*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [9]. Han, Yehrim. 'Usury and the Ideology of Adventure: Rewriting the Golden Fleece Myth in *The Merchant of Venice*'. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* 28, no. 3 (2018): 331–360. (Published in South Korea).
- [10]. Houghton, William. 'Englishmen for My Money: Or, A Woman Will Have Her Will'. In *The Three Renaissance Usury Plays*, edited by Lloyd Edward Kermode, 16–274. Manchester University Press, 2009.
- [11]. Horbury, Ezra. *Prodigality in Early Modern Drama*. Boydell & Brewer, 2019.
- [12]. Jones, Norman Leslie. *God and the Moneylenders: Usury and Law in Early Modern England*. B. Blackwell, 1989.

- [13]. Kamps, Ivo, and Karen Raber, eds. *Measure for Measure: Texts and Contexts*. Bedford, 2004.
- [14]. Kay, W. David. 'Reforming the Prodigal: Dramatic Paradigms, Male Sexuality, and the Power of Shame in *All's Well That Ends Well*'. In *Re-Visions of Shakespeare: Essays in Honor of Robert Ornstein*, edited by Robert Ornstein and Evelyn Gajowski, 108–127. University of Delaware Press, 2004.
- [15]. King, James I. 'Trew Law of Free Monarchies'. In *King James VI and I: Selected Writings*, edited by Neil Rhodes and Jennifer Richards, 259–279. Routledge, 2017.
- [16]. Knutson, Roslyn. *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594–1613*. University of Arkansas Press, 1991.
- [17]. Lever, J. W., ed. *Measure for Measure. The Arden Shakespeare*, 2006.
- [18]. Lipsius, Justus. *Politica: Six Books of Politics of Political Instruction*. Edited by Jan Waszink. Royal Van Gorcum, 2004.
- [19]. London Prodigal. *A Critical Edition of the London Prodigal*. Edited by Paul Matthew Edmondson. Diss. University of Birmingham, 2000.
- [20]. Maus, Katharine. *Eisaman. Being and Having in Shakespeare*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [21]. Nerlich, Michael. *Ideology of Adventure: Studies in Modern Consciousness, 1100–1750*. University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- [22]. Nugent, Teresa Lanpher. 'Usury and Counterfeiting in Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* and *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London*, and in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*'. In *Money and the Age of Shakespeare: Essays in New Economic Criticism*, edited by Linda Woodbridge, 201–217. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- [23]. Quarmby, Kevin A. *The Disguised Ruler in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Ashgate Publishing, 2013.
- [24]. Rowe Jr, George E. 'Prodigal Sons, New Comedy, and Middleton's *Michaelmas Term*'. *English Literary Renaissance* 7, no. 1 (1977): 90–107.
- [25]. Rust, Jennifer. "'Of Government the Properties to Unfold": Governmentalities in *Measure for Measure*'. In *Sacred and Secular Transactions in the Age of Shakespeare*, edited by Katherine Steele Brokaw and Jay-Zysk, 93–116. Northwestern University Press, 2019.
- [26]. Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought: Vol. 1, The Renaissance*. Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- [27]. Shakespeare, William. *The New Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. Edited by Gary Taylor, John Jowett, Terri Bourus, and Gabriel Egan. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- [28]. Stonex, Arthur Bivins. 'The Usurer in Elizabethan Drama'. *PMLA* 31, no. 2 (1916): 190–210.
- [29]. Tippens, Darryl. 'Shakespeare and the Prodigal Son Tradition'. *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 14, no. 1 (1988): 57–78.
- [30]. Tuck, Richard. *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.