

## "Everyman and roach" in Retrospect: A Study of Street Theatre that Worked

Mimi Gisolfi D'Aponte

During the 1960's and 70's many cities in the United States experienced an explosion of street event activity: festivals, parades, processions and street theatre brought new vitality to parks, plazas and street corners. This national phenomenon was the happy bequest of what were perhaps more serious political concerns: many Americans, from flower children to peace and civil rights activists, were reminding us that public space belongs to the people, whether for performance or for protest.

Looking back with the hindsight offered by the late 80's, it seems that many of these events were evanescent happenings, perhaps persuasive for the moment, but often, like so much of the fervor of those decades, gone with the wind or buried in some forgotten "television special" footage. In the realm of street theatre, plays were often improvised or rehearsed, performed, and then forgotten. Actress and director Geraldine Fitzgerald recalls that most common in New York City were agit-prop theatre pieces which would address a particular issue, "teach" a point of view, and then evaporate.<sup>1</sup>

And yet, from this era of untold numbers of often-anonymous outdoor enactments, significant theatre arose, theatre whose existence depended upon a point of view. William F. French, in an essay about the theatrical use of New York City streets, suggests that by the mid-60's street performances in the United States represented the diverse modes of ethnic, classic and avant-garde theatre.<sup>2</sup> Certainly a stirring landmark from West coast street theatre is the

---

Mimi Gisolfi D'Aponte is on the Theatre faculty of The Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, and is Associate Professor of Speech at Baruch College. Her writing has appeared in *Centerpoint*, *Commonweal*, *Communication Education*, *Educational Theatre Journal*, *Modern Drama*, *Performing Arts Journal*, *The Drama Review* and *The Italian Quarterly*.

ongoing work of the San Francisco Mime Troupe, which has brought its avant-garde, counter-cultural message across the country, and, in this decade into war-torn Central America as well. The Mime Troupe's theatre neighbor in Southern California, El Teatro Campesino, can be credited with having awakened thousands of Mexican migrant farm workers to a fuller awareness of their own political dilemma. On the East coast French points to Peter Schumann's Vermont-based Bread and Puppet Theatre as a paradigm of the avant-garde mode pursued as a religious mission. The epitome of the classic mode, on the other hand, and one that will remain important in the theatre history of this century, was achieved by Joseph Papp when he set mobile stages in motion to perform free Shakespeare in New York City streets and parks.

On a more modest plane, yet representative of the ethnic, avant-garde and classic modes in a single endeavor, was another landmark event, accomplished by a unique Brooklyn street theatre experiment. Thanks to a variety of complementary forces, the Everyman Theatre Company worked successfully at the time of its inception, bequeathed a legacy of production which is still alive today, inspired the establishment of the Lincoln Center Plaza Summer Festival, and deeply affected the lives of those young people it involved. The script of *Everyman and roach*,<sup>3</sup> a street theatre piece first performed in 1968 and produced in various forms during the late 1970's, was revived in 1989. There are four basic reasons for its survival: the classic plot upon which the script was based; the star theatre personality who co-initiated and co-developed the project; the artistic quality of the endeavor; and the socio/political philosophy which the *Everyman and roach* production staff, founders of the Everyman Theatre Company, practiced along the path to artistic fulfillment.

## Text

As E. G. Schrieber explains in his essay, "Everyman in America,"<sup>4</sup> the *Everyman and roach* script is essentially modelled after Hugo von Hofmannstahl's *Jedermann*<sup>5</sup> (1911?). *Jedermann* was, in turn, traditionally accepted as a re-working of the anonymous medieval English *Everyman*<sup>6</sup> (1520?), until the eminent medieval scholar Martin Stevens illustrated its even greater dependence upon Hans Sachs's *Hecastus*<sup>7</sup> (1549). A comparative textual study of *Everyman*, *Jedermann* and *Everyman and roach*, reveals a progressive development of both structural and character elements which increase the immediacy of situation while preserving common themes of death, its loneliness and, as Schreiber puts it, the "brittleness of earthly things."

The medieval *Everyman*'s entrance is preceded by God's lecture to Death about *Everyman*'s poor spiritual state. His character is then discerned first-hand by the audience during the course of his search for travelling companions to accompany him on his fateful journey toward death and salvation. *Jedermann*'s life style, on the other hand, is clearly demonstrated,

rather than merely discussed, *before* Death approaches him with the announcement of the dreaded journey. *Everyman and roach* follows this same structure of character disclosure, but incorporates a new dimension of spontaneity. Whereas Jedermann, the wealthy burgomaster, is approaching middle age and is described by his mother as "stately" (J, 25), Everyman of *Everyman and roach* is someone on his way up the ladder of success--nervous, itching to do more and have more and be more--the stereotypical rock hero he embodies.

Consistent character presences among the three plays abound, although presentation style varies, often tremendously (see chart below). The sonorous God of *Everyman* and *Jedermann* becomes a non-speaking, audience volunteer God in *Everyman and roach*. The verbose Messenger of the earlier plays is transformed into a singing guitarist in the late play, while *Everyman's* Doctor becomes a preacher. The Angel of the earlier plays becomes the Angel of Death, played simultaneously by an actor and a dancer. Fellowship remains stable in personality although his name is altered, first to Good Fellow in *Jedermann* and then to Amico in *Everyman and roach*. The characters of the cousins appear in *Everyman* and *Jedermann*, but disappear in *Everyman and roach*. Those of Poor Neighbor, Courtesan, Debtors and Everyman's Mother, all originating in *Jedermann*, are broadly re-created as Harry the Head, Broad, Fat Debtor and Mother in the contemporary play.

Goods in *Everyman* is faithfully rendered in the Mamon of *Jedermann*, but transformed into No-Count, the business manager of *Everyman and roach*. The most radical transformations affect the original Death and Good Deeds. While they are recognizable in *Jedermann*, they are metamorphosed in *Everyman and roach* into the spectacular Death Machine and the unforgettable roach (with a small "r" because that's how insignificant he appears at the onset). Finally, the most dramatic character addition occurs in the latter play with the small but important role of Dolores the Fortune Teller, who incorporates aspects of von Hoffmannstahl's debtor and mother figures, but functions also in the novel position of seer.

The story of *Everyman and roach* is told as much through song and dance as through dialogue, with a dozen musical numbers composed by John Orlando and Jimmy Justice,<sup>8</sup> and sung to the accompaniment of a "folk rock-combo." Everyman is a smart guy who owns a discotheque, and is full of himself and his power. He has a gang, a girl, and money, and he decides to build a bigger place. His business manager, No-Count, says business isn't that great, but his crowd urges him on, and he decides to call in his loans to finance the project. Then, his "perfect" life begins to evaporate. He keeps hearing strange voices threaten death, his Mother comes to see him and speaks of death (he is delighted to discover that it is *her* death she fears), his debtors give him a hard time. One of them, Dolores the Fortune teller, sees something in his palm that compels her to refund his money and run away without a word. Everyman keeps trying to shake off these strange happenings, but as his new club opens and he is surrounded by his girl Broad, his best buddy Amico, and his

bodyguards Bull, Knife and Whip, the Death Machine enters again, and this time everyone sees it. Everyman's excuse that someone has spiked the punch with acid doesn't wash. Suddenly the Angel of Death and Cassandra, who is the dancer of Death, come out of the Machine and summon Everyman. He is terrified and begs successfully for a short reprieve in order to find company for the journey. But no dice--Amico tells him he's a dead man and that now his place, his girl and his gang are all Amico's. Even the Fat Debtor, whom Everyman had had punched out for his loan money, can't be bribed to go on this dreaded journey as a companion. Just as Everyman is near despair, roach, the filthy hanger-on whom everyone, including Everyman, has been tormenting throughout the play, offers to go with him. No, says Everyman, it's too frightening, you'll be afraid. But roach is stubborn, and his love for Everyman overcomes his fear. Slowly he and Everyman hold hands and inch toward the Death Machine. Then through a ruse, Everyman knocks roach out, carries him away from the Death Machine to safety, pronounces him his only true friend, and goes on to meet Death alone. He has suddenly gained courage, perhaps from roach's fidelity and from his own ability to save this single loyal friend. Everyman defies the awful figures which comprise the Death Machine--Suicide, Disease, Pallor, Sickness, Old Age, Time, Violence, War, Accident, Poison, Madness--by entering into their midst and proclaiming that Death is "nothing." The Preacher stops the play and asks the volunteer audience member playing the part of God whether Everyman should die, and receives an assenting answer.<sup>9</sup> The Angel of Death kisses Everyman gently, and after he dies he is surrounded, picked up and carried away by the Death Machine--as his gang looks on.

As a written text *Everyman and roach* demonstrates two obvious limitations--an over-reliance upon stage directions, and a repetitive quality created by the inclusion of lyrics which (as in any musically-oriented text from opera to musical comedy) amplifies and reinforces themes already sounded by the text proper. In the first instance, however, stage directions are the key to the improvisational quality of the production, a quality essential both to its artistic and to its social/political success. The dynamic force of improvisation in the production will be discussed in detail below.

As text, *Everyman and roach* also displays three obvious strengths which explain to some degree its success in production. First, the characters are delineated in bold, definitive strokes, and therefore remain in the mind's eye. Everyman, his "friend" roach, his mother, Dolores the Fortune-teller, the composite characters of the Death Machine, even Amico and Broad, possess and preserve the potency of generic morality play characters.

Second, despite initial and consistent reminders to the reader/viewer that the play's theme concerns death, the comic elements offered by this text are visible and viable. Everyman's hubris, for example, is tragi-comic from the moment of his first appearance as a big shot disco owner. The Fortune-teller's lies about her lack of funds offer tremendous comic relief, as do the macho



## Production History

*Everyman and roach* was written, directed and produced by Jonathan Ringkamp<sup>10</sup> and Geraldine Fitzgerald. Ringkamp, a Franciscan brother and Brooklyn high school teacher of theatre, had written an initial script at the time he and Ms. Fitzgerald were serving on Mayor Lindsey's Cultural Council of New York. Both felt frustrated by the inability of the Council to directly affect the quality of life on New York City streets in summer time, and so decided to initiate a theatrical plan of their own. It was in this spirit that the two agreed upon the *Everyman* concept, and approached the Brooklyn Arts and Culture Association (BACA) as local facilitators. As the project gradually gained momentum and publicity, offers of funding came in--and were not accepted, since this independent production pair did not wish to be told "what to do." Production plans proceeded, based upon three shared philosophical premises: "Every human being has talent;" "Everyone is acceptable;" "There would be no rejection." As Geraldine Fitzgerald put it nearly twenty years later, this production "might have included the entire population of the United States!"(GFI)

What happened next during that first summer of 1968? Through the good offices of BACA publicity, anywhere from 50 to 100 people, most of them teen-agers and most of them Black and Hispanic, would appear at the appointed Brooklyn location (initially in the Coney Island section "in a room over Nathan's"<sup>11</sup>) at the appointed time--usually 6 p.m. Brother Jonathan would begin with exercises which, as Geraldine Fitzgerald recalls (GFI), ran in this sequence.

- 1) We sat in a circle.
- 2) Each person would get up and say his name, and then have to shout his name.
- 3) Then we would form ourselves into a loose group of people and walk slowly around in our circle.
- 4) Brother Jonathan would call out STOP, and in the position of that instant each person would look for plasticity, as if in water, but with head up and both feet on the ground.
- 5) We would then begin the CHANGE & SUPPORT exercise. Someone would go into the middle space of the circle and stake out a healthy position.
- 6) Anyone could come and CHANGE this person's position as long as he or she could help SUPPORT the first person. Person #2 would in so doing stake out his own position.

- 7) Slowly everyone added him or herself to the group in the middle--which existed only by virtue of everyone SUPPORTING each other.
- 8) After the actors learned to SUPPORT each other, they graduated to the TRUST of each other that permitted them each to develop a DEAD FALL, to be lifted up and to be CARRIED OFF.

These theatre games, states Fitzgerald emphatically, permitted casting without rejection, and taught the group trust essential for both physical and vocal improvisation. Auditions were then held for the vocal principals. The rehearsals which followed the games were always open to viewers. They included open discussions on everything from how Everyman would talk (what would he call his girl? how would he address his pals?) to how the gang would ride their "motorcycles" and how the Death Machine would "sludge." If either words or actions "worked" in improvisation, they were incorporated into the text. The device of the Death Machine became the brilliant means of maintaining the company's policy of including, on any evening, any newcomer who might wish to be a performer. By the same token it gave the company a "chorus" from which they might in effect "train" actors for the larger roles when these might be vacated. Generally, recalls Fitzgerald, the actors were responsible to the initial concepts of punctuality and presence, and the company bonded artistically and personally. The final script, while built upon the initial invention of Ringkamp and Fitzgerald, was ultimately the cooperative vision of composers, choreographers and actors as well.

The brilliance of the Ringkamp/Fitzgerald alliance was that each had an equal commitment to making an aesthetic statement on New York City streets. Ringkamp brought his expertise as a young people's theatre coach, Fitzgerald her considerable reputation as a theatre artist. Teacher and actress were joined eventually by choreographer Elizabeth Keene and producer Dolores Kagen, and together these four individuals launched an undertaking which was to nurture not only the young and talented composers Johnny Justice and John Orlando, but hundreds of amateur actors as well. The project caused a stir. BACA provided much moral support, a well-chosen selection of street locations, and good publicity. Fitzgerald's presence as co-director and sometime performer (in the role of Dolores, the Fortune-teller) attracted continuous media coverage along the way.

The original New York Everyman company brought rock opera *Everyman and roach* to a variety of settings. From continuous street theatre in Brooklyn beginning in 1968, it became TV theatre thanks to filming by Channel 13 that same year. The production next moved indoors in Manhattan--first to La Mama's in 1971 and then to the Society for Ethical Culture in 1972. It metamorphosed into outdoor theatre again in Lincoln Center Plaza in 1971--always with its cast of amateur actors intact.

Developing simultaneously with its changes of setting (and equally significant in the history of this experimental venture) were the proliferation of Everyman Street Theatre companies and the expansion of repertory, based always upon the original company's premises of inclusion (everyone has talent and everyone who wishes to perform may join in). The summer of 1971 saw 300 New York City teen-agers involved in five Everyman companies performing, not only in the five boroughs of the city, but also showcasing their work at Lincoln Center's Outdoor Festival which an Everyman Company performance had initially inspired.<sup>12</sup> Shakespeare was well represented that season: while one Everyman company was performing *Mister Esteban*, a rock version of *Macbeth*, another was performing *Monster*, a rock version of *Coriolanus*. During this heyday period, six Everyman members were scholarship students at the Julliard School of Drama.<sup>13</sup> (MD).

The most impressive Everyman company success story is provided by its Washington, D.C. chapter which is still alive and well today. Established in 1969, the year it first performed *Everyman and roach* at Lincoln Center Plaza, this company numbered 80 youngsters by 1976 when, for its fifth Lincoln Center performance it presented *The Life and Times of Stagolee*, a musical "based on ballads about the Southern folk hero, a larger-than-life street fighter and gambler." At that time, the Washington company was not only performing almost daily in different city neighborhoods, but had also extended its performance route to include appearances in nearby Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey and far-flung Alabama and Ottawa. The tangible educational result of this summer performance program with urban teen-agers was that it became "the basis for the creation of a high school . . . the Duke Ellington High School of the Arts in Washington is a product of the EST Company."<sup>14</sup> The school, organized in 1973 by educators inspired by that Everyman group, is alive, well and accredited today.<sup>15</sup>

In 1977 the Everyman concept undertook yet another new step when a professional company of Everyman players produced another adaptation, *St. Joan of the Microphone*, performing outdoors in Queens, in Brooklyn, and at Lincoln Center Plaza. This musical went indoors two years later to Manhattan's Ansonia Hotel, and both indoor and outdoor productions received good reviews.<sup>16</sup> That same year Ms. Fitzgerald received an inquiry from the Commissioner of Community Relations in Canberra, Australia about how to start an Everyman Company.<sup>17</sup> In 1978 the original Everyman Company returned "home," opening a store front theatre on Union Street in Park Slope, Brooklyn, where they produced *Hamlet*, the tale of a Nigerian Prince.

The latest update on Everyman production activity is that Mike Malone has continued to direct the Washington company annually since 1969, usually creating new material of a morality play variety through improvisation with his teen-age casts: *The Great McDaddy*, *God is in the Streets Today*, *The Seven Deadly Sins*, *The Prodigal Son*, *A Story a Story*. These productions have come regularly to Lincoln Center, and in 1989 Malone brought back to New York



a revival of *Everyman and roach*--to celebrate both the group's 20 anniversary, and the survival of the Everyman company concept.<sup>18</sup>

### Critical Response

Opinions about just what the Everyman Theatre Company was doing proliferated, even faster than the companies themselves. While *New York Times* critic Clive Barnes gave the Society for Ethical Culture production of 1971 something of a "gentle pan,"<sup>19</sup> the reviewer for the small *Manhattan Park West* publication raved,

*Everyman and roach* . . . is a dynamo of a play. An epic rock opera, as it calls itself, it is not. But a brave, new bursting work of art, straight from the streets--it is!<sup>20</sup>

*Variety's* critic had a mixed reaction:

While much of the book is banal, the score undistinguished, the diction slipshod, and the singing shaky at best, it is the dynamism of the performers which recommends this offering. Few other professional musical offerings can match the excitement generated by the "Everyman" cast.<sup>21</sup>

Edith Oliver of *The New Yorker*, on the other hand, pronounced the score "melodious and stirring."<sup>22</sup> And George Oppenheimer of *Newsday* was delighted by the level of performance.

. . . there are some excellent performances by Eugene Washington as Everyman, who sings and acts splendidly, and Michael Darden as the insignificant but touching roach. There are also superior performances by the Angel of Death, divided in two by a highly effective singer, Roberta Williams and a lithe and graceful dancer, Ernest Eliot Edwards. In fact, the production is crowned with talent--Robert Tuthill as Everyman's Amico, Sheryl Dembroft as a hooker, Miss Fitzgerald herself as a palmist, barely recognizable in dark and distorting clothes, but outstanding in her acting and singing in a tiny part . . .<sup>23</sup>

Leo Mishkin of the *New York Telegram* also praised Michael Darden's performance, and in reference to the apparent lack of training of some performers, had this to say:

It would be both ridiculous and offensive to say *Everyman and roach* should have had a more professional production. It's something that

opens up the theater itself to the people involved thanks to Miss Fitzgerald and to Brother Jonathan, and only in this way can it be accepted as a stirring and vital experience in our contemporary culture.<sup>24</sup>

Martin Washburn, critic for the *Village Voice* in 1971, did not like the character of Everyman when he saw the production at the Society for Ethical Culture, nor did he believe that Everyman was saved by his concern for roach, but he did like the character of roach a good deal.

There is one small person on stage who is allowed to exist, though only because he worships. He is called "roach" because he is badly dressed and not "cool" . . . It is clear that the true Everyman is roach. . .<sup>25</sup>

And it was roach who won kudos from Richard Watts of the *New York Post* as well.

Although Everyman is the central figure, it was that roach who delighted me. Beguilingly portrayed by Michael Darden, a most engaging little actor, this humble young fellow with the wistful desire to be a big shot, was both amusing and touching. At once frightened and cocky, he was torn between the longing to be bravely loyal to his hero to the extent of dying with him and his eagerness to hold on to life. Funny and pathetic at the same time, he made it understandable that poor little roach should at the end provide inspiration for Everyman . . .<sup>26</sup>

Michael Smith, writing for the *Village Voice* in 1971 about *Everyman and roach* at La Mama, also singled out several performances, especially "Jimmy Justice, singing from the piano, [who] propels the show with the energy of his music."<sup>27</sup>

A study of critical reaction afforded *Everyman and roach* is particularly useful in its underscoring of the dominant success of three characters developed through the improvisational means employed by Ringkamp and Fitzgerald. Indeed, the cumulative blossoming of roach, the Fortune teller and the Death Machine accounts in large measure for the success of the entire undertaking. Interviews with both Fitzgerald and Darden confirm the information that roach's original role was tiny in comparison to what he "became." (GFI and II, MD) It was through the creative combustion of an improvisational rehearsal environment, Darden's obvious talent, and an ongoing flexibility with the text, that a roach character emerged which one reviewer considered the "Everyman" of the play, and others applauded as a principal performer. Fitzgerald recalled that the development of roach into a

major character took place after about a year of performance. Similarly, the innovative character of Dolores grew with Fitzgerald's presence: it provided a small but pivotal role from which she could function as a performer model for the young cast while continuing to fulfill her directing and producing responsibilities. Finally the Death Machine, truly the creature of improvisational creation during rehearsal, provided a practical means, not only as mentioned earlier of incorporating as many amateur actors as wished to participate in any given performance, but also an equally practical means of removing "bodies" from the playing area!

In reviewing the history of *Everyman and roach* one is left with the vivid impression that, while this venture was perhaps but one of many inevitable rebirths which the classic *Everyman* plot will continue to generate, it is nonetheless a rebirth which has both enriched and strengthened the *Everyman* tradition. Literally speaking, the fearful journey toward death is made more palatable by the enduring presence of human friendship and loyalty in the person of roach. In this modern morality tale, roach perpetuates the tradition of Good Deeds as *Everyman's* most significant companion. In a certain sense, however, the redemptive strength of medieval *Everyman's* Confession has not left the stage, for the Ringkamp/Fitzgerald *Everyman* continues to confess at large, both to his gang and to us, his audience. Nor has von Hofmannsthal's strong personification of Faith completely disappeared, for, in his one brave moment of defying Death's multiple characteristics, this *Everyman* displays a faith which he has never before possessed. Finally, von Hoffmannsthal's comic Devil figure, foiled in his repeated attempts to thwart *Everyman's* final journey toward salvation, is in some measure recreated in the ominous comedy of the "sludging" Death Machine.

In the contemporary production, a large, late-20th century dose of group, youth-cult frenzy has been added to the *Everyman* mystique. Its *Everyman* is a young man who, because of the tremendous speed at which young people lead their lives today, must go on the dreaded journey sooner than his predecessors. Medieval *Everyman* is ageless; Jedermann is about 40; our *Everyman* has perhaps made it to 25. His youth is epitomized, of course, by the young players who, by virtue of their willingness to improvise in a street theatre experiment, became co-authors of an allegorical drama in which their own potential destinies were under discussion and, theatrically speaking, at stake.

There is, finally, a metaphorical match between the values exercised in this contemporary production and the medieval philosophy which informed the first *Everyman*. The revolutionary, inclusive premise practiced by Ringkamp and Fitzgerald ("everyone has talent") serves to underscore, in almost ritual fashion, the theological premise (everyone is equal in the face of death) evoked by *Everyman's* first, anonymous author.

Chuck Reichenthal, program director of BACA since 1966, expressed his admiration for *Everyman* accomplishments succinctly in 1988. Recalling the

uniquely paired qualities of theatrical artistry and community involvement practiced by the original New York group, he concluded almost wistfully, "The Everyman Company offered a phenomenon I'd never seen before, and have never seen since."<sup>28</sup> Mike Malone, director of the ongoing Everyman company in Washington, put it this way: "We make a point of going into areas of real urban blight to perform, and while doing this the Everyman company has inspired hundreds of kids to come to the Duke Ellington School of the Arts. Geraldine Fitzgerald always said this thing could change lives--and it has."<sup>29</sup>

*Baruch College  
New York City*

## Notes

1. Ms. Fitzgerald's remarks hail from two two-hour interviews which I was privileged to record with her--the first on 5/13/87, the second on 2/24/88. These sources are referred to in my text in parentheses as GFI and GFII.

2. William French, "Rich joy of the sixties: the streets of New York City as theatrical space," *Themes in Drama 9: The Theatrical Space* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1987) 176-185. See also Benjamin F. Carney's doctoral dissertation, "The Baltimore Theatre Project, 1971-1983: Toward a People's Theatre" (Columbia, Missouri: U of Missouri P, 1985), which offers a detailed history of that city's professional, outdoor theatre productions in an inner city context.

3. Jonathan Ringkamp and Geraldine Fitzgerald, *Everyman and roach*, unpublished manuscript, kindness of Ms. Fitzgerald.

4. E. G. Schreiber, "Everyman in America," *Comparative Drama*, 9, no. 2 (Summer 1975) 106.

5. *The Salzburg Everyman*, an English translation of Hugo von Hofmannsthal's "Jedermann" by M. E. Tafler (Berlin: M. Mora Verlag Salzburg, 1911). Referred to as *J* in my text.

6. *Everyman*, in *Medieval and Tudor Drama*, edited and with modernizations by John Gassner (New York: Bantam Books, 1963).

7. Martin Stevens, "The Reshaping of *Everyman*: Hofmannsthal at Salzburg," *The Germanic Review*, XLVIII, no. 2 (1973) 119-131.

8. John Orlando died several years ago, and it has not been possible, despite much effort, to trace the whereabouts of Jimmy Justice.

9. In a follow-up telephone conversation to our second interview (see 1 above), Ms. Fitzgerald indicated that the original company ended their performance only once with God's decision to spare Everyman's life, because that ending "did not work."

10. Jonathan Ringkamp died in 1986. See *The New York Times* (September 20) 14, and *Variety* (October 20) 127.

11. 4/14/88 interview with Michael Darden, the original actor of the roach part. This interview is referred to in my text in parentheses as MD. Mr. Darden continues to perform and to coach. He was one of the six Everyman actors on scholarship at Julliard in 1971.

12. Jules Irving was evidently inspired to create the Lincoln Center Outdoor Festival when he saw an Everyman performance out-of-doors in Brooklyn which, of course, Ms. Fitzgerald had invited him to attend (see Babette McGee's article, note 17).

13. Jo Ann Levine, "On Everyone an Actor," *Christian Science Monitor* (September 3, 1971) 3.

14. Gerald C. Frazer, "Street Theatre to End Outdoor Festival," *The New York Times* (September 4, 1976) 8.
15. Follow-up conversation with Washington, D.C. attorney, Laura Gilbert, 5/88.
16. See reviews by Mary Ellen Milne (*Show Business*, September 1, 1977, 31) and Todd Patterson (*New York Theatre Review*, February 1979, 43).
17. Babette McKee, "Born and Bred in Brooklyn Street, Everyman Makes Theater of, by, for the People," *The Phoenix* (August 4, 1977) 9.
18. 8/24/89 telephone interview with Mike Malone.
19. Clive Barnes, "From Street Theater, an 'Everyman,'" *The New York Times* (October 6, 1971) 42.
20. Sonia Pilcer, "Street Theatre Comes Indoors," *Manhattan Parkwest* (October 21, 1971) 10.
21. "Everyman and roach", *Variety* (October 20, 1971) 58.
22. Edith Oliver, "Everyman & Roach," *The New Yorker* (October 16, 1971) 101.
23. George Oppenheimer, "Everyman & Roach," *Newsday* (October 5, 1971) 101.
24. Leo Mishkin, "Everyman Theater Does 'roach' Indoors," *Morning Telegraph N.Y.* (October 6, 1971) 3.
25. Martin Washburn, "Wrapped in Emotional Impotence," *The Village Voice* (October 14, 1971) 65.
26. Watts, Richard. "Everyman and his Friends," *New York Post* (October 16, 1971) 14.
27. Smith, Michael. "Everyman and roach," *The Village Voice* (September 21, 1972) 67.
28. 4/20/88 telephone interview with Chuck Reichenthal.
29. 9/1/89 telephone interview with Mike Malone.

THAT I AM AN AGENT, but also a plant; that much that I did not make goes towards making me whatever I shall be praised or blamed for being; that I must constantly choose among competing and apparently incommensurable goods and that circumstances may force me to a position in which I cannot help being false to something or doing some wrong; that an event that simply happens to me may, without my consent, alter my life; that it is equally problematic to entrust one's good to friends, lovers, or country and to try to have a good life without them—all these I take to be not just the material of tragedy, but everyday facts of lived practical reason.

Martha C. Nussbaum  
*The Fragility of Goodness*



I SUSPECT NUSSBAUM'S retrieval of Aristotle at least partly involves an attempt to sustain an *eros* sufficient to underwrite the institution we associate with the "liberal project," i.e. an allegedly limited state in service to a social economic order based on exchange relations. To use the phrase "the liberal project," of course, is to put the question in MacIntyre's terms but that has the virtue of reminding us that the social-political question cannot be divorced from the epistemological—i.e. can liberalism survive the acknowledgment that it is a tradition when its epistemological commitments are based on the denial of tradition?

Stanley Hauerwas

AN ARISTOTELIAN *SUBLIME* is, of course, an anachronism, and the concept might therefore be assumed to be of little relevance to Nussbaum's patient reconstruction of Aristotle's poetic ethics. However, the *pathos* of tragedy, including Aristotle's description of that *pathos*, is more ethically ambiguous than Nussbaum's account implies, and theories of tragic sublimity like those of Burke, Kant, and Schiller address this ambiguity by supporting that the discovery and empowerment of an ethical identity is both threatened and facilitated by community.

Allen Dunn

IN NUSSBAUM'S READING of Plato I value her recognition of the importance of the dialogue form (but puzzling her insistence that Plato was the main creator of the austere, unambiguous style of philosophical discourse) and her awareness of how difficult it can be to ascertain what choice between the alternative responses articulated within a dialogue "Plato" wants us to make.

Christine Downing

NUSSBAUM ARGUES that Aristotle's remarks about the limitations of the ethical life at the end of the *Nicomachean Ethics* contradict both his earlier acceptance of the dependence of a good life on fortune and his commitment to an "anthropocentric perspective" on the human condition. On the contrary, the limited character of human goodness follows directly from the beliefs about its vulnerability that she derives from Aristotle and urges us to accept.

Bernard Yack

WINTER 1989

A SOUNDINGS SYMPOSIUM ON *THE FRAGILITY OF GOODNESS*



For further information or a subscription write Ralph V. Norman, Editor, SOUNDINGS: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL, 306 Alumni Hall, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-0530.

U.S. Annual Subscription Rates: Individual \$15; Institutional \$24.  
Single Copy: \$5. One copy of a double issue: \$8.