Woman's Theatrical Space. Hanna Scolnicov. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

From the title, one would expect this to be a book which explores the spatial element of *performance*, and the way in which various stagings of a playtext might convey certain readings in relation to "Woman." The "theatrical space" of the title, however, refers not to the play in performance, but to the location(s)/ setting(s) in which the action of the written text takes place. Scolnicov tracks the way in which the location inhabited by female characters ("Woman") has changed from one of interiority to exteriority and posits that "the changing spatial conventions of the theatre are faithful expressions of the growing awareness of the specificity of gender differences and the changing attitudes to [sic] woman and her sexuality" (1).

Basing her analysis on the settings called for by the written text—gleaned from stage directions, descriptions and dialogue—Scolnicov traces the changes in spatial conventions through the major periods of Western theatrical history, beginning with the Greeks and progressing chronologically up to the 1980s. For each period, she chooses one or two major playwrights whose work she lets serve as an example of the theatrical conventions and gender relations of the period.

In her opening chapter, Scolnicov sets up a useful vocabulary for her discussion, making careful distinctions between the *theatrical space within* (the visible theatrical space) and the *theatrical space without* (a space implied by the play but not physically present onstage.) She then begins the task of analyzing playtexts, devoting the next two chapters to a discussion of Greek theatre. She spends a great deal of time positing how the plays of Aeschylus and Aristophanes were staged and discussing the locations suggested by the texts, but she does not make a strong enough case for the way in which this reflects gender attitudes of the time. Scolnicov offers little to evince the general consensus of Woman's position in Greek society. The inclusion of more non-theatrical documents as support would have helped to contextualize the theatrical evidence and provide added weight to the argument.

Chapter 4 is a brief seven pages on the analysis of Roman theatre and then Chapter 5 moves on to a longer discussion of Renaissance play texts. Here, Scolnicov uses the work of Ben Jonson and Shakespeare as her main illustrations, focusing on the importance of "the woman in the window" as an icon of "elopement, farewell, assignation, lewd invitation and luxury" (68). She notes that this convention was a way of getting around the obstacle of the "locked door" which was so important to Roman theatre.

The strongest chapters in the book are those devoted to Ibsen and Chekhov. Because these playwrights provide so many descriptions and stage directions in their texts, Scolnicov is afforded an opportunity to plot the movement of the characters with precision and thus provide a more detailed analysis than in earlier chapters. There is a particularly interesting discussion of the spatial details of the scene in *Hedda Gabler* in which Hedda and Lövborg look at a photo album together while Tesman and Judge Brack drink in the next room. Using this scene as an illustration, Scolnicov shows how Hedda's duplicity and her ability to easily switch between public and private voices is echoed spatially in the scene (102-3).

After a discussion of the work of Harold Pinter, and his penetration of private space, Scolnicov turns her attention to Samuel Beckett and Peter Handke. She argues that these playwrights' abstraction of theatrical space liberates Woman from her special link with the home by replacing recognizable locations with undefined theatrical spaces. As familiar theatrical spaces are effaced, so are spatial links with the characters. As Scolnicov notes, "Woman's special links with space, based on her privileged position in the home, have come to an end. Space is no longer a woman" (154).

Scolnicov labels her final chapter a "coda" and in it she argues that the new feminist playwrights have returned to the use of mimetic spaces because, for them, the question of Woman's association with the home has not been settled. She posits that the "needs of the child" have become a central concern in contemporary feminist drama (155), and that this has caused women playwrights to return to the theatrical setting of the home, but to re-define this setting as "the child's space" (159). Scolnicov's main example in support of this argument is Caryl Churchill's *Top Girls*, with its discussion of motherhood between Marlene and Joyce. Unfortunately, the inclusion of this chapter weakens the book considerably because the most current play discussed is Charlotte Keatley's *My Mother Said I Never Should* (1987), and to call Maureen Duffy's *Rites* (1969) and Pam Gems' *Dusa, Fish, Stas and Vi* (1982) "examples of recent feminist plays" (155) is naive.

Although Scolnicov states that she seeks to trace the development of "Western theatre and drama" (155), it is apparent that she is tracing only the development of the *major canon* of Western drama, and thus, it is not surprising that the "woman" discussed in Scolnicov's book is heterosexual and white. Lesbians and women of color are not included. While one can assume that Scolnicov chose to focus on major playwrights of the Western canon because she thought they would most strongly reflect the ideologies of their time, it would have been an interesting addition to her argument if she had included some playwrights who could have allowed her to track the "space" of these non-heterosexual and/or non-white women and their movement from "marginal"

settings to more "central" locations in theatrical texts. This would have served to strengthen the argument. Also, Scolnicov could have been far more persuasive if she had used a wider array of examples from each time period. As it stands, unfortunately, her book is interesting in concept, but disappointing in execution.

Beth A. Kattelman
The Ohio State University

Sartre, Un Art Deloyal: Theatralite Et Engagement. John Ireland. Surfaces. Paris: Jean-Michel Place, 1994.

It used to be that the argumentation of a book on the theater of Jean-Paul Sartre would follow a somewhat predictable course. The plays would be studied as concrete examples of more general philosophical truths or political dilemmas, and, as the analyses of Francis Jeanson (*Sartre par lui-même*, 1955) and Pierre Verstraeten (*Violence et éthique*, 1972), among others, have shown, this has proven to be a valid approach to an understanding of the place of Sartre's theater in his overall *oeuvre*. Even the book by Robert Lorris (*Sartre dramaturge*, 1975), while attempting to separate itself from the objectives of these previous two by focusing on the literary and artistic merits of the plays, still uses these plays as its primary material and considers them principally as read texts. However with the publication of Ingrid Galster's pioneering study (*Le Thèâtre de Jean-Paul Sartre devant ses premiers critiques*, 1986), new directions were forged which have greatly helped to revitalize interest in the subject. Sartre's first three plays were now understood as performed texts (private or public), with the resulting primary emphasis being placed on the initial critical reaction to them. It is precisely this distinction between theater as literature and theater as spectacle which lies at the heart of the recent book by John Ireland under review here and which enables him to investigate the complexities of Sartre's theatrical production in a most original way.

Having been completed as a doctoral dissertation at New York University in 1989, *Sartre, en art dèloyal* benefits most notably from the influence of Serge Doubrovsky in the area of psychoanalysis and literature, as well as Denis Hollier and Philippe Lejeune with regard to the "politics of prose" and the "autobiographical pact," respectively. The idea here is to bring to bear on Sartre's theatrical practice and commentary the most contemporary and, one must admit, controversial approaches to his fictional work, in the hope of attracting

renewed attention to a theater which Ireland sees as suffering from "an effect of saturation and of weariness which has discouraged all critical reevaluation" (9) and which, as a result, rarely finds its way to a diversified audience such as the readership of this journal. It is to his credit that this book succeeds both in satisfying the demands of the Sartre specialist and in placing the scope of the investigation within a larger theoretical framework.

Ireland's thesis admits the importance of 1940 as the date Sartre uses to mark his entrance into the practice of theater; many of the later interviews echo the same theme that Sartre's life and career can be divided into two distinct periods, before and after this date. The early period contains Sartre's initial philosophical and literary texts, while the later one, which extends up until his death in 1980, sees him convert to a more political and ideological agenda. Ireland places the clarity of this conversion into serious question, overdetermined as it is by Sartre's more recent pronouncements. According to Ireland, after 1940 Sartre, in the name of a new, ethical vision of the writer, tries to suppress and deny the philosophical and literary in favor of the political and ideological but encounters great difficulty in doing so. Ireland correctly points out that this difficulty is not entirely obvious and acknowledged, however, and that it will take a close rereading of both the fiction and the nonfiction in order to fully articulate and understand the conflict between Sartre the militant and Sartre the phenomenologist.

Ireland's analysis of this conflict is at the same time subtle and consistent. He arrives quickly at his main point and proceeds confidently through the maze of theoretical principles in order to reach his ultimate goal, the fictional works and, in particular, the plays themselves. On the one hand, Sartre the militant, in an attempt to establish a new, oral form of communication to guide the spectator toward a more precise understanding of his plays, makes increasing use of the interview for this purpose after 1940. On the surface this would seem to indicate "the shift from the private writer to the engaged orator-dramatist" (29). Yet Ireland complicates matters by examining the text of *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* and by insisting upon its problematic status in this regard; Sartre continues here to uphold the relationship between the author and the reader and to outline the role of the latter in the creation of the literary act. What one is able to conclude therefore is that a theoretical separation exists between Sartre's attitude toward theater as performance (interviews as explanation) and theater as text (author-reader pact), an assertion which underlines Sartre's inability to repress totally his writerly ambitions.

No place is the above conflict more evident than in the actual practice of literature, in this case Ireland's extended discussion of Sartre's unfinished series of novels, *Les chemins de la liberté*, and his initial plays from the 1940s, in

particular *Barion, Les Mouches*, and *Les Mains sales.* As stated at the outset, previous criticism has tended to treat these plays in light of Sartre's contemporaneous philosophical and political ideas; what is unique in this book however is Ireland's successful comparison of the formalistic problems inherent in the creation of these two fictional genres, a situation that has plagued many a twentieth-century writer. Contrary to the prevailing view, the results of this analysis suggest that Sartre's abandonment of *Les Chemins de la liberté* has less to do with his growing interest in outside events, the force of circumstances, and all the more to do with his failure to find a narrative form, equal to the possibilities of theater, which would support his new stance. Once again his writerly ambitions are positively affirmed: "And Sartre who preaches the virtues of a direct and oral communication cannot escape from the first condition of writing, its elaboration in solitude" (43). If Sartre's militant position, once held to be uniquely representative of his post-1940 intellectual itinerary, is placed into serious question by the preceding analysis, on the other hand his involvement with phenomenology, once believed to be restricted to the period from 1933 to 1943, is demonstrated to be a more permanent factor in the development of both his theory and practice. Engagement, by definition, necessitates an overwhelming concern with the problems of the real, and Sartre's theater is supposed to function therefore as a vehicle for an ideological agenda. However, Ireland shows, in some of the most interesting pages of the book, how Sartre's phenomenological investigation into the workings of the image, the imagination, and the imaginary provides the basis for a theory of art which remains the cornerstone of his esthetic program right through *L'Idiot de la famille* in 1971-72. Sartre's theater cannot help but reflect this line of inquiry, so much so that Ireland describes its importance as "the ultimate expression of a theory of the imaginary which underlines the power and the fascination of the unreal" (119).

The above assertion is no idle speculation. In order to bolster his controversial point, the author examines in detail certain subsequent plays and "existential" biographies whose problematics originate in the theatrical domain. From an interpretation of the ontological status of objects associated with Hugo, the main character in *Les Mains sales*, to a lengthy explanation of the role of passivity in the constitution and personalization of Jean Genet and Gustave Flaubert and their reliance on theatrical conventions in the process, Ireland cites numerous examples of Sartre's apparent resistance in practice to his own stated theory of engagement. He then goes on to show how Sartre's later theater manifests the "contamination" of the real by the unreal or imaginary and uses *Kean*, Sartre's adaptation of the Alexandre Dumas play, as the prime example of this central conflict between what is stated or intended in the nonfiction and what is shown or demonstrated in the fiction; this association is all the more relevant

when one considers the success of the Robert Hossein/Jean-Paul Belmondo reprise at the Théâtre Marigny in Paris in 1987. While the casual reader may tire at some point from this enumeration, he or she is certain to take notice once again of Ireland's summary comment with regard to the work on Genet but which could easily stand for the thesis of the book as a whole:

> Contrary to all that Sartre tried to establish during the decade which followed his conversion, *Saint Genet* affirms implicitly but in a massive way that the Sartrian project of writing has never been, when all is said and done, on the side of engagement. (173-74).

Before concluding, I would be remiss if I did not at least briefly signal the beneficial use that the author makes of an episode in Sartre's wartime notebooks, published posthumously, which relates directly to his youthful experience of theater. This episode concerns Sartre's success with certain *pièces de marionnettes* that he performed as a child and which gained him the admiration and envy of his peers. One would expect such an important remembrance to be a focal point in his autobiographical narrative, *Les Mots*, but, as Ireland details scrupulously, it has been omitted on purpose from the final version of this text. Now previous scholarship, recognizing *Les Mots* as part of Sartre's late strategy "to show that he has not become the writer whose origin this work traces" (195), has tended to interpret this omission as necessary to maintain the image of the young Sartre as isolated and unsocial. But Ireland contends, in a most original way, that this episode instead celebrates theater as a vehicle of power and seduction and, as such, is actually suppressed since it displays a very different use of the genre from that of the post-1940 militant. Once reinstated in its proper context, it again refutes and contests the foundation of Sartre's theory of engagement and the role of theater in this ideological project.

In conclusion, it would not be surprising if future reviews of *Sartre, un art déloyal* cast this book in a much less favorable light than I have done. After all recent philosophers and biographers, taking their cue from Sartre's own pronouncements just before his death, have in unison fashioned an image of him that embraces the real politics of the radical left at the expense of the imaginary works of the bourgeois writer. John Ireland, to the contrary, has sought to dispel the clarity of Sartre's division between his life and work before and after the war and, in so doing, is to be commended for his close reading of these Sartrian texts in which he emphasizes the revolt on the part of the writer, and in particular the dramatist, during the following two and half decades. One can therefore imply that it is only the later, post-"Flaubert" Sartre that completely rejects literary creation in favor of direct political action on the street. As such, Ireland presents

us with a Sartre we perhaps never knew or, at the very least, a Sartre we once knew but have long since forgotten.

Dennis A. Gilbert
Boston College

The Paper Canoe: A Guide to Theatre Anthropology. Eugenio Barba. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

The Actor's Way. Erik Exe Christofferson. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Towards a Third Theatre: Eugenio Barba and the Odin Teatret. Ian Watson. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Over the past ten years, the work of Eugenio Barba has provided a catalyst for extensive critical debate. Focusing primarily on the International School of Theatre Anthropology, an organization founded by Barba in 1979, scholars from various disciplines have interrogated the premises and implications of his research, specifically Barba's notion that certain elements of performative behavior are transcultural in nature and can be seen to underlie a variety of codified forms. Peggy Phelan has critiqued the concept of pre-expressivity, a central element of Barba's theories, by placing it in relation to feminist discussions of the Lacanian pre-Oedipal, seeing in both an unrealizable, utopian impulse toward a lost state of primal union. Rustom Bharacha and Phillip Zarilli focus more explicitly on the intercultural politics of Barba's praxis, raising questions of appropriation, dehistoricization and homogenization in regard to Barba's collaboration with artists from diverse traditions.

Regardless of this ongoing debate, it is impossible to dispute Barba's place among the master stage directors and performance theorists of the 20th century. Odin Teatret, the group he founded in Denmark in the early 1960s, has remained vital and productive throughout its thirty-year history. Three recent books on the work of Barba and his collaborators will be of interest to a range of performance theorists and practitioners, as well as to students of Odin Teatret's work.

The Paper Canoe: A Guide to Theatre Anthropology brings together a number of Barba's most significant theoretical essays, revised and expanded for this edition, interwoven with newer works. Originally published in Italian, the

book employs a richly performative, metaphoric style of discourse. The essays in *Paper Canoe* range from concrete, practical discussion of performance technique to confessional meditations on the formation of Barba's thought process. Barba's gift as a writer lies in his ability to capture the logic of the process, articulating performance principles that are tangibly and immediately useful to the practitioner. Barba attempts to decenter what he refers to as "the ethnocentrism that observes the performance only from the point of view of the spectator, that is, of the finished result" (11), reasserting the primacy of the actor's creative process and highlighting the complex network of relations that make up the theatrical event. His discussions of luxury balance, the dilated body, the pre-expressive bases of the performer's art and the distinction between daily and extra-daily behavior exemplify a type of scholarship which destabilizes the (false) binary between theory and practice.

Barba explicates his principles by drawing examples from a wide range of European and Asian performance traditions. He points to fundamental similarities that recur in various traditions, for example a convention of envisioning the locus of energy at a specific point within the body. The designated position differs from one tradition to the next; Barba's purpose is neither to deny the specificity of the respective forms nor to determine which is physiologically more correct. Rather, he observes, "[w]hat is important is that every performer selects a very precise place, not arbitrarily chosen, mentally and therefore physically effective, different from the points at which, in daily action, movement seems to begin" (75). Theatre anthropology as Barba conceives it is made up of such pragmatic insights, what he has elsewhere referred to as "bits of good advice."

Barba regards intercultural dialogue as a natural, thoroughly unremarkable element of the performer's work. "The theatrical profession is also a country to which we belong, a chosen homeland, without geographical borders. [. . .] It is not strange that performers meet within the common borders of their profession. It is strange that it seems strange" (47). He describes himself as a man whose nation is not made up of land or geography, but rather of history, of people. (147). While post-colonial theorists might raise legitimate questions about relative power positions in situations of intercultural exchange and the thorny issue of who is granted authority to speak for whom, there is something profoundly magnetic about Barba's vision of Eurasian theatre. His impulse to establish connection across boundaries of race and culture is undeniably sincere, and the continuing vitality of ISTA, which will convene the largest public session of its history in May 1996, suggests that his attempt to create intercultural dialogue within the common homeland of the theatrical profession has met with a certain degree of success.

Unlike *Paper Canoe*, which highlights the intercultural dimension of Barba's research, *The Actor's Way* by Erik Exe Christofferson explores the dynamics of Odin actors' creative process, tracing various means by which performers generate, develop, and structure performance materials. Christofferson's study is unusual in that it foregrounds the voices of four Odin actors (Roberta Carreri, Else Marie Laukvik, Iben Nagel Rasmussen and Torgeir Wethal), allowing them to articulate their own perspectives on processual work. The director's viewpoint is peripheralized, with a single chapter near the end relaying Barba's construction of the meaning and significance of Odin's practice. The text was compiled from lengthy interviews with the four performers, recording their insights in a conversational format with brief interpolations by Christofferson.

Each of the four performers emerges as a distinct personality with a highly individualized way of working, revealing not only the complexity of Odin's group culture, but more importantly the range of approaches open to actors in ensemble-generated work. In describing the process that led to the development of her one-woman show *Judith*, Carreri focuses on the influence of specific physical techniques, including the use of the eyes in traditional Asian theatre forms, in the creation of her performance score (149-57). Laukvik describes how costume elements, including a wig, hat, and prayer shawl, became the point of departure for the character of Zusha Mal'ak in *Oxrinchus Evangeliet* (131-32). Wethal, describing a sequence from Odin's *Kaspariana*, focuses more explicitly on details of physical action and the internal associations such elements awakened in him. The actors' voices are at times complementary, at times contradictory, as each relates similar events and production processes from the vantage of her/his unique positionality.

The book follows a loosely chronological structure, including brief introductory passages by Christofferson that provide an overview of the history and development of Odin's work. Like Barba's text, Christofferson's explores the distinction between performance montage as perceived by the spectator and the meaning these same actions hold for the performer(s). The spectator's position is represented by Christofferson himself, whose impressionistic accounts of Odin productions convey a strong sense of the visceral impact of the company's work; the book would be worth reading for the sake of his descriptions alone. Yet the spectator's vantage, like the director's, is peripheralized, serving as a framework and point of contrast for the actors' elucidations of their work. The true substance of the text lies in the performers' meticulous accounts of their training and rehearsal methods, along with their discussions of the personal meanings each attaches to her/his work.

Christofferson is an actor himself, as well as a director and theatre professor. The final photo of this richly-illustrated book shows Christofferson,

carrying a ribboned staff reminiscent of Odin's street performances, walking a tightrope suspended above a river. The photo, titled "The Dance on the Water," is emblematic of the balance he achieves between practice and theory, lived experience and textualization. Christofferson navigates the frail bridge which links the actor's world to that of spectator (along with the spectator's surrogate, the theorist/critic), moving between the two worlds with uncanny grace. *The Actor's Way* is essential reading, not only for students of Barba's work, but for anyone interested in the craft and practice of acting.

Towards a Third Theatre by Ian Watson provides a history of Odin Teatret and related projects initiated by Barba, written from the viewpoint of a scholar/performance ethnographer. Watson's study is supported by extensive field research, including having traveled with Odin Teatret on a number of the group's international tours. The first comprehensive study of Barba's work, the book provides a coherent framework within which to contextualize the development of the director's theories and the evolution of Odin's methodology and techniques.

Towards a Third Theatre begins with a discussion of Barba's initial apprenticeship with Grotowski and the influence this exerted on the younger director's subsequent work. The book also includes chapters on physical and vocal training, an exploration of Odin's rehearsal techniques and means of developing performance montage, and a detailed chronology of the company's studio productions and outdoor performances. Watson's performance descriptions, which highlight structural elements of the productions and include an overview of critical response, complement the more subjective portrait offered by Christofferson. Watson is particularly attentive to the sociopolitical aspects of Barba's agenda, noting that the political significance of Odin's work lies in the group's approach to how theatre is made rather than in the discursive content of their productions. He examines Barba's role as founder of the Third Theatre movement, a loose affiliation of performance ensembles throughout Europe and Latin America. In one of the most stimulating and insightful passages of his text, Watson examines the implications of Odin's "barter" work, a form of encounter in which performance itself becomes the means of exchange. Described by Mette Bovin as "provocation anthropology," a typical barter involves a type of dialogue between Odin performers and the residents of a specific locale, in which each party presents selected elements of their own performance culture—songs, traditional dances, etc.—in a format of reciprocal exchange. Watson considers the significance of this practice, which destabilizes the passive role of the spectator and dissociates performance from the realm of economic exchange.

Watson's prose style seems rather stark in comparison to the imagistic language employed by both Barba and Christofferson, but his writing is lucid,

concise and jargon-free—factors that play to his advantage when he begins to situate Barba's work within the discourse of interculturalism and performance. In a concluding chapter on ISTA, Watson tackles difficult questions head-on, summarizing the major debates surrounding Barba's praxis and outlining various positions in a clear, straightforward manner. Watson is particularly self-reflexive about the extent to which his long-term association with Odin Teatret might render his work vulnerable to charges of bias, yet he skillfully negotiates the liminal position of the ethnographer as insider/outsider, producing a remarkably balanced study of Barba's ongoing work.

Scholars of theatre and performance studies would be well advised to read these three books in dialogue with one another—indeed, the texts seem almost to have been intentionally structured to be read in this way. Barba identifies three levels of meaning in his dramaturgy: the actor's meaning, the director's meaning, and the spectator's meaning. These three publications examine the work of Odin Teatret from each of the vantage points Barba describes; taken together, they constitute an extraordinarily rich and multi-faceted evocation of a significant (and still evolving) body of work.

Lisa Wolford
Northwestern University

Presence and Desire: Essays on Gender, Sexuality, Performance. Jill Dolan. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1993.

A scholar collecting previously published essays into book form is faced with three particular choices. First, s/he can allow the essays to stand on their own and let the reader make of them what s/he will. An afterward can be added, by which the scholar offers a summation of the work, after the reader has finished the text. Or, as in the case of Dolan's collection, an introduction can be provided, creating a lens through which the essays are viewed.

The 39 page introduction, with 66 citations, is actually the first essay of the collection. Dolan describes her history as a "spectator" and theorist, provides a brief overview of the Women and Theatre Program, an adjunct of the Association for Theatre in Higher Education, and then, in *Rethinking the Critical History: The Essays*, constructs the self-reflective lens informing the reader of her current position on many of the articles. Of *Personal, Political, Polemic: Feminist Approaches to Politics and Theatre* she writes, "In the few years since I wrote

the article I've grown to disagree with some of the basic premises on which the essay is built" (13). Dolan crafts her lens out of time and reflection, covering her scholarly bets throughout the introduction, guiding the reader through her perceptions regarding changes in attitudes or situations since the writing of the essays.

The articles themselves are a mix of theory, production practices, and the history of recent conflicts and struggles within the academic feminist community, especially among more traditional theorists and lesbian and minority feminists. Dolan again shapes a cautionary lens as she describes the Women and Theatre Program "pre-conferences" at the Chicago and San Diego ATHE conventions: "All I can do here is to provide an accounting of my own experience of the events, filtered through my own various, often conflicting, positions as a white-materialist-feminist-lesbian-Jewish-poststructuralist-postmodern critic and theorist" (71). These same positions are also the starting place for such essays as *Gender, Sexuality, and "My Life" in the (University) Theatre*, *Breaking the Code: Musings on Lesbian Sexuality and the Performer*, and *The Body as Flesh: Or, the Danger of the Visual.* In *Breaking the Code*, for example, her concern confronts the limitations of depicting lesbian characters through the frame of realism: "The only viable position for lesbian characters within realism appear to be as heterosexuals-in-transition . . . or as observers" (137). Her decision to leave acting and become a critic ("Assuming a critical role brought with it pariah status") parallels this depiction of the lesbian as "in-transition" and as "observer" (3).

The first-person voice shapes every essay, successfully eroding the distance between critic, theory and reader. Dolan's personality and passion permeates these articles. By demonstrating her strong personal connection to her theoretical explorations of body, gender, and representation she reaffirms the notion that "the personal is the political," and asserts the body, and its representation, as a source for the theoretical. The essays collected under the rubric *Sexuality and Visibility* read as an attempt to come to terms with a specific body, Dolan's, and an examination of the generalized implications arising from her efforts.

In this section her qualitative frame slips slightly, specifically in her description of incorporating theory into the productions of *Etta Jenks* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* It is important not to disregard the insights she offers by detailing her disruptive production techniques, but present in her evaluations is a subtle confusion between intent and result. The implications of Dolan's assessment of her directorial efforts are that spectators saw the performances as Dolan intended them to, or that they saw them the same way she did when she was in the audience. Earlier in the book, though, she expresses doubt about the existence of a universal spectator and asserts the need to consider

the effects of race, class, even sexual orientation on the spectator. Ascertaining the resulting effect on spectators is more difficult than generating those techniques intended to bring deconstructive interpretations to traditional texts. However, a careful reader should be able to identify this confusion, move past it, and still appreciate Dolan's efforts to join theory and production. (Dolan, interestingly enough, is very careful, in a previous essay, to qualify her perceptions of the possible results generated by her production of *The Heidi Chronicles.*

Finally, this collection serves as an excellent starting place for any student or scholar unfamiliar with feminist theorists of the past decade, for Dolan's work is closely connected to that of her peers. The articles, and the extensive notes attached to each article, provide a reference base for essays and plays by other feminist critics and dramatists. Dolan also demonstrates a broad and thorough knowledge of the field, from Kant to marxism to materialist feminism. This knowledge contributes significantly to her analysis and theoretical positioning, as well as paying scholarly homage to the other women theorists—Teresa de Lauretis and Elin Diamond, in particular, who continue to contribute to feminist studies.

David-Michael Allen
University of Kansas

Understanding Tennessee Williams. Alice Griffin. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

Tennessee Williams scholarship has thrived in the last five years or so. On the biographical front Ronald Hayman's *Tennessee Williams: Everyone Else is an Audience* (Yale University Press, 1993) has been followed by Lyle Leverich's magisterial, Williams-commissioned *Tom: The Unknown Tennessee* (Crown, 1995), possible because the recently deceased Maria St. Just, the self-appointed executrix of Williams literary estate, had surrendered her lockhold on rights to the letters, plays, memoirs, etc. Required reading on how the Countess St. Just impeded Williams's scholarship is John Lahr's witty article in the *New Yorker* (Dec. 19, 1994). David Savran's *Cowboys, Communists, and Queers* (University of Minnesota Press, 1993) and John Clum's *Acting Gay: Male Homosexuality in Modern Drama* (Columbia University Press, 1992) have explored Williams's plays from the standpoint of gay history and theory. Brenda Murphy's *Tennessee Williams and Elia Kazan: A Collaboration in the Theatre* (Cambridge, 1992) has cogently argued for a fuller participation by and acknowledgement of Kazan in

the Williams canon. Two volumes in the Twayne Masterworks series—Thomas P. Adler's *A Streetcar Named Desire: The Moth and the Lantern* (1990) and Delma Presley's *The Glass Menagerie: An American Memory* (1990)—offer rewarding readings of these Williams plays. And *Confronting Tennessee Williams's A Streetcar Named Desire: Essays in Critical Pluralism* (Greenwood, 1993) gathers 15 original essays studying the play from a variety of theoretical perspectives.

To this growing body of Williams criticism comes *Understanding Tennessee Williams* in the Understanding Contemporary American Literature series overseen by Matthew Broccoli and published by the University of South Carolina Press. Broccoli explains that each volume in the series "provides instruction in how to read certain contemporary writers—identifying and explicating their material, themes, use of language, point of view, structures, symbolism and responses to experience" (ix). The series is intended for the "nonacademic reader." Alice Griffin dutifully adheres to the goals of the series, adding that hers is a "guide to Tennessee Williams's major plays for those who read them, those who view them, and those who stage them" and that while "(s)ome studies regard Williams primarily as a literary figure, to others a stage innovator . . . a comprehensive consideration must explore both aspects as does this book" (xi). Griffin confines her coverage to nine of Williams's plays (*Glass Menagerie, Streetcar, Summer and Smoke, Rose Tattoo, Camino Real, Cat on a Hot Tin Roof, Orpheus Descending, Sweet Bird of Youth,* and *Night of the Iguana*), the "last and possibly best of Williams's major plays" (217). It is disappointing to find Griffin perpetuating the misnotion that Williams's work after *Iguana* (1961) went downhill, though, to be fair, she surveys some of the plays of the 1960s and 1970s in rapid-fire succession in her 19-page omnibus first chapter. Some scholars hold that Williams's plays of 1960-1982 will be judged his best experimental work. Among the chapters on the nine plays, those on *Camino* and *Cat* are the most satisfying; those on *Streetcar* and *Iguana* less so.

Each of Griffin's short chapters on these "great stage works whose lyricism, humanity, and theatrical impact enriched the achievement of the American theatre" (19) follows predictable contours. Blending plot summaries with a melange of quotations, she supplies a running commentary on Williams's themes, characters, languages, symbols, and, to an extent, the premieres. She is fond of repeating Williams's pronouncement that "Without my symbols I might still be employed by the International Shoe Co. in St. Louis" (173). Griffin overflows with the critical remarks that have made their way into students' spiral notebooks (and I daresay now their laptops) for years. Williams displays "mastery in depicting sexual tension" (185); for his "heroes and heroines desire, love, conception, liquor, and madness are some of the avenues of escape or transcendence from the imprisonment of life and the inevitability of defeat by time or death" (175). Griffin affirms that "[i]n depicting . . . society Williams employs a favorite technique, that of dramatic contrasts" (125), and that a visit

(e.g., Blanche's to her sister; Val Xavier to Two River County) is a frequent structural device for Williams.

Griffin often turns to Williams symbols *ad seriatim* at the ends of chapters (e.g., the light bulb, the blind Mexican woman in *Streetcar*; the rose, the goat in *Rose Tattoo*), unfortunately isolating these dramatic elements from the characters and plots which they energize. Even so, Griffin at times perceptively elucidates Williams's symbols, especially the dummies in the *Rose Tattoo* which "form their own chorus—bloodless personifications of the seven stages of life" including the bridal gown dummy and the "black-veiled" one (115). Within the conventional bounds of Williams criticism, Griffin admirably explains the Orpheus myth and how it informs *Orpheus Descending* and provocatively explores Eliot's influence on *Camino Real*: "The use of symbolism, the stream of consciousness, the theme of desire, death, and resurrection, of destruction of cities, of sterility and life-giving water, the allusions, and even the choice of characters and settings reveal the influence of T.S. Eliot, the reigning poet of Williams's day" (128).

Griffin is on much more dangerous ground, St. Elmo fires abounding, in advancing her key idea that "Williams's plea for poetic imagination and transcendence of realism to represent 'truth, life, or reality' generally went unheeded in the productions of his plays in his lifetime" (37), because they "suffered from the realistic style that dominated the commercial theatre of the 1950s" (190). Accordingly, Griffin maintains that these productions generated "misunderstanding and even attacks on [Williams's] method by many of the early critics, from whom some later scholars took their cue" (16). In defending her claim, Griffin blames a host of directors, sceneographers, and actors for realistic misrepresentations, but often prize-winning productions, of Williams's dramaturgy. She chastises Eddie Dowling, *Menagerie's* first director, for removing the screen devices, yet she fails to point out that Williams participated in and agreed with that decision. She lampoons Daniel Mann for directing a "spell-it-all-out-script" (121) of *Rose Tattoo*; Harold Clurman "missed the mark" in directing an *Orpheus*, as did Boris Aronson whose set "did not conform to Williams's stage directions" (191). Griffin's most acrimonious attacks are reserved for Elia Kazan who "was strong on realism and short on poetry" in directing *Streetcar* and who unfairly made Williams change the ending of *Cat*, thus minimizing Kazan's artistic collaboration with Williams. She also faults Marlon Brando for making Stanley Kowalski too likeable (against Williams's intention) and Elizabeth Taylor for her Maggie, since the "vulnerability was missing and there never was a doubt she would succeed, against any odds" (168).

In her attempt to redeem Williams's work from the realists, Griffin astonishingly omits the name and contributions of Jo Mielziner, the sceneographer for *Streetcar, Cat,* and *Sweet Bird* whose gauze scrims precisely captured the lyricism she champions. Equally distressing, Griffin privileges revivals, particularly by British directors. Howard Davies's 1990 production of *Cat* in London, with its Broadway third act restored, for Griffin becomes "The best major production of a play by Williams up to that time" (167) and Peter Hall's

Orpheus in 1989 was "truer to the script and one Williams surely would have enjoyed" (194). Such assessments distort the significance of the American theatre in the 1950s and 1960s, a particularly unfortunate bias given Griffin's information-seeking "nonacademic" audience.

Given that audience, Griffin would have been better advised to give kinder attention to the illustrious premieres Williams's plays did receive, since, after all, many of these productions changed the history of American theatre and established reputations. And while Griffin's discussions are clear and concise, she should have included more recent (post-1990) critical opinion. Typical of offering only dated views is a discussion of *Cat* on page 155 which cites only Signi Falk (1961), Arthur Ganz (1962), and Esther Jackson (1965).

Philip C. Kolin
University of Southern Mississippi

Exiles, Eccentrics, Activists: Women in Contemporary German Theater. Katrin Sieg. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

As Sieg notes in her introduction, hers is the "first book-length examination, in either German or English, of twentieth-century plays written by women in German." As a well-researched and beautifully written work of theater historiography, *Exiles, Eccentrics, Activists* serves as the perfect critical companion to Sue Ellen Case's *The Divided Home/Land*, a recent anthology of translated plays by German women. Like Case's anthology, Sieg's book goes beyond simply adding to the sum of knowledge already amassed about German theater history. By focusing on two historical periods—the Weimar Republic and contemporary Germany—Sieg couples insightful analyses of the texts and contexts of her chosen theater artists and examines the modern works vis-a-vis their predecessors. Thus, she consciously refutes traditional (male) criticism by positing a feminist genealogy and succeeds in her task of recording "a history of women's theater contiguous to and engaging with the dominant tale, exposing its biases and mechanisms of exclusion at each intersection."(1)

Chapter One examines Marieluise Fleisser, probably the best known of these writers due to her association with Brecht. Sieg describes how Fleisser utilized realism in the form of the critical Volksstuck to critique sexual and moral double standards, and argues that Fleisser's negative experience with Brecht during the production of her play *Pioneers in Ingolstadt* exemplifies the ways in which the play's sexual politics challenged established ideologies of both the right and the left. Using this vexed political dynamic as the background, Sieg provides an insightful reading of Fleisser's earliest play, *Purgatory in Ingolstadt*, informed by Fleisser's troubled personal history. Borrowing from Case, Sieg also articulates

a link between Fleisser's oeuvre and the work of a contemporary German writer, Kerstin Specht, foregrounding a female line of succession overlooked in previous theater scholarship, which focuses on contemporary male writers of this genre, such as F.X. Kroetz. *Purgatory* appears in Case's anthology; *Pioneers* has also been translated in *Plays by Women: Nine*, edited by Annie Castledine (London: Methuen, 1991), along with several other short prose pieces by Fleisser, describing her life at the time of her association with Brecht, though Sieg fails to mention this.

In Chapter Two, Sieg, breaking from the traditional focus on institutionalized houses, traces a history of cabaret in order to illustrate how Erika Mann's troupe, the Peppermill, both protested the Nazi regime and critiqued the stereotypically misogynist view of women common in other forms of cabaret. Included also is useful information about other female performers whose use of physical humor subverted the dominant classical traditions of actor training. Sieg argues that Mann's status as an exile and a lesbian informed her work and links her to contemporary feminist performers.

Chapter Three examines another artist's contribution which Sieg configures as a precursor to contemporary women's performance art and queer politics: the work of Else Lasker-Schuler, who, as a Jew, was eventually forced into exile. Instead of dismissing her personal theatrics as other critics have, Sieg argues that Lasker-Schuler's cross-dressing and playacting roles were outrageous and courageous strategies designed to foreground her position as outcast in terms of class, gender, ethnicity, and profession. This fractured identity is reflected in her plays, particularly her last one, *IandI*, a reworking of the Faust myth, which excoriates the Nazis and interrogates the role of the artist in society. As in the case of previous chapters, Sieg's perceptive reading of this play and Lasker-Schuler's earlier play *The Wupper* are highlights of the chapter.

In some ways even more compelling is the book's second half, which concentrates on three contemporary writers, situating them within recent cultural and historical debates in Germany, such as the analysis of fascism by the New Left, and the move in literature towards New Subjectivism after the student movement of the 1960's.

Reinshagen, the most acclaimed female playwright in Germany, has contributed to the analysis of fascism and questions surrounding German identity through a trilogy of plays which covers the last fifty years of German history. Sieg discusses her play *Sunday's Child* in this light. She also analyzes the socialist feminist play *Ironheart*, pinpointing Reinshagen's use of lyrical language as a strategy of resistance within realism, creating a space for a form which incorporates aspects of realism with a feminist reclamation of expressionistic techniques, and utilizes "proximity" rather than distancing effects in its examination of the effects of capitalism on subjectivity.

The last two chapters are particularly enlightening, since very little has been published in English or German about Elfriede Jelinek and Ginka Steinwachs, whose works are consciously informed by feminist and Marxist politics. Jelinek

is the only Austrian writer treated in the book and also the only playwright whose texts do not appear in Case's anthology. One of Jelinek's plays, *What Happened After Nora Left Her Husband*, is available in English—translated by Tinch Minter in *Plays by Women: Ten*, edited by Annie Castledine (this translation is not mentioned by Sieg). I was a bit disappointed with the short shrift Sieg gives *Nora*, particularly since I think American readers would appreciate this socialist feminist sequel to Ibsen's *A Doll House*. Although Sieg (probably rightly) dismisses the play as "dated," its humor is often quite engaging, and its politics germane in light of capitalist and communist debates about the role of women in unified Germany, though the conclusions drawn possess a bleakness typical of Jelinek. Nevertheless, the plays Sieg does choose to discuss—*Clara S.* and *Illness or Modern Women*—are excellent representatives of Jelinek's feminist strategies of deconstruction and the "negative dialectic" which Sieg adroitly summarizes. As in previous chapters, Sieg once again successfully synthesizes the playwright's biography, theoretical positions, and politics in order to contextualize the major issues of the texts.

Steinwachs, another postmodern feminist writer, stages in her plays the dialectical relationship between French poststructuralism, on the one hand, and German materialism, on the other. In her final chapter, Sieg gives a concise overview both of French feminisms and the concept of *ecriture feminine*, and of the German women's movement, which fostered the confluence of a Marxist/materialist and feminist critique. She focuses on Steinwach's play, *George Sand*, which enacts the deconstruction of psychoanalysis and humanism, and the return of the centrality of excess, fantasy, pleasure, and play. Sieg describes Steinwachs as occupying the "climactic moment" of her narrative—her work, Sieg argues, comes closest to straddling the poles of French and German feminist discourse, with her materialist critique of representation. Steinwachs, like Split Britches, whom she quotes in *George Sand*, injects postmodernism with feminist politics, embracing women's experiences while deconstructing notions of a stable identity.

What I find most intriguing about Sieg's book is the way in which it engages with its chosen texts in order to address contemporary debates in feminist performance theory: the "strife and stall" of essentialism vs. poststructuralism (Case), the efficacy of realism as a feminist strategy, the (de)merits of deconstruction, the questions raised by identity politics and queer politics. By loosening up the meaning of a hotly contested term such as "essentialism," which Sieg (re)defines as "a theoretical position that rests on *identity* as a stable concept, whether conceived of as organic or as social/cultural," divorcing it from its usual biologism, she opens up space for new configurations of identity. On the one hand, this "loosening" of the term allows for possibilities outside this dichotomy; on the other, her re-definition in some ways reifies the initial bipolarization, with its rejection of realism, though Sieg does argue that certain forms of realism might be utilized for a feminist politics. For instance, Reinshagen's use of the lyrical, not unlike some uses of magic realism, illustrates one effective way to

combine the notion of verisimilitude with the possibility of social change. Sieg suggests but leaves it to others to ask: Isn't there always within representation (even realism) the component of "performativity" or "hallucination," as Lynda Hart proposes? And is there not, as Case has argued, a certain reliance on essences within the often ahistorical discourses of poststructuralism?

Finally, one of the most exciting aspects of this book is that it opens the way for more scholarship, giving its readers an excellent headstart with its extraordinarily extensive bibliography. Sieg envisions this book as an incentive to further study, particularly in areas she does not explore: Turkish and other minority women writers living in Germany; contemporary German women performance artists; and writers from the former GDR. This pioneering volume is sure to inspire further interest in the study and performance of these provocative texts and to promote more dialogue between Anglo and German theater artists and scholars. This book is also a valuable text for feminist scholars due to its pertinence vis-a-vis contemporary debates within feminist performance theory and for all theater historians eager for a more comprehensive view of German theater history.

Susan Russell
College Misericordia

The Shakespearean Wild: Geography, Genus and Gender. Jeanne Addison Roberts. Lincoln, Nebraska and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.

Over the past decade it has become common to speak of "feminisms" in the plural, in order to account for the diversity of woman-centered perspectives. Jeanne Addison Roberts' *The Shakespearean Wild: Geography, Genus and Gender* is interesting in part because we get to watch an intuitive and highly-informed reader negotiate her position in the pluralistic landscape of feminist viewpoints. The results of Roberts' inquiry into Shakespeare's excursions beyond the cultural frontier may not be entirely satisfying, but the candor and intelligence with which she conducts her endeavor help to make this book a worthwhile contribution to gender-based studies of Shakespeare.

In her introduction, Roberts establishes the complexity of the relationship between patriarchal early modern Culture and the predominantly female Wild (I am following Roberts in capitalizing these terms to indicate their centrality and scope). By virtue of its elemental quality of difference, the Wild simultaneously threatens masculinist Culture and helps to define it. The characteristic response

of Culture to this difference is to seek to repress and explore the Wild, and finally to attempt to preempt and incorporate it.

Arguably, this response is enacted in some way or another in nearly all of Shakespeare's plays. Roberts has avoided becoming swamped by her subject by making a judicious selection of texts for discussion. Her treatments of *Titus Andronicus, The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Taming of the Shrew* and *All's Well that Ends Well* are especially rich. *Titus* and *The Merry Wives* anchor Roberts' first chapter, which reveals that the Wild landscape can be a forest of fear as well as a green world of promise. Roberts' second chapter is concerned with the interplay of metamorphosis and metaphor. Here her reading of *The Shrew* finds elements of romance and fantasy more compelling factors in the play's network of meaning than the elements of farce that are conventionally discussed. The final chapter deals with the potential for reconciliation between male Culture and the female Wild. In this context, Roberts shows that as an "integrated woman," Helena in *All's Well* provides more than simply a challenge for Bertram (155); she represents the potential merger of Diana and Venus, one of several manifestations in Shakespeare of the "unsettling female [who] remains a Wild presence never wholly contained" (117).

It is noteworthy that Roberts acknowledges that the variety of Shakespeare's treatments of these themes is such that any attempt to discover a coherent, progressive development in his attitude toward the Wild landscape of woman, barbarian and beast would be grossly reductive. She is right to insist above all else that it is not a simple, linear journey from the green world of Arden to the problematized new world of *The Tempest.* One of the real merits of this study is that Roberts consistently refuses to downplay Shakespeare's restless thematic tinkering.

It is equally noteworthy that Roberts attempts to confront the limitations of her method. To employ the terms that Jill Dolan delineated in the 1980s, Roberts writes here from a cultural feminist position, at least to the degree that she has substituted a binary essentialism based on gender difference for the humanist essentialism of liberal feminism. Dolan and other materialist feminists would of course argue that this ideology of sexual difference is itself oppressive, and that it inhibits the definition of a true female subject. It must be noted in this regard that Roberts envisions her work as part of "the feminist enterprise . . . to imagine a world in which women are central" (16), as she asserts that "women should not be defined simply in terms of their sexual status or their relation to men" (182). But as she notes in her treatment of *Troilus and Cressida*, the "dissolution of boundaries" can be "bewildering" (105), and to the extent that the female subject escapes definition here we might find cause in Roberts' decision to accept the binary male-female polarity as a "justifiable risk" to her method (16).

In actuality, Roberts' method is placed at somewhat greater risk by her barely-restrained eclecticism. It is certainly reasonable enough to use Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* as a foil and point of departure for an investigation of the forest topos in Shakespearean comedy and romance. But problems arise when

this strain of myth criticism begins to share the field of inquiry with rather diluted elements of Freudianism and cultural materialism. In the most egregious instance, Roberts' promising explication of *Venus and Adonis* as a nondramatic treatment of themes that are central to green world drama is derailed by psychoanalytical speculation in which the boar appears as "the specter of a vengeful father that has forced his son back to infantile regression" (35).

Such lapses are more than adequately redeemed by the consistency with which Roberts treats Shakespeare's comedies as what they are—plays. She gives considerable attention to the complicity of the audience in the function of comedy and she is fully alert to the categorical differences between male and female spectatorship. Early on, she frames her discussion with a useful suggestion about the "unstable equilibrium between being and becoming that is unique to drama" (12). These perspectives help to give Roberts' reader a sense of Shakespeare working more provisionally than we might otherwise expect on the problem of his own culture's claim to centrality. Shakespeare emerges here not as "the voice of special revelation" (22), but as a playwright who was intensely interested in the uncertain equilibrium between forces and interests on both sides of the early modern cultural boundary.

Thomas Akstens
Siena College

Shakespeare: Who Was He? The Oxford Challenge to the Bard of Avon. Richard F. Whalen. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1994.

Everybody loves a conspiracy. And the one offered by Richard F. Whalen is as wide-reaching as they come, implicating playwright Ben Jonson, Queen Elizabeth I, and, at times, the whole of British literary culture in a conspiracy to conceal the true author of Shakespeare's works. Whalen's primary assertion is that Elizabeth's favorite courtier Edward de Vere, the seventeenth earl of Oxford, wrote under the pen name "Shake-speare" to avoid any royal persecution and that Will Shakspere, a successful Stratford businessman who only had a financial interest in the theater, became known as the "Bard" as a matter of convenience long after both men were dead. Whalen makes the distinction in his terms between "Shake-speare," the author's name as it appears on the folio editions of Shakespeare's plays, and Will Shakspere, the Stratford native whom most believe to be the legitimate author. For clarity's sake, that distinction will be used in this review as well.

Certainly, Shakespearean comedies, tragedies, histories all include criticisms of the aristocracy for which an earl might find his position imperiled, and they

all reveal a knowledge of courtly matters which would not easily be attributable to an upper-class businessman from Stratford. These are key issues for Whalen. Yet, he never really addresses what advantages were to be gained from masking the "true" author's identity even when that supposed author, Edward de Vere, was dead and obviously could no longer be punished for his effrontery. Furthermore, Whalen goes into great detail about the popularity of Shake-speare's plays at the time of de Vere's death. Hence, one concludes that de Vere's family name would not have been sullied by revealing de Vere as the true author, yet the motives for the continuation of this deception by the de Vere family as well as by certain members of the court and by de Vere's fellow playwrights—all people who according to Whalen were well aware of de Vere's double life—are never explored by Whalen.

The primary fault with the book lies in the author's hypocritical stance in regard to his subject. In the first chapter, Whalen vehemently criticizes "conventional" Shakespearean scholars whose belief that the man from Stratford wrote these marvelous plays is based solely on "speculation and inference."(13) Some of Whalen's points against Will Shakspere being the author of Shake-speare's plays are well-taken: how could a man with little education and living in Stratford far from London be able to write accurately about the court, foreign lands, complicated matters of law and so on; how did Will Shakspere have the time to read the classics, learn Latin and Greek, research the court, manage a thriving business, and begin a family all between the ages of 24 and 28, 28 being the age when he wrote his first play; how did Will Shakspere of Stratford whose business affairs were well-documented manage to avoid having any mention of his literary development in the record books of the time?

However, in many ways, Whalen's response to these questions, contending that Edward de Vere was the true author, is as based in speculation as our modern assumption that Will Shakspere was the author. Whalen offers no concrete proof of de Vere's authorship. Whalen contends, for example, that since de Vere's sons-in-law assisted financially with the publication of the first Shakespearean folio and that the events in *Hamlet* parallel those in de Vere's life, then de Vere is the more logical person to be the recipient of all our "Bardolotry" (a phrase with which Whalen liberally peppers his book). He does not offer any documented facts attesting to de Vere's authorship, though.

Whalen's book is strongest in its first section in which he systematically dismantles the long-held belief that Will Shakspere is the immortal Bard, but his argument loses steam in the second section in which he props up Edward de Vere as the only alternative to Will Shakspere. It should be noted that the book is lucidly written and is quite a page-turner, like any good detective story. Whalen offers a wonderful overview of the history of this "long-standing and continuing dispute" over Shakespeare's identity with a detailed introduction and copious appendices and endnotes. This book is essential for those whose scholarly work may lead them to join the fray in the great Shake-speare debate, but for those

looking for a final resolution to this nettlesome question of the Bard's true identity *Shakespeare: Who Was He?* ultimately is a disappointment.

Roy Sexton
Ohio State University

The History of the Commedia dell'arte In Modern Hispanic Literature With Special Attention to the Work of García Lorca. David George. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.

The Relationship of Oral and Literature Performance Processes in the Commedia dell'arte. Beyond the Improvisation/Memorisation Divide. Tim Fitzpatrick. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.

Commedia dell'arte transformed human folly into incisive satire. It was ritualized carnival—a popular street theatre that served not only as communal fun but also as a political instrument through its mockery of the powerful. A seemingly casual and lowly form of theatre, it became a distinctly powerful *lingua franca* of the imagination, connecting cultures and artists throughout Europe. Two new books on commedia explore both its influence on modern Hispanic literature (particularly the plays of Lorca) and examine performance issues born out of the commedia tradition.

David George's *The History of the Commedia dell'arte in Modern Hispanic Literature With Special Attention to the Work of Garcia Lorca* is the better of the two. George recognizes that at the beginning of the twentieth century, almost simultaneously, an astonishingly diverse group of playwrights, actors, directors, and designers rediscovered commedia in ways that would permanently change the direction of the modern theatre. Pirandello, Craig, Meyerhold, Reinhardt, and Copeau, and later, Dario Fo, the San Francisco Mime Troupe, Eugenio Barba, and many individual artists and collective theatre troupes, looked to commedia for liberation from naturalism and formal literary drama. George focuses on commedia influences found in Lorca's work—and has discovered fertile ground. Lorca is presented as yet another modern theatrical giant whose debt to commedia traditions is significant. George's clear, reasoned prose and astute analysis provides a fascinating and valuable accounting of Lorca's commedia foundations, along with a few excellent illustrations to support the text.

Tim Fitzpatrick's *The Relationship of Oral and Literature Performance Processes in the Commedia dell'arte. Beyond the Improvisation/Memorisation Divide* takes a close look at the ways commedia scenarios contribute to oral performance with a strong historical base. He makes use of Scala's scenarios for *Il finto marito, Li duo fidi notari, L'amante geloso, Il cavadente, Cava Denti, Il*

marito, and *Il geloso senza fondamento* to describe commedia as a performance process. His study is interesting and he provides a deep analysis of some of the scenarios unlikely to be found elsewhere. But in paying such considerable attention to the scenarios and the act of improvisation, he gives little attention to such other aspects of commedia (masks, stock characters, etc.). These are at least as significant in understanding the centrality of the commedia actor who could rise above realistic illusion to create larger-than-life and universal human symbols.

It is George's study that makes clear that commedia is theatrical art at its pinnacle of expressiveness and creativity. Lorca, like many of his contemporaries, was drawn toward a kind of archetypal Jungian vision which reduced and also transformed life into a handful of simple plots and instantly familiar characters that confront us with spiritual and intellectual glimpses of our deepest beings. The characters of commedia thus became the expression of the universally human; to the modern mind the characters' magic was powerful because it was a kind of street psychology, revealing directly who we are.

James Fisher
Wabash College

Titus Andronicus. Critical Essays. Edited by Philip C. Kolin. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1995.

To the scholar and student of Shakespeare's plays, the value of *Titus Andronicus. Critical Essays*, edited by distinguished scholar Philip C. Kolin, will be immediately obvious. As part of a series published by Garland and supervised by Kolin, *Titus Andronicus. Critical Essays* joins previously published entries on *Twelfth Night* (edited by Stanley Wells), *The Merchant of Venice* (edited by Thomas Wheeler), *Love's Labour's Lost* (edited by Felicia Hardison Londré), *The Winter's Tale* (edited by Maurice Hunt), *Romeo and Juliet* (edited by John F. Andrews), and *Coriolanus* (edited by David Wheeler). This entry in the series is undoubtedly one of the most welcome. Few plays in the Shakespearean canon have been as misunderstood as this most controversial and problematic drama, but readers of *Titus Andronicus. Critical Essays* will find much illumination in its pages.

Mixing a number of previously published essays on the play, Kolin laces the volume with much new criticism as well. Particularly valuable is his astute introduction, "Titus Andronicus and the Critical Legacy," which not only provides a thorough overview of *Titus's* production history, but also offers a useful tour through the highs and lows of the play's critical heritage. Kolin notes that through the centuries, *Titus* "has not won the respect of great writers"(p. 4) such

as Ben Jonson, Dr. Johnson, William Hazlitt, Robert Burns, and others, although Tennessee Williams admired its "grotesqueries" (p. 5) even though he believed his own *Suddenly Last Summer* to be a superior dramatic construction. Kolin notes that it is the play's "blood and gore, its sensational cruelty"(p. 5) that has unsettled audiences over the centuries, making it among the least produced of Shakespeare's canon. As such, *Titus* has been viewed as Shakespeare's black sheep and Kolin writes that the result has been that "Over the centuries critics have denied the play even that status, claiming that Shakespeare could never have written such a barbaric spectacle."(p. 3) In "Shakespeare—Cruel and True," Jan Kott states that "In reading, the cruelties of Titus seem childish. I have recently re-read it, and found it ridiculous. I have seen it on the stage [Peter Brook's celebrated 1955 production featuring Laurence Olivier], and found it a moving experience. Why?"(p. 393) This, of course, is the essential question that all of the essays in the volume, as well as the reviews and production recollections, must address in some form. It emerges that there are numerous possible answers, and that though *Titus* seems on first glance to be much less dimensioned than some of Shakespeare's other tragedies, it is, in fact, a work of many levels and a surprising depth of character.

Twentieth century productions receive most attention in this volume, with reviews of or comments by participants in many significant international revivals of the past one hundred years (although Kolin also dips back to Ira Aldridge's 1857 performance as Titus in England). Among the critics and practitioners represented along with Kott are Carados, A. M. Witherspoon, Desmond Pratt, Daniel Scuro, Martin Gottfried, Gerald Freedman, Edward J. Feidner, Paul Barry, Audrey Ashley, Kevin Kelly, Alexander Leggatt, Michael Billington, Alan Farley, Qiping Xu, Alan C. Dessen, Joel G. Fink, Naomi Conn Liebler, Marion Thébaud, Fabiola Guilino, Richard Risso, Yoshiko Kawachi, Horst Zander, and myself. Not surprisingly, many of these selections focus on the play's significant problems in production (internationally, as productions from Asia to America are represented), especially the extreme and absurd violence, the motivations of the characters, and questions of theme and language.

These generally fascinating glimpses at the staggering variety of production concepts applied to *Titus* are expanded by an array of essays illuminating the political, social, and cultural history of the play. As might be expected, these essays include analyses of characters, genre, dramatic structure, and language to issues of gender, race, and family. Eldred Jones, Leslie A. Fiedler, and Bernard Spivack offer differing perspectives on Shakespeare's "stranger," Aaron, while Dorothea Kehler focuses on the multi-faceted Tamora in "'That Ravenous Tiger Tamora': Titus Andronicus's Lusty Widow, Wife, and M/other" and Maurice Charney delves into Titus himself (as many of the essays do in considerable depth). Edward Dowden, Frederick S. Boas, and H. T. Price deal with matters of authorship and influence, Eugene M. Waith, David Willbern, and Kolin examine issues of violence inherent in the play, and A. C. Hamilton, Jane Hiles, William Proctor Williams, Alan Sommers, and Kolin focus on intricate matters

of text and language. An exploration of racial matters in the play is finely traced in Emily C. Bartels "Making More of the Moor: Aaron, Othello, and Renaissance Refashionings of Race" and Carolyn Asp provides an interesting feminist reading of "female agency" in the play. Matters of history and culture are introduced in essays by Robert S. Miola, Gail Kern Paster, Heather James, and particularly by David Bevington in an outstanding piece, "'O Cruel, Irreligious Piety!': Stage Images of Civil Conflict in *Titus Andronicus.*"

The volume's five hundred and eighteen pages may explain, in part, the expensive $75 price tag on the book. Hopefully, many libraries will add *Titus Andronicus. Critical Essays* to their collections, but the price may cause individual purchasers to pause. However, the book is well-worth its cost for serious scholars of Shakespeare and essential for libraries. It might be hoped that Garland would consider issuing a reduced price paperback edition so that a wider audience might have greater access to it. As it is, *Titus Andronicus. Critical Essays* is an attractively bound, well-illustrated volume that significantly expands the horizons of Shakespearean scholarship—and invites reconsideration of a flawed but magnificent play.

James Fisher
Wabash College

Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class. Eric Lott. Oxford University Press, 1993.

Ambivalence resists scrutiny; it is easier to intone than document the assertion that cultural production reflects an ever shifting complex of contradicting forces, yet Eric Lott has accomplished the latter in his impressive book, *Love and Theft: Blackface, Minstrelsy and the American Working Class.* In Lott's analysis, minstrelsy emerges as simultaneously deriding and appropriating. It inadvertently demonstrated the "permeability of the color line" while also attempting to establish an inviolable racial hierarchy. White critics simultaneously expressed disdain for blacks and their performance forms while praising minstrelsy as America's only truly indigenous and representative art form. In Lott's analysis, this paradoxical situation is further complicated by the transition to an industrial economy, prompting new class divisions and upsetting the traditional family structure. In such a context, Lott asserts, analysis of the minstrel show yields "some sense of how precariously nineteenth-century white working people lived their whiteness" (4).

Lott confines his analysis to the ante-bellum period, concentrating on the late 1840's when minstrelsy attained its greatest popularity. In the first half of the book, Lott sketches the social conditions in which blackface entertainments

developed and discusses their reception, while in the second half he analyzes specific examples of blackface entertainments. In the first chapter, he moves briskly over a variety of topics related to minstrelsy's inception, such as the various creation stories about minstrelsy's origins, early blackface stage characters and the use of blackface during acts of political rebellion. He then turns to black characters in the fiction of Stowe and Twain, finding that here, as elsewhere, "blackness" was a matter of performance, a cultural construct that both attracted and repelled white Americans. While covering this varied material, Lott introduces many of the ideas that will inform his interpretive frame: the relationship of blackface to sexuality and transvestism, the white insecurity that underlay cultural appropriation, and the possibilities that blackface offered whites for ludic transgression.

In the second chapter, Lott gives greater attention to how white Americans perceived black performance, quoting several nineteenth-century accounts of "Negro dancing," "frolics," and black theatrical productions. He teases fear, fascination and elaborate deferrals from these accounts. The book then addresses how minstrel performers described their own relationship to the black performances they transformed in their acts. Rejecting the revisionist assertion that minstrels had no investment in black culture, Lott argues that minstrels saw "blackness" as a means of foregrounding their own difference and exercising an illicit liberality. For these minstrels, as well as other whites, "blackness" became central to a peculiarly American form of bohemia, a form that persists in Mailer's "white Negro" and the affected blackness of rock and roll singers. In the third and fourth chapters Lott examines the audiences for minstrelsy in the context of shifting class definitions. For Lott, minstrelsy was instrumental in defining a working class culture while at the same time uniting class factions over the bodies of black people. At the same time, in apparent contradiction, minstrelsy also provided for instances of cross-racial identification. Lott notes, as examples, that on the Bowery stages there were frequent references back and forth between Jim Crow and Mose (a white character from working class theatres of the Bowery) and that blackface was used in representing a variety of ethnic characters. Across these conflicting meanings, Lott argues, minstrelsy united the North against preindustrial foes, most notably the South.

In the second half of his book, Lott analyzes specific minstrel forms, focusing—in each chapter—on a specific theoretical concern that has been suggested in the first part. Chapters five and six address the black body as figured in minstrelsy. Minstrelsy simultaneously produced and subjected the black body; fascination with "blackness" could never be openly acknowledged. Tellingly, black minstrels also wore grease paint. Their performances were no less "imitations" than those of their white counterparts; the sensual presence cast upon blacks was necessarily deferred through mimesis. In the next chapter, Lott further expands on the sexuality of the blackface body, specifically as a cite of joys seemingly marginalized by industrialization. Lott also considers the misogyny and homoeroticism evident in the wench figure, whether the wench is

described in song or physicalized by a cross-dressed blackface performer. In these chapters Lott also addresses the class animus manifested both in disdain for the black dandy character, Zip Coon and in the 1834 antiabolitionist riots.

In the last two chapters Lott first examines minstrel music (focusing on the work of Stephen Foster) and then theatrical adaptations of *Uncle Tom's Cabin.* Focusing on what he terms "Carry me back" songs, Lott argues that these repeated laments for lost plantation life were less endorsements of slavery than nostalgia for a preindustrial past. The old slave master became emblem of a lost paternal society, speaking to the anxieties workingmen felt as they lost authority as a result of a changing family structure. Minstrel songs also celebrated Western expansion, shoring up support for the Free-Soil movement and highlighting the sectional conflict that would be most apparent in the Tom Shows. Lott contrasts the Aiken and Conway adaptations of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* along with their respective marketing and audiences, but both plays "translated [Stowe's] antislavery (not antisouthern) convictions into sectional barbs" (226). In both versions, the plight of George Harris—a slave of mixed race, who loses his job in a factory to which his master had hired him and is then forced into an arranged marriage though he is already married—invokes the plight of all wage-slaves. Cross-racial identification is prompted (just as when blackfaced mechanics would rise against Zip Coon), also conflating class and sectional antagonism.

Throughout his analysis, Lott adopts varied methodologies. He agilely moves between Marxist and psychoanalytic criticism, frequently cites film theory and even presents formalist readings of minstrel songs and skits. As is always the case with interdisciplinary work, Lott runs the risk of appearing reductive to those committed to a particular methodology, and eclectic to those hoping for a simple and coherent image of minstrelsy. But Lott's frequent shifting arises from his understanding of minstrelsy as a particularly unstable form, signaling a variety of contradicting impulses. Confronting material that resists a single interpretation, Lott dances with blackface, minstrelsy and the working class through their varied transformations.

Love and Theft represents a significant departure from a body of minstrel criticism that defines blackface as an unambivalent act of racial domination, exemplified by works such as Robert Toll's *Blacking Up* and Nathan Huggins' chapter on minstrelsy in *Harlem Renaissance.* Though Lott cites these works, a more important influence is Alexander Saxton's excellent essay, "Blackface Minstrelsy and Jacksonian Ideology" in *American Quarterly* 27.1 (1975). Saxton examines many of the same aspects of minstrelsy—its sexual and class subtext and its potential for cross-racial identification—but without Lott's elaborate theoretical frame. Lott's use of varied methodologies is his most original contribution to the subject, however, his striking interpretations mask a weakness of the book: Lott's conclusions occasionally outpace his analysis. For example, the first part of the book concludes that blackface performers inadvertently united the North against "preindustrial drags on capital formation"—namely the South. I am uncertain how Lott supports this, certainly the mere existence of regional

characters like Zip Coon and Jim Crow does not prompt so sweeping an assertion (especially since Lott demonstrates that Zip Coon was set up in opposition to sympathetic black mechanic characters.) Though one may object to aspects of Lott's argument, that is not to discredit this important contribution to the studies of race, theatre and American history.

Ed Ziter
University of California at Santa Barbara

The Play of Nature: Experimentation As Performance. Robert P. Crease. Indiana Series in the Philosophy of Technology. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993.

More and more, the notion of "performance" is being employed in social and cultural research fields such as linguistics and gender studies. At the same time, various scholars have been striving to apply scientific theories (quantum mechanics, chaos theory, etc.) to cultural realms. Alarmed over widespread misunderstanding of science and the resurgence of pseudosciences, in *The Play of Nature* Robert Crease reverses the tables by applying the performance analogy to the structure of scientific experimentation. The result is a subtle and suggestive argument that sheds light on science, and perhaps indirectly benefits theater as well.

Crease's interests in the performance analogy have nothing to do with psychology, role-playing, or the presentation of self. Nor does he portray theatrical performance as the realm of spectacle, fiction, or deception (although some situations raise these issues). Instead, Crease views theater as a model of action, especially of prepared engagements with the world involving the presentation, representation, and interpretation of beings and behaviors—imagined human ones, perhaps, for theater; real phenomena, for scientific activity. These three aspects structure his analysis of theatrical performance and scientific activity, and organize a major portion of his book.

According to Crease, experimentation is fundamental to science and must be placed on a par with theorization; but the dominant views of science (positivism and social constructivism) ignore experimentation, treating it as mechanical and unproblematic, and make theory everything. Furthermore, the dominant views fail to account for science's dual character: it is both a social product shaped by society, history, and culture; yet it pursues phenomena that have a certain independence from those factors. To develop an alternative understanding, Crease adapts John Dewey's pragmatic ideas on the process of inquiry; Edmund Husserl's phenomenological argument that entities possess various "profiles" (forms of appearance revealed by different approaches) but

retain a certain identity or invariance; and Martin Heidegger's hermeneutics for an analysis of interpretation and learning. Crease then proposes that the analogy of theater can coordinate and consolidate these aspects. Everything focuses on disclosing a phenomenon (or in theatrical terms, performing a play). Experimentation becomes a performing art, and knowledge (scientific or otherwise) aims at disclosing something to a suitably prepared audience.

Elaborating the theatrical analogy, Crease suggests that where the *presentation* of a phenomenon in theater means making a play's characters, settings, actions, and so forth "present," in science presentation concerns disclosing an entity's presence, insofar as it appears in a certain profile (e.g., as a set of effects). Presentation requires preparation and must be achieved at a suitable place with proper tools, and it also demands skill and trained judgment. The *representation* of a phenomenon, theatrically, takes the form of a script, whereas in science it is a theory. In either case the representation both "structures the performance process (it 'programs' the performance) and it structures the product of the performance" (123). The moment of *interpretation* in the sciences, says Crease, can best be understood not as sudden discovery, but as gradual recognition. To flesh out this idea he draws on Aristotle's account of recognition (*anagnorisis*) in the *Poetics*. Finally, Crease argues that in science as well as in theater, one must distinguish between performance, which aims at making a phenomenon manifest for an audience, and production, which concerns the interaction between the performers and their social context.

Along the way Crease shows the weaknesses not only of the dominant views of science, which proffer a "mythic account of experimentation," but also of corollary myths. He especially censures attempts to merge quantum mechanics with Eastern philosophies. Such "quantum mysticism," he maintains, distorts Eastern religions, their history, context, and distinctiveness; and also quantum mechanics, the implications of which he persuasively argues have been widely misinterpreted (even or especially by some of its founders). The indeterminacy appearing in quantum theory is like that of a script, since both are subject to "the principle of the primacy of performance: that the meaning of a play is fully realized only in performance" (141). Crease thereby demystifies quantum mechanics in particular, and the powers of theory in general.

His spirit of demystification applies to theater as well. Crease pays little obeisance to theater's sacred cows: for example, neither Shakespeare nor Stanislavski are ever mentioned. He applies the theatrical analogy with a light and subtle hand (indeed, sometimes it is barely sketched), and he carefully points out where the analogy fails (perhaps too carefully). My summary unavoidably exaggerates its role, for this is a book about science, not theater.

Crease calls his perspective on science "hermeneutical phenomenology," but he grants culture and politics much more of a role in structuring scientific research than this term might lead one to expect. His approach has much in common with the "critical realism" of Roy Bhaskar, Russell Keat, John Urry and others—surprisingly so, for Crease appears unaware of their work. The strength

of his position makes his few missteps disconcerting. For instance, he wishes to buttress the notion that Continental philosophy is "universal rather than merely critical" (73), which contradicts the historical context he wants given to Eastern mysticism. He broaches Heidegger's (and others') view that science strives to dominate and control nature (69-70), but his philosophical reply only obliquely addresses the political issues at stake. He decries historians' abandonment of narrative, yet includes marxists among those he criticizes.

This last oddity signals a larger shortcoming. Crease's distinctions between theater and science sometimes suggest that he accepts the idea of a chasm between culture and nature, and thus between social and cultural analysis on the one hand, and the physical and biological sciences on the other. Certainly he never outright challenges the notion of a divide, and his concentration on physics makes doing so more difficult. Thus, while he maintains that natural structures exist and present regular profiles, he never considers the possibility that social structures could too. His critique of non-narrative history consequently ignores the possibility that such work explores the enduring profiles of social structures. By the same token, his discussion of theatrical practice concentrates on its presentation and representation of a play. But such a view is hermetic unless one pairs it with a recognition that theater also may present and represent aspects of the world—that is, theater can disclose social realities even as it participates in them. This too suggests the possibility of a richer science/theater analogy.

Notwithstanding such issues, Crease's book offers a stimulating re-envisioning of science, and one can easily extend his ideas to other fields even if he does not. His work also encourages one to view theater from a new perspective. Early in *The Play of Nature*, Crease addresses the value of his inquiry for science and for philosophy. Its value for theater, I feel, is indirect but significant. Crease's pragmatically-oriented analogy between theater and science not only demystifies science, but deromanticizes theater as well, making their social positions more balanced. Moreover, Crease underscores what theater shares with other forms of engaging and disclosing the world. That, I think, ultimately helps theater and theater studies shake their attitude of inferiority toward science, for if science is like theater, then theater is like science. Crease's volume nudges us to relinquish the radical antithesis between material facts and social constructs, and learn to grasp their actual interplay.

Tobin Nellhaus
Portland, ME

Theatre and Fashion: Oscar Wilde to the Suffragettes. Joel H. Kaplan and Sheila Stowell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Theatre and Fashion maps the intersections between theatre, fashion, and capitalistic enterprise during the late Victorian and Edwardian eras. Kaplan and Stowell convincingly argue that the relationships between the fashion pages and theatrical stages encroached upon *fin-de-siecle* and early twentieth-century societies, influencing such seemingly unrelated events as the emergence of the society playhouse, the acceptance of Ibsenism, the genesis of the modern fashion show, and the adoption of dress codes by militant suffragettes. Their text thoroughly examines the semiotic interplays that occurred among the works of such contemporary dramatists (both canonical and now marginalized) as Wilde, Pinero, and Granville Barker, Cicely Hamilton, Emily Symonds and Edward Knoblock, the privileged audiences who patronized these playwrights, and the stage trafficking of both contemporary fashions and the bodies of the female actresses that modeled the garments. Drawing upon a variety of methodologies from performance phenomenology and reception theory to feminist historiography and theatre semiotics, Kaplan and Stowell question Barthes's reading of couturier(e) fashions as "hypertrophied," and hence incapable of functioning in the process of signification ("The Diseases of Costume"). The authors seem to turn the eminent semiotician's argument on its head, asserting that "fashion itself becomes the subject as well as a means of dramatic discourse" (2) during the period that separates *Lady Windemere's Fan* from the outbreak of the First World War. Their study is cogent and insightful, providing fascinating evidences gathered from a variety of disparate, contemporary sources, including theatre prompt books, rehearsal notes, costumes and costume renderings, fashion house and department store records, and, most impressively, sixty periodicals addressing the issues of dress, theatre, and fashion politics.

The first chapter, "The glass of fashion," relocates the *fin-de-siecle* comedies at a site characterized by an aggressive fashion press, a rise in conspicuous consumerism (which included fashion and all of its accessories) encouraged by innovative marketing techniques, and the acceptance of a select group of West End Theaters (Haymarket, Criterion, and the St. James's) as an integral part of the London Season. Affluent audiences witnessed representations of themselves on these stages, thus participating in "a voyeuristic triangle between stage, stalls, and gallery that echoed the arrangement of semi-public events like Ascot, Henley, and the Derby" (2). Kaplan and Stowell's study relates the sartorial elements of *Lady Windemere's Fan, A Woman of No Importance, An Ideal Husband,* and Jones's *The Liars* to the dramatic discourses, thus revealing the respective playwrights' critique of this voyeuristic triangle.

Chapter Two, "Dressing Mrs. Pat," examines Mrs. Patrick Campbell's tenuous relationships with Wing Pinero and Bernard Shaw. Foregrounding the chapter with an analysis of the reception of Ibsen by West End audiences, the authors discuss Elizabeth Robins's production of *Hedda Gabler* (1891) which,

they contend, made palatable "problem plays" with the latest fashions, smartly accessorized. Pinero's *The Second Mrs. Tanquerey*, first produced in 1893, attempted to relocate such marginalized dramas to the center of the "smart set." Shifting the study into the realm of fashion phenomenology, Kaplan and Stowell then examine Mrs. Patrick Campbell's erotic anorexic appearance and chic gowns as concatenated signifiers, images which intertwined the seemingly disparate images of demi-mondaine of mid-century melodramas and modern woman in her performance as Paula Tanquerey. They also examine her performance (and choice of costumes) as the title character Agnes in Pinero's *The Notorious Mrs. Ebbsmith*. Mrs. Pat challenged, they suggest, the playwright's attempt to use her anorexic appearance as a site for mediation between the shabbily dressed spinster and the tight-laced provocateur: by appearing in a rather salacious, low-cut Italian gown, which drew more commentary than the production itself, Mrs. Pat dismissed Pinero's original intentions, forcing the audience to rewrite its own conclusions to the drama. The chapter concludes with an analysis of Shaw's attempt to relocate the actress within the realm of disquisitory playwriting and her consequent resistance to such a strategy in light of her "determination to reconcile free-thinking with couture house gowns" (4).

"The ghost in the looking-glass" and "Millinery stages," the following two chapters, shift the analysis to the Edwardian preoccupation with the processes as well as the products of haute couture. The former considers the work of three feminist playwrights whose dramas exposed the exploitative nature of the dress trade. Edith Lyttleton's *Warp and Woof* (1904) presented the West End couture house business as an oppressive trade which victimized both its overworked seamstresses and well-dressed patrons. Cicely Hamilton's *Marriage as a Trade* (1909) and Elizabeth Baker's *Miss Tassey* (1910) focused upon the drapery shop assistant for the purpose of revealing the victimization of the "living in" system. Kaplan and Stowell's analysis of the spectacle and meaning of women "dressed and undressed" provides telling connections to the voyeuristic triangle discussed at length in the first chapter.

"Millinery stages" is a fascinating study that links together the rise of the fashion show as devised by the couturiere Lucile, the growths of the advertising industry and department store chains whose capitalistic empires were built upon Edwardian consumerism and, in particular, the independent "shopping woman," and Granville Barker's *The Madras House* (1910), a "comprehensive indictment of a trade and ideology that had consigned women to lives of buying and being bought" (6). Kaplan and Stowell counterbalance this pejorative drama (which was praised by the labor and suffrage press) with the greater commercial successes of West End musicals like *The Girl Behind the Counter* and *Our Miss Gibbs* (1909) and Knoblock's *My Lady's Dress* (1914) which affirmed (in the latter case) and even celebrated (in the former) what Granville Barker set out to condemn.

The final chapter, "The suffrage response," moves away from the realm of the theatre to the responses of Edwardian feminists to theatricality, fashion, and

gender stereotypes. The authors examine the ways in which suffragettes and their supporters used haute couture to combat anti-suffrage propaganda. Robins's dramatic tract *Votes for Women!* (1907) and the sartorial dramas of Emily Morse Symonds relocate the women's movement to a space identified by women's fashion and finery. These dramas are then reviewed within the context of the mercurial alliance between suffrage consumers and fashion producers, and in particular, the strategies employed by Gordon Selfridge who attempted to appropriate the suffragette movement for commercial gain. The chapter, and the study itself, concludes with an analysis of *Selfrich's Annual Sale* (1910) and *The Suffrage Girl* (1911), both produced by Selfridge with the intention of conflating Edwardian consumerism and female emancipation. With this final analysis, Kaplan and Stowell insightfully return their study to its starting point, the pre-Wilde nineties during which time the haute couture and its related industries were neither exposed nor condemned as ideological apparatuses that had "consigned women to lives of buying and being bought" (6).

Theatre and Fashion is a cogent study that interweaves Edwardian fashion and costume histories, the rise of female consumerism and its effects upon the burgeoning advertising and department store industries, the suffragette movement, and the competing West End and avant garde theatre markets. It provides fascinating re-readings of several canonical and marginal texts which are worth reconsidering in light of Kaplan and Stowell's evidences. Also, the study foregrounds the twentieth-century history of the costume designer in the relationships that existed between couture houses and theatrical stages. And finally, it interprets the history of commercial Edwardian theatre as it was inextricably linked to the changing fashion industry as aggressive department store chains appropriated the clientele of the smaller couture houses. Well-written, persuasively argued, and documented with telling contemporary sources (including wonderful illustrations and photographs), *Theatre and Fashion* is both an excellent study and a "great read" for historians and designers alike.

Ann Marie McEntee
Illinois College

A Journey Through Other Spaces. Essays and Manifestos. 1944-1990. Tadeusz Kantor. Edited and translated by Michal Kobialka. With a Critical Study of Taduesz Kantor's Theatre by Michal Kobialka. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1993.

Perhaps those charged with the task of, as Beeb Salzer puts it, "teaching design in a world without design," should read this. It shakes up our assumptions of *how* to design by questioning *what* to design. Likewise, this survey of the

theory and practice of a huge figure in the Polish *avant garde* of the twentieth century shakes up our assumptions of who writes a play.

Throughout the twentieth century the *avant garde* arts of Eastern Europe in general, and the theater of Poland and Czechoslovakia in particular, have had a profound influence on the shape of the world's theater. Therefore it is somewhat disappointing that Michal Kobialka, the foremost English speaking scholar of the life and works of Tadeusz Kantor, has intentionally avoided a singular critical examination of influences on and of Kantor in *A Journey Through Other Spaces.*

Instead Kobialka helps us understand the heuristic problem created by a traditional biographical treatment of an artist who spent his life and art under the credo, that, "a single interpretation rigidifies thinking processes (xix)." He feels he must resist academic methodologies which he feels will inadequately describe Kantor's lifetime of artistic transformation by "compartmentalizing" (describing him as a director, designer or painter), "reducing" (specifying what influenced his work or how his work influenced others), or "limiting" (via a single biographical study) (xvi-xvii). Resist as he may, in order to achieve his purpose he must assemble a literary frame for Kantor's contributions to theater. It is a fitting dilemma because it was just this kind of frame Kantor resisted through the creation and refinement of his autonomous theater. The solution is to show the traces of Kantor's Derridian journey—first in his writings and then through records of his stage work.

A book—lacking the temporal nature of performance—puts its author in the dilemma of taking a still portrait of a lifetime of artistic activity. What seems true from this snapshot is that his life and work remains blurred into a five decade long work in progress. To evade this dilemma Kobialka cites the book's twofold function: "(1) to provide the English reader with selections from Kantor's critical writings [most of which until now have been unavailable] and (2) to present an analysis of Kantor's visual theater (xviii)."

He organizes this volume into two sections. The first, "Further on, Nothing," is a collection and translation of representative essays and manifestos by Kantor. The second, "The Quest For the Self/Other," is a critical study analyzing his stage work to expose its "vibrant discourse (xix)." Placed at the end of the first section we discover, "The Milano Lessons," which function as a section of their own, providing a pivotal midpoint.

Preceding "The Milano Lessons" are translations of essays chosen by Kobialka as representative of Kantor's transformational life journey—spanning 36 years from 1944 to 1990. A deliberate, cover-to-cover reading of these texts subtitled a nihilistic "Further on, Nothing" becomes mind numbing due partly to their complex form of free verse and sometime ambiguous emphasis through capitalization, textual manipulation, abundant quotation marks, hyphens and ellipses. It is all reminiscent of personal journal writing made public. It resists a linear reading, requiring us to go off the edge of the text and into *terra incognita* where, it is reported, there are dragons.

Though the language and structure of, "The Milano Lessons," continue in the lyric and poetic style Kantor favors, the content is less solipsistic by virtue of its outward turn toward *The Wedding Ceremony*, a work created by his students at the *Civica Scuola d'Arte Drammatica* in Milano. The new tone is vaguely reminiscent of Craig's dialogues, or Stanislavski's conversational lessons in *Creating a Role*. These twelve lessons turn upon the question one is left with after a string of Kantor's ephemeral essays—how these ideas might manifest themselves in performance—and so prepares the reader for Kobialka's analysis.

"Further on, Nothing" is so unabashedly enigmatic that it is tribute to the value of Kobialka's second section, "The Quest For the Self/Other," where Kobialka battles the dragons and illuminates the essays via a critical study of the theater Kantor wrought.

This study of Kantor's visual theater reveals a pattern to Kantor's life work in the form of two "quests." The first quest, "The Quest for Self," covers the period from 1944-1973 and is characterized by a search for a truly autonomous theater achieving separation from representation. The second quest, "The Quest for the Other," covers the period from 1973 to 1990 and is characterized by an exploration of the metaphysical through memory. Kobialka's conclusion then leaves us with an image of the artist "standing on the threshold between reality and illusion (384)."

Navigating the essays after reading the critical study the reader will recognize three landmark essays revealed by Kobialka's questing analogy. "The Credo 1942-44" becomes a highly readable treatise on the theories Kantor held firmly to as he began his quest for self. "The Impossible Theatre 1969-1973," while less straightforward, becomes a summary of the plateau Kantor reached between quests, and "Silent Night (Cricotage) 1990" becomes a highly lucid account of the metaphysical underpinnings of the quest for the Other. Each of these three essays acts as a string bag to draw up the ideas scattered enigmatically about the other essays.

However, Kobialka's tendency to wait to draw up his own loose ideas until the end of each chapter is a structural shortcoming for a reader new to Kantor's ideas. The convergent chapters begin with scattered observations and a description of what happened on stage, followed by a summary pulling it all together.

His first chapter, "The Quest for Self," points to traces of Kantor's journey in the essays and links them to traces from the production record. Despite his avoidance of linear, biographical strategies, this is a record of Polish *avant garde* artists who influenced Kantor's early years. He then rambles on through most of the chapter recording transformations in Kantor's Autonomous Theatre, renamed by the artist Informel, Zero, Happenings and finally Impossible Theatre. And though the author resists a biographical search for cause and effect he uses quotes from "The Milano Lessons," written in 1988, to shed light on Kantor's seminal production of *The Return of Odysseus* in 1944.

The infirm organizational strategy of the first chapter makes it as difficult a read as Kantor's essays. However, it does describe to the reader how, through performance, Kantor discovered what he was looking for. After the destruction of classical/traditional representation, the remnants became the form—traces of memory that would remain hidden by the interpretive structure of a conventional performance. Kobialka helps us further understand Kantor's spatial rather than temporal perception of history, and prepares the reader to understand his, "quest for the other," where memory is defined as an autonomous spatial fold.

"The Quest for the Other" reveals a much more confident Kobialka. He is less bogged down by the difficult challenge of illuminating the essays in which he recognizes "multiple shifts of focus, lack of continuous development of ideas [and] sudden disappearances of ideas from . . . discourse (xix)." Here he makes facile use of paintings by Valasquez, Magritte, Courbet and Khnopff as well as Berenice Abbott's photograph *Parallax* as analogies to Kantor's theater. This scholarly strategy works to combat the rigidity of a single interpretation he finds inherent in biographical strategies (xix), and brings the reader to an understanding of Kantor's work as a discursive form of expression.

Using Suzanne Langer's classic dichotomy of how an audience apprehends an artwork, one would have to describe Kantor's performances as non-discursive. Kantor's reliance on analogy and metaphor in the essays describing his work reinforce this perception. He alludes to a post office in describing his Autonomous Theatre, "where objects are suspended from their destiny and are, so, anonymous (82-83)." In his essay "The Theatre of Death 1975" he says "IT IS NECESSARY TO RECOVER THE PRIMEVAL FORCE OF THE SHOCK TAKING PLACE AT THE MOMENT WHEN OPPOSITE A MAN (THE VIEWER) THERE STOOD FOR THE FIRST TIME A MAN (THE ACTOR) DECEPTIVELY SIMILAR TO US, YET AT THE SAME TIME INFINITELY FOREIGN, BEYOND AN IMPASSABLE BARRIER.(114)" Then in a later essay, "Reflection 1985," he explains the relationship between self and other in the much more theatrical language of metaphor as he describes a mental scene: "There is a mirror in front of me, the invisible boundary of the mirror that marks the beginning of an extension of reality and the time of poetry. . . . Someone, who is another I, is walking up to me. . . . I am walking forward back. And then I realize that the other person, the I-Over-There, is walking not forward, but in the direction of the depth I left behind me (154-5)." It is surprising, then, that Kobialka does not use a strategy of comparison with non-discursive art forms throughout his critical study because it works so well.

In the final chapter, "Found Reality," Kobialka continues his successful strategy. Using paintings by Kantor, he shows how the artist's Room/Inn of Memory/Imagination was a multidimensional reality that had been found, rather than created, by the holder of this discourse. If there is a simple conclusion to his quest for the other Kobialka suggests it might be that, "there is no difference between illusion and reality. There is just a mystical oneness (376)."

But the value of Kantor's work (and Kobialka's) is not in this conclusion. Kantor, himself, was opposed to transferring the "emptied out techniques of constructivism or the surrealists to postmodern art (308)." And so, we can assume, we should not try to appropriate his techniques to our means. The value of the work seems to be to remind us of the horizon.

Kantor's aim was to crush the impregnable shell of drama to expose the inadequacies of a literary text in the intimate process of creating art—in effect blocking the text. The remnants then become the form—not unlike atom smashing—assessing reality through the, until now, unobservable traces. Kobialka provides us with an intimate study of the creative process used by an iconoclastic creator of the highest order. As he recognizes, "few contemporary artists offer comments regarding their work in progress (xix)." Particularly in his essay "The Impossible Theatre 1969-73" Kantor reveals that it is the creative process and not the product that is his object of fascination. He has an affinity for "turning them [objects and texts] around, recreating them indefinitely until they begin to have a life of their own, until they begin to fascinate us (86)." We should not be surprised, therefore, that Kobialka shows us that the artist has done that with his whole, creative life.

Many of Kantor's writings circumlocute the naming of things and ideas. Interpreting this mental exercise and translating it must be enough of a challenge. To this difficulty add the poetic structure of Kantor's essays and translating his work becomes an achievement indeed.

Furthermore, Kantor also calls on one to be aware of the minutest influences on perception, and so one must question whether the "frame" of Kobialka's book may have rendered a different meaning to the poetic forms written by Kantor. Then to use the translated text as a device to critically examine the theater of Kantor leaves Kobialka open to accusations of translator bias. The ten pages of selected writings about Tadeusz Kantor and the Cricot 2 go a long way to allaying any fears of that problem, as do the copious notes and references made throughout the work.

Now that Kobialka has opened up the *terra incognita* what remains to be done by scholars familiar with Kantor's work is an examination of the influences he has had on today's most adventurous work. Robert Wilson's theater of images, Peter Brook's ritual theater, and recent applications of Action Design principles form a fertile field for that scholarship. Kantor's indebtedness to Artaud for his idea of an Autonomous Theatre should also be explored. Finally, Kantor's Informel Theatre activities probe deeply into the structure of performance, and scholars of performance studies will want to embark on their own journey now that Kobialka has slain the dragons at the door.

Brian Jones
Providence College

Unmarked: The Politics of Performance. By Peggy Phelan. New York: Routledge, 1993. ISBN 0-415-06822-3.

Peggy Phelan's *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* provocatively interrogates the assumed connections between representational visibility and political power. Suggesting that there is real power in remaining unmarked, Phelan addresses the dangers of visibility, such as legal surveillance, fetishism, appropriation, and violence. Her eight chapters focus on the politics of the gaze and the relationship between self and other in various representational art forms—photographs, paintings, films, theatre, political protests, and performance art. Twenty-seven black and white illuminating photographs constitute an integral intertext.

The first chapter, "Broken Symmetries: Memory, Sight, Love," delineates the theoretical discourses within which Phelan's study functions. She critiques the notion that the 'self' can be adequately represented within the visual or linguistic field, and considers the gender and sexual politics within various forms of representation. Phelan deliberates Freud's and Lacan's theories of sexual difference, desire and the unconscious, truth and 'the real,' subjectivity in relation to the Other, perception and loss, and the heterosexual imperatives driving desire. She emphasizes the 'unmarked' political and social values informing the hierarchical binaries constructing our lives, including male/female, white/black, rich/poor, and heterosexual/homosexual.

Chapter two is a sharply focused discussion of Robert Mapplethorpe's photography, highlighting the interdependence of 'normal' sex and sadomasochism/pornography, and of 'normal' desire and the possibility of transgressive desire. She argues that his use of the virile, racially marked black male body posed in stereo-typical soldier, dancer, playboy, and slave stances replicates white culture's political and psychic power, and confirms and reproduces the dominant ideology of a normative whiteness. While she praises Mapplethorpe's celebratory erotics of the male body and his sustained critique of heterosexism, Phelan notes that his work also lends support to the heterosexual valuation of maleness. Phelan then discusses the performativity in Cindy Sherman's self-portraits. Sherman's emphasis on disguise and distortion display the unrepresentability of women's bodies and the foundational otherness of women in culture. Mira Schor's paintings frame fragmented body parts to examine sexuality and reproduction, but Phelan suggests Schor's refiguring of the penis risks reinscribing the power of the phallus and invites charges of essentialism.

Jennie Livingston's *Paris Is Burning*, which depicts competitive drag balls in Harlem, shifts Phelan's observations to living bodies in performance in Chapter Four. The gender politics of performance are clear: women's presence is totally displaced by male bodies as "the film traces a series of displacements which

reveal the *mise-en-abyme* of 'woman as fetish'" (94). Since Willi Ninja teaches young women how to perform as models, and the male walkers imitate the models, the re-presented woman is always a copy of a copy. Phelan suggests that while the gay male performers long to be 'unremarkable'—to pass as normative and unnoticeable on the street—in reality they are excessively marked as 'other' when outside the hyper-visibility of the ball runway, and as the visible 'other' they are subjected to violence, imprisonment, death. Phelan notes the self-invention and bodily changes that the walkers will undergo in order to perform the ideal woman's body and imitate the 'real' woman—including breast implants, and sex-change operations. She concludes that the power of *Paris Is Burning* lies in its framing of the mimicry of all identity: "The film mimes the performance, the performance mimes the images of women; the images of women mime the fantasies of men; the fantasies of men mime the 'real' which underscores all fantasy" (107).

A brief overview of the other chapters indicates Phelan's complex demonstration of the need for vigilance in monitoring the ways in which women are, or are not, represented. Chapter three, "Spatial Envy: Yvonne Rainer's *The Man Who Envied Women*," addresses implications for spectatorship analysis when the heroine is denied a visible presence, but does take up 'air space' and thereby asserts power. Phelan argues that Rainer's work destabilizes points of view and critiques theories of the gaze which are gender-specific and universalizing. She suggests that since subject positions are always partial, and the gaze itself can only be partial, feminist film theory must attend to the 'woman' who cannot appear.

In Chapter Five Phelan examines visibility and invisibility relations in love, secrets, theatre, and physics through a detailed study of Tom Stoppard's play *Hapgood*. Phelan traces the way in which instability, doubt, deception, doubles, and uncertainty permeate a metaphysics and metatheatre wherein boundaries are blurred between performers and audience, truth and fiction/illusion, love and deception, 'real' self and performed role. Hapgood, appearing also as Mother, Celia, Elizabeth, Betty, Ma'm, Mrs. Newton—the 'dream-girl' desired by all the men—is inscrutable; she cannot be fixed; desire to possess the 'real' woman is always deferred. Phelan invokes a continuous woman-mother's acting body who crosses thresholds, combining erotic love and maternity, mind and body, and replacing patriarchal fixed binaries and the regulated marked maternal body.

Chapter six deliberates intersections of the politics of representation of women's bodies and the politics of reproduction in relation to the anti-abortion demonstrations staged by the largely white male group Operation Rescue. Phelan claims new technologies which make paternity identifiable lessen what Freud describes as paternal "anxiety" but produce new stresses which are displaced into heightened emphasis on paternal rights and power. New technologies such as fetal imagery locate reproductive visibility independent of a woman's body, erasing the pregnant woman. Operation Rescue men politically perform as visibly heroic rescuers and nurturers of the innocent unborn while pregnant women are

represented as unnatural, valueless, failed, "the terrifying specter of the monstrous, forever murdering/castrating, mother" (135). She concludes, "while the male psychic subject uses the woman's body as the focus of erotic/ medical/social spectacle" (145), the pervasive law of the father remains invisible, unmarked, and all-powerful.

Chapter Seven, "The Ontology of Performance," concentrates on performances by Angelika Festa, in particular her piece *Untitled Dance*. Festa is hung suspended from a pole, head down at an 80 degree angle, body wrapped with white sheets, and eyes covered with tape, against a background wherein her feet are projected on a screen in close-up and a video tape of the embryology of a fish. Phelan suggests Festa foregrounds women's bodies as bound, controlled, confined, and unseeing, raising the issue of the fetishized female body. Festa's body as spectacle evokes awareness of the violence of perception and the dominant power the spectator holds. Phelan claims this piece suggests that it is only within the space *between* the polarities of presence and absence that 'a woman' can be represented. She engages our attention on what cannot appear *between* the hegemonic binaries which dictate how the female body is necessarily read, such as birth/death, presence/absence, self/other, possession/dispossession, time/space, and spectacle/secret.

The last chapter, "Afterword: Notes on Hope for my Students," articulates the promise Phelan identifies for the future. Analyzing hegemonic codes of visibility, she evokes another way of conceiving the relation between representation and the real, a new view of the performative body as continuous: "Identities continue across and exceed the political and discursive boundaries of sexual preference, racial markings, age, physical abilities, economic class" (171).

Phelan's astute close examination of the misogynistic heterosexism pervading theoretical discourse on representation and identity makes *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* a crucial and compelling document. The integrity with which she approaches each work, balancing the negative and positive performative possibilities for calling into question ways of seeing subjectivity, provides a model for navigating the contemporary terrain of theories of subjectivity. Elucidating the inextricability of sex, race, and class power dynamics impacting our ability to interpret what is given-to-be-seen, she critically initiates exciting new approaches valuable for several disciplines. Her unsettling and controversial critique of visibility politics and her exposure of the potential dangers of political power over representations are essential reading for those interested in feminism and performance, and the politics of representation, and should prove equally provocative for those involved in political, social and gender studies.

Lynda Hall
University of Calgary

Pinter at Sixty. Edited by Katherine H. Burkman and John L. Kundert-Gibbs. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1993. ISBN 0-253-34499-9.

To honor Harold Pinter's momentous and innovative contributions to the theatre, 250 scholars and practitioners met in celebration of the playwright's sixtieth birthday. From this significant occasion, Katherine H. Burkman and John L. Kundert-Gibbs have gathered a valuable and interesting group of essays. The collection from this first American symposium devoted solely to the playwright's work offers new insights into the ideology of the plays and the influence of the playwright. The articles consider Pinter's dramaturgical and aesthetic practices as well as his production practices in theatre, film and television.

The three keynote speakers Carey Perloff, Louis Marks, and Martin Esslin have each contributed new and important essays to the large body of Pinter criticism that currently exists. Their concerns suggest a focus to this book as they investigate Pinter as a political writer and as a practicing theatre artist.

Carey Perloff ("Pinter in Rehearsal: From *The Birthday Party* to *Mountain Language*") speaks from her previous position as the Artistic Director of the Classic Stage Company in New York. There she staged these two plays as a double bill and found each play reflected in a startling way upon the other. She recounts her experiences in rehearsal with the plays and examines the effect of the actual presence of the playwright on the company's understanding of the work. Pinter's own comments and answers to the performers' questions contribute vital information, particularly for directors and actors who engage in these works.

Louis Marks ("Producing Pinter") extends the ideas as he recounts his experiences in the drama department for BBC Television with Harold Pinter, a neophyte television director. He describes Pinter's television debut in directing Simon Gray's *Rear Column*. Marks reveals other facets of Pinter's character and work habits. He comments on the relationship in viewpoints between the playwright's own work in live theatre and his work with others in television.

Martin Esslin ("Harold Pinter's Theatre of Cruelty") sets the tone and topic for a number of fine essays examining Pinter's politics. He discusses the movement from inherent but hidden political messages to overt political action in Pinter's life and art. Esslin establishes Pinter as "a true representative of his century, the century of the Holocaust, genocide, the nuclear bomb" (28).

Two excellent essays by Rosette C. Lamont ("The Hothouse: A parable of the Holocaust") and Jeanne Colleran ("Disjuncture as Theatrical and Postmodern Practice in Griselda Gambaro's *The Camp* and Harold Pinter's *Mountain Language*") develop and specify Esslin's concept. Their essays consider dramaturgy and mine its meanings, and through comparisons with other political events and writers provide an interesting re-visioning of the chosen plays.

Other essays concern themselves with Pinter's writing for film. Steven H. Gale ("Art Objects as Metaphors in the Filmscripts of Harold Pinter") offers an

analysis of the relationship of art objects and themes. He demonstrates how things can resonate ideas beyond their function as plot and character devices or chronotopes. Phyllis R. Randall ("Pinter and Bowen: The Heat of the Day") uses changes from one medium to another to illuminate Pinter's artistry. A particularly brilliant piece by Judith Roof ("The Betrayal of Facts: Pinter and Duras") investigates the relationships among desire, knowledge, and the medium. She argues the lust for knowledge as well as the means by which this knowledge is displayed provides a shaping principle in the work and operates to form illuminating interrelationships among differing media.

While the strongest contributions this volume makes lie in the explications of the political and the theatrical, the editors have also included additional essays which locate Pinter within the tradition of modern drama. The book's final two essays with illustrations of a commissioned dance-theatre piece discuss *A Kind of Alaska.*

The book is of interest to both scholars and theatre artists. Its strategies of performance, politics, and dramaturgical manipulations as well as it explorations of the interplay among media demonstrate the many facets of compelling ideas provoked by this writer's body of works. Furthermore, these essays mark the importance of Harold Pinter as a pre-eminent contemporary playwright and man of the theatre.

Marya Bednerik
Kent State University

Bayreuth: A History of the Wagner Festival. Frederic Spotts. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Richard Wagner and Festival Theatre. Simon Williams. Contributions in Drama and Theatre Studies, No. 53. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1994.

More than a century after his death, Richard Wagner remains one of the most fascinating and controversial figures in Western performance history. The fiftieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War has seen a rise of interest in Wagner scholarship, with particular attention in several recent books given to reassessing the relationship between Wagner and Nazism. But the bulk of Wagnerian scholarship still focuses either on Wagner as a musician or on his importance as a social and political figure; Wagner's revolutionary contributions to the theatre, both musical and spoken, remain underreported. While most theatre history texts acknowledge the innovations of Wagner's theatre at Bayreuth, few works have explored the wider impact on the theatre of the

Wagner festival. Two new and highly accessible books, both introductory in nature, have begun to redress this gap in the literature: *Bayreuth: A History of the Wagner Festival* by Frederic Spotts, and especially *Richard Wagner and Festival Theatre* by Simon Williams.

Spotts's history of Bayreuth is certainly not the first book written about the Wagner festival, but it offers a broad and candid assessment of its personalities and productions. Spotts has been a regular attendant at the festival, and he approaches the subject as an informed and opinionated audience member, more than as an analytical historian. Spotts clearly adores Wagnerian music-drama and is enchanted by the Bayreuth mystique, but he also pays attention to the cultural significance of the festival, and to its less pleasant side, particularly its association with the government of the Third Reich. The book is organized chronologically, with each chapter (titled by appropriate quotations from the libretti of Wagner's music-dramas) roughly covering the regime of each of the major administrators of the festival, from Wagner himself through to his grandchildren. Spotts includes a wealth of photographic material, presented advantageously in this beautifully produced volume.

Spotts presents his overview of the Bayreuth festival in a lively, readable style, direct and lucid in its descriptive prose. The book leaves the reader with a vivid sense of Bayreuth's special role in the history of performance, as a living entity rather than a cultural monument. Spotts provides fascinating portraits of both the well-known and the lesser-known personalities of the festival, particularly the various members of the Wagner family. The portrait of Richard Wagner here is, somewhat disappointingly, less vivid than the images of the two iron-willed women who dominated the festival for much of its history: Wagner's widow Cosima, and his daughter-in-law Winifred. The introductory chapter offers an evocative description of the theatre itself, from both the audience's and the performer's viewpoint. Given the difficulty of getting tickets to the festival these days (it can take up to seven years to work your way up the waiting list), Spotts's portrait of the theatre, its assets and its quirks, provides a tangible grounding for the book's later discussions.

The greatest value of *Bayreuth* is Spotts's forthright confrontation of the festival's connections to German National Socialism. While Spotts holds both Richard Wagner and the festival in the highest esteem, and is effusive in their praise (sometimes excessively so), this book is not, like many other accounts of the festival, an exercise in uncritical adulation. Spotts spends much of his time discussing the parallel rise of the festival and of the German nationalist movement, and later the intimate connection between members of the Wagner family, especially Winifred, and the Nazi hierarchy. Wahnfried, the Wagner estate, and its residents became the home and family that Hitler had lacked, and the book offers a revealing portrait of Hitler in a less militaristic persona. Spotts is at his best when evoking the political milieu surrounding the festival, though his distaste for German nationalism sometimes leads him to be more accusatory than analytical in his assessment of the Third Reich. For example, he refers to

the "horrifying . . . ideological manipulation" of Bayreuth audiences during the war through propaganda in festival programs (192-3); such propaganda is certainly explicable under the circumstances, and similar anti-German propaganda is hardly absent from Allied publications of the same period.

In addition to his emotional assessment of German nationalism, Spotts also brings some clear biases to his portraits of various members of the Wagner clan. He is something of an apologist for the composer. Spotts glosses over the less pleasant aspects of Wagner's personality, and largely absolves him of responsibility for the appropriation and development of his ideas by the Nazis. He finds fault instead with Wagner's successors, especially Winifred, who comes off as the villainess of the story. In discussing postwar Bayreuth and the regime of Wagner's two grandsons, Spotts has little bad to say about Wieland, and little good to say about Wolfgang (the two chapters covering their work are titled, respectively, "Marvel upon marvel now appears," emphasizing Wieland's creative genius, and "It's mine and I'm keeping it," painting Wolfgang as an Alberich-like philistine bookkeeper). To his credit, Spotts makes no apologies for his opinions, nor any attempt to mask them under a veil of historical objectivity. But the book's "good guy/bad guy" framework potentially undermines the reader's confidence in Spotts's evaluations. This problem is reinforced by the author's tendency to write in superlatives, offering few shades of gray to reflect the ambiguities of history.

Spotts is not a theatre historian, and his failure to place Bayreuth in the context of theatre history, and at times even to check his facts, can be frustrating. Spotts states, for example, that "Wagner's opera house was the first proscenium theatre since the Roman era designed essentially to give a clear view of the stage" (50). While the central assertion, that the theatre at Bayreuth is notable for its rearrangement of seats to facilitate viewing, is correct, the statement is misleading: there were no proscenium stages per se in the Roman era, nor did every European theatre before Bayreuth employ the horseshoe shape against which Bayreuth rebels. Spotts refers to the scenic art of the 1870's as a period of "low taste and primitive technology" (74), a cultural darwinist view which belies the period's significant accomplishments in scenic representation, and its audience's sense of admiration for these advances. He undervalues the influence of Adolphe Appia on post-war Bayreuth productions, and largely attributes to Wieland ideas which had been developed previously on the spoken stage during Weimar-era expressionism. Josef Svoboda is described merely as "a Prague architect and stage designer" (274), with no mention of his reputation or impact on European theatre.

Given the large territory covered in this relatively short book, the production history provided here is of necessity somewhat spotty, and less fully-developed than the history of the Wagner family and its foibles. Spotts discusses most of the significant Bayreuth productions, and provides valuable visual documentation for them. But he isolates these discussions into a few paragraphs in each chapter, separate from the chronological narrative of the Wagner family and European

politics. Thus, it is hard at times to follow exactly when productions came and went, which operas were staged in any given year, and which singers were in the casts. Spotts by no means ignores the performance history, but in a comprehensive overview of the Bayreuth festival such as this, a more clear sense of the development of the stage productions themselves would have been helpful. (A supplemental year-by-year production chart listing the performances, production team, and casts could have filled in this gap.) The broad scope of the text also leads to occasional holes and unanswered questions in the historical narrative. And why, in a book published in 1994, do the discussions of Bayreuth productions end with the 1988 season?

In aiming at a general audience, Spotts limits the extent of his citations, which makes the book of limited value to historians who may want to use it as a springboard for further research. There is a general bibliography, and a list of sources used in each chapter, along with endnotes for direct quotations. But throughout the book there are frequent instances where source material is not cited, or where citations are vague. In discussing critical response to Bayreuth productions, Spotts typically quotes one or two reviewers, but then adds a general summary of what "most critics" thought, and omits specific citations of other reviews. The reader is forced to trust that the author has actually scanned the bulk of available reviews, and cannot easily go to the originals for comparative purposes. *Bayreuth*, then, does not add much new material, or expand the research tools, in the historical study of Wagnerian theatre. It is, instead, a solid, accessible, enthusiastic (if at times biased and underdocumented) account of the Bayreuth festival and its strange cast of characters.

Simon Williams, in *Richard Wagner and Festival Theatre*, offers a more narrowly-drawn account of the Bayreuth festival, but as a result his book is more clearly-focused, and ultimately is a more successful project. Rather than covering over a hundred years of production, Williams limits his discussion to the concept of festival theatre, mostly during Wagner's lifetime. The book does not attempt to present a complete history of Bayreuth, nor a comprehensive biography of Wagner himself. Instead, Williams aims to supplement the existing scholarship on Wagner by placing his work within the context of the development of theatre in nineteenth-century Europe. Williams's primary intended audience is the student of theatre; the book is part of a series offered by Praeger called "Lives of the Theatre," short, focused works which elucidate a particular form or genre of theatre through an in-depth study of its most characteristic practitioner. Even so, through the force of his clear writing and exemplary scholarship, Williams's book is of value not only to students of theatre, but also to theatre scholars looking to understand Wagner's influence on subsequent theatre.

Williams's book, like Spotts's, is organized chronologically, beginning with Wagner's birth and early life, and following his career through to the creation of the Bayreuth festival and its first performances under Wagner's direction. A final chapter, "Wagner's Theatrical Legacy," traces the influence of Wagner's ideas on later theatre, as well as providing a brief summary of major events at Bayreuth

after the composer's death. Some useful illustrations (though not nearly as many as in Spotts) and a chronology of Wagner's life and work, with parallel lists of events in European art and politics, supplement the text. Throughout the biographical material on Wagner, Williams focuses on those events and works which directly influenced Wagner's idea of a theatre festival: an idealized framework for creating art in a rural setting, apart from the commercialism of middle-class theatre, with artists and audiences devoted solely to the creation and appreciation of high art.

Because of his attention to the theatrical context surrounding Wagner's work, Williams offers a more useful and satisfying history than does Spotts, especially for readers more interested in performance than in personalities. Williams carefully traces the influence on Wagner of numerous artists and thinkers of the nineteenth century, particularly the playwrights and composers of early romanticism: Beethoven, Weber, and Meyerbeer, Raimund and Tieck. There is also an extended discussion of the close relationship between Wagner and Nietzsche, and of their later falling out, a subject largely ignored by Spotts. Williams also includes discussions of Wagner's theoretical writing, notably of several smaller but important essays such as "A Theatre for Zurich" not normally mentioned in theatre texts; there are also detailed accounts of Wagner's pre-Bayreuth production work, including a more balanced account than is usually available of the disastrous production of *Tannhäuser* in Paris. While Spotts offers a more detailed history of the actual building of the Bayreuth theatre, and the complex negotiations which preceded the first festival, Williams provides a more revealing and nuanced reading of why Wagner created the festival in the first place. If Spotts presents more information, Williams develops a clearer and more compelling historical analysis of the Wagner festival.

Williams's book is also free of the historical pitfalls which plague Spotts's analysis. He avoids the broad generalizations, the partisanship, and the overenthusiastic language which often call Spotts's evaluations into question. The writing is clear and concise, but never overtly adulatory or accusatory. Most significantly, Williams clearly documents all of his source material. He uses a wide range of primary sources, and presents them in a manner which facilitates further research. At the same time, the citations are not so complex as to overwhelm an introductory-level reader (Williams also makes the text accessible by translating the titles of Wagner's music-dramas, and by providing plot synopses). The only problem which undermines this historical care is the presence of a relatively high number of typographical errors in the text.

Both of these books, then, are valuable additions to theatrical writing on Wagner. Spotts's book provides a lively and readable overview, handsomely presented and lavishly illustrated, though more notable for its vivid portrayals of the quirky Bayreuth personalities and for its confrontation of Bayreuth's Nazi past than for its historical scholarship. Williams's book, if less impressive-looking than Spotts's, is in the end of more use to theatre scholars and students, by

offering a carefully-argued portrait of Wagner and the origins of the Bayreuth festival within the historical framework of the nineteenth century.

Sam Abel
Dartmouth College