**Early Theatre**
**A Journal Associated with the Records of Early English Drama**

Volume 8 | Issue 1 Article 6

1-1-2005

# Book Review: Leeds Barroll (ed), Susan Zimmerman (book review ed); *Shakespeare Studies* 29. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001.

Gillian Murray Kendall
*Smith College*, gkendall@email.smith.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/earlytheatre

Recommended Citation
Kendall, Gillian Murray. 'Book Review: Leeds Barroll (ed), Susan Zimmerman (book review ed); *Shakespeare Studies* 29. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2001.'. *Early Theatre* 8.1 (2005): 109-12 (paper). Article 6.
Available at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/earlytheatre/vol8/iss1/6

Copyright © 2005 by Early Theatre. This Book Review is brought to you by DigitalCommons@McMaster. It has been accepted for inclusion in Early Theatre by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@McMaster. For more information, please contact scom@mcmaster.ca.

# Book Reviews

Leeds Barroll (ed), Susan Zimmerman (book review ed). *Shakespeare Studies* 29 (2001). Pp 278.

I can't be the only one to have a visceral reaction when I see the word 'body' in a title. This journal's forum, organized and introduced by Bruce R. Smith, merely by its title, 'Body Work', caused palpable anxiety about encountering bodies called 'grotesque' or 'classical' or 'subversive' or 'carnivalesque' or 'Bakhtinian'. Whether or not I may have been guilty of using such terms in the past, my mood, after ten years of facing an infinitely variable number of bodies on display, was simply this: I had had enough.

Or so I thought. In fact, 'Body Work', which consists of seven essays, held my attention throughout. From Smith's newly discovered strand of hair through Masten's brilliant analysis of our treatment of collaborative hands, the body-centered pieces of this volume finally help to answer two questions that have been on my mind for some time. First, can the intertwined nature of the dramatic body be followed through the labyrinth of representation and reality of the body on stage? Second, what kind of voyeuristic motivations keep us looking at tongues and hairs and hands (or the lack thereof)? No group of essays, of course, is going to come together to answer these questions directly, but this volume has the virtue of acknowledging that these (and other) questions exist – without simply gallivanting off to examine the meaning behind the consistency of someone's urine.

This section of the journal, thank heavens, is not just another bit of body. The essays are exceptional; the book reviews a boon to a harried scholar. To be brief with my dispraise, my only real irritation concerns typographical errors. I suspect proofreading was entrusted to the spell-check systems of computers (explaining why the errors are, in and of themselves, actual words): ironically, just when the journal has real need of some literal eyes belonging to some literal body, the volume fails us. But this objection is trivial.

A brief outline of the volume: seven informal essays on the forum 'Body Work'; four articles; twenty-one book reviews. The sections hold together – the volume, if I may, knows how to body surf. Although Bruce R. Smith seems abashed at his New Historicist anecdotal opening – of finding a hair, probably

from a 'long-dead printer's body' (19) – this anecdote leads gracefully into the volume's forum on 'Body Work' and the issue of our fascination with real bodies (as opposed to representations). Bodies seem more material than words, and so this is why, perhaps, our obsession has lasted so long, and the topic of the body has yet to go to ground.

Smith also notes the early modern concern that theatre has 'visceral physiological effects' (24) on the audience (weeping, increased heart rate, laughter), caused by, as Hamlet puts it, 'nothing'. I feel this may account for epilogic apologies: a good playwright invades the body (brain and all), and an apology is due for such grotesque and overt manipulation of the audience. Theatre, given its ability to represent the body with the body and to invade the body of the audience proves, at the very least, dangerous.

The first essay in the forum, Alan C. Dessen's work on 'The Body of Stage Directions' (27), primarily catalogues stage directions, leaving the reader to interpret such interesting data as the quantity, in theatre, of 'severed heads' (31) – some arriving 'in dishes' (31) – removed ears, cut-off noses, and limbs served up at dinner. These body bits, of course, are props, and we should remember that as actors onstage follow stage directions, their own bodies can be embarrassingly rebellious, and sweat, flush, spit, even have bad hair days. Dessen's essay opens the forum by reminding us of the actor's body in space.

James R. Siemon's essay, 'Between the Lines: Bodies/languages/times' (36), provides another reminder of the actor's literal body. Siemon addresses how actors use the body work of previous generations of actors – their pauses (which I now sometimes find endless), their death agonies. (Irving went so far as to gnaw on his sword in *Richard III*'s last battle – surely putting the real body in conflict with its representation).

In 'The Body and its Passions' (44), Gail Kern Paster notes that the mind-body separation is foreign to the early moderns. Pastern's work compels, and I find pleasure in noting her continued interest in bodily fluids (here, tears and hot blood). An aside: on hearing Paster speak, I have experienced an acute bodily reaction as a member of her audience. At a talk Paster gave on women's leaky bodies, I confess becoming distinctly queasy. As with stage acting, representation and reality began to meld as my mind, body, and surroundings became one (the gist of her argument in this essay), and I became seasick without a sea.

Cynthia Marshall's essay, 'Bodies in the Audience' (51), for me, re-embodied the phenomenon of the Beatles. At the height of their popularity, numerous divines feared that the fantastic four were giving the young girls in the audience orgasms. Marshall notes a similar concern in anti-theatrical sentiment that focuses on maidens whom theatre might 'devirginate' (51). Certainly Marshall

exhibits early modern fears as to the ways in which theater could provoke bodily audience response.

John Gillies, on the other hand, explores the way in which early modern geography erases the body from the map. According to 'The Body and Geography' (57), the 'New Geography' (57) is said to be responsible for 'the emptying of the body from the world picture' (58). In point of fact, despite the convincing nature of the essay, I doubt the body-oriented map was ever truly lost. Perhaps the body was no longer mapped onto paper with sacred locations orienting the viewer, but the succeeding maps make a palimpsest: a mapping out of the new over the old model.

In wonderful juxtaposition, Jyotsna G. Singh's essay, 'Whose Body?' (63), discusses bodies represented onstage 'by looking backward in order to map the terrain of both our past and future interventions' (64). Indeed, I suspect mapping and bodies show up in early modern drama more often than we would guess.

The delightful and acerbic essay, 'Body Problems' (68), by Dympna Callaghan reveals what can happen when one rides the wave of the body topic for too long. With a vehemence underlain by tongue-in-cheek (sorry) bluntness, Callaghan questions the fascination with 'heart, lungs, entrails' and 'early modern innards' (68). Her claim that body-studies excite by reason of 'thingness' (69) circles us back to the beginning of the forum, to the dead printer's hair, and the heart of my questions concerning the body obsession.

The four articles that follow the forum flow gracefully from the topic of 'Body Work'. Emily Detmer-Goebel examines Lavinia's body made inarticulate – at a time when changes in the law required women's voices to report rape. This article sheds new light on *Titus*, as Titus tries to hear through Lavinia's silence. Once he gets her testimony, however, he gets back the silence with the use of his dagger.

The tale of Patient Griselda illuminates *The Taming of the Shrew* in Margaret Rose Jaster's 'Controlling Clothes, Manipulating Mates: Petruchio's Griselda' (93). Griselda, like Kate, shows a bodily identity transformed by – even transferred to – clothing, making, in this reader's mind, the public nudity of Griselda followed by her re-garbing , a kind of bodily identity rape.

Jeffrey Masten, in an article not to be missed, 'More or Less: Editing the Collaborative' (109), focuses on the various 'hands' (112), including Shakespeare's, that collaborated in writing *Sir Thomas More*. Editions of Shakespeare, it seems, tend to reduce the play as a whole to 'Hand D' (110). The Oxford editors carefully provide 'the final form Hand D gave to it, before it had been massaged by Hand C'(112). The language suggests the embodiment behind the (massaged) and privileged hand of Shakespeare. Manuscript, hand, mas-

sage, body, Shakespeare. So it goes. Hand D does more than represent Shakespeare; it resurrects him.

The final article, by Leeds Barroll, 'Assessing "Cultural Influence": James I as Patron of the Arts' (132), focuses on history. Barroll states that James I took extensive measures 'to assure his physical security at the accession' (139). That, coupled with James's interest in the highly physical activity of hunting, rather than in theater productions, finalizes the idea that this volume deals with more than abstractions, and that actors' bodies, the bodies of the audience, even the question of our interest in bodies, may lead us closer to understanding the now long decayed mind-bodies of early moderns who actually lived, as well as to an understanding of the literature they produced.

The twenty-one book reviews (165) that make up the rest of the volume are delightfully useful at guiding one's reading. Many of the reviews lead back to the essays. This is clearly so in Jonathan Dollimore's review of George Minois' *History of Suicide* (240) and Jonathan Gil Harris's review of Michael C. Schoenfeld's *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England*. (252). This volume of *Shakespeare Studies* will reward the reader, will stimulate thought, will add a book or two to one's reading list, and this is so no matter how many works with the word 'Body' in the title one has read.

Gillian Murray Kendall

Elizabeth Cary. *The Tragedy of Mariam: The Fair Queen of Jewry*. Ed Stephanie Hodgson-Wright. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Literary Texts, 2000. Pp194.

*The Tragedy of Mariam: The Fair Queen of Jewry* deserves a place in literary history as the first original play in English written by a woman. Focused on the relationship between Herod and his wife, Mariam, in the first century BC, the play examines issues of gender and dynastic politics which have relevance for the author's seventeenth-century milieu. However, for nearly four centuries, this play existed in obscurity, overlooked even by Robert Birley in his reconsideration of lost masterpieces called *Sunk Without a Trace.*[1] Between 1613 and 1994, only two editions of *Mariam* were published: the 1613 first edition and a 1912 Malone Society edition, edited by A.C. Dunston (this latter was reprinted with a supplement in 1992). Then, in 1994 Weller and Fer-