



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

<http://muse.jhu.edu>

works chosen for study: as Favorini admits in his opening remarks, his focus is “selective and Eurocentric rather than global.” He goes on to note the importance of memory drama in India, Japan, South Africa, and Southeast Asia. He does not mention Latin America, where memory and theatre are virtually inseparable, and his characterization of “Eurocentric” is a very generous one, since his examples are almost exclusively English-language ones, with only a sprinkling of French and German illustrations. While it is always good to have a thoughtful new study of dramatists like Wilder, Williams, Miller, Beckett, and Pinter, a little broader cultural spread might have made the book seem more suited to this century rather than the last one. One can only hope that the praise-worthy analytic work on memory in the drama that Favorini has demonstrated here will serve as an inspiration for him or other scholars to extend such analysis outside the traditional and familiar world of the Anglo-Saxon theatre.

Although also centrally concerned with memory and drawing upon much of the same theoretical background, the anthology by Liedeke Plate and Anneke Smelik could scarcely be more different in orientation and methodology from Favorini’s book. Plate and Smelik’s collection is much more typical of contemporary work in the field—a group of essays by various authors rather than a single extended study by one, ranging across the broad areas opened by modern cultural studies rather than focusing, as theatre scholars have traditionally done, on dramatic texts (significantly, Plate is a professor of gender and cultural studies, Smelik a professor of visual culture; Favorini is a professor of theatre arts), and moving beyond Europe and America to range very widely over the contemporary world, from Colombia to Indonesia.

Indeed, the drama does not figure in the Plate and Smelik anthology at all, nor, in fact, does theatre, properly speaking, although performance more generally is certainly involved, and any student of contemporary theatre will find much relevant material in the analysis of the operations of memory in a range of contemporary activity, often concerned with the visual arts. The book is divided into four sections, each containing three essays. The first section concerns the mediatization of memory, with two essays on memorialization, one by Woutr Weijers on official “monuments” and another by Marita Sturken on touristic souvenirs. The third, by Smelik, considers the use of memory in such recent fantasy or science-fiction films as *Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind*. The second section, on memory and counter-memory, studies various cases of the conscious creation of alternative memory by the process of “writing back” in various cultural texts, with essays by Nagihan Haliloglu and Plate

on contemporary novels with feminist orientations and a retrospective French comic strip analyzed by Ann Miller.

The final two sections come closest to certain central concerns in Favorini. The third, “recalling the past,” looks at objects and artistic performances as they are utilized for cultural recall. Here, Elizabeth Wood considers the memorial power of childhood objects, Marta Zarzycka considers the memory of pain in the work of visual artists like Frida Kahlo, and, closest to performance, Frances Guerin provides an analysis of the notorious *Rednerposen*—photographs used by Hitler to perfect his oratorical presentation.

The anthology’s final section also takes up a concern of great interest to Favorini, Pierre Nora, and memory studies in general: the ongoing negotiations between memory and history. This is also the most wide-ranging section, with a fascinating study by Julia Noordegraaf on the re-use of colonial film from Indonesia to reexamine the Dutch colonial past, a report by Marusa Pusnik on the attempted rewriting of Yugoslavian history by contemporary Slovenian documentary films, and a consideration by Marta Cabera of the struggle in contemporary Colombia between the desired amnesia of official state organs and the efforts by artists to reclaim memory. One can, of course, find many examples of this intensely current and important struggle, especially in Latin America, but also in many parts of the world, and it is a struggle in which theatre artists, like the visual artists studied here, are deeply involved. Here, as in most of the essays in this important collection, there is much to concern students of theatre, even when theatre itself is, unhappily, rarely mentioned.

In their contrasting perspectives, as well as in the achievement of each, these two very different books provide clear evidence of the continuing importance of memory studies to the understanding of both modern culture in general and modern theatre and performance in particular.

MARVIN CARLSON

The Graduate Center/CUNY

HOMO AMERICANUS: ERNEST HEMINGWAY, TENNESSEE WILLIAMS, AND QUEER MASCULINITIES. By John S. Bak. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2010; pp. 306. \$51.50 cloth.

John Bak’s *Homo Americanus* is at once a narrow character study and a broad examination of Ameri-

can masculinity in the twentieth century. The main character under study is Brick Pollitt, protagonist of Tennessee Williams's 1955 play *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*. Brick exemplifies the titular *homo americanus*, a queer heterosexual male whose struggles with sexual identity mirror the "epistemological confusion in understanding the rules governing sexual identification" (40) experienced by modern man. Bak reads Williams's work as a response to the queer aesthetics of a writer popularly seen as more homophobic than queer—Ernest Hemingway. By juxtaposing Williams not with another playwright, but with novelist and modernist icon Hemingway, Bak demonstrates how Williams's texts shed new light upon some of the central themes of literary modernism.

Despite the unusual move of comparing a novelist with a playwright, Bak's *Homo Americanus* is not a genre study, nor is it interested in exploring the numerous thematic connections between Williams and Hemingway, or even between Hemingway's 1924 novel *The Sun Also Rises* and *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (such as how Maggie's desire for Brick mimics Brett's desire for Jake, or how Jake's rejection of homosexual "toleration" is echoed in Brick's similar rejection of Big Daddy's call for toleration). What the book does provide, succinctly and cogently, is an explanation of the numerous theorists that are invoked in the service of Bak's thesis, including Sigmund Freud, Michel Foucault, Jean-François Lyotard, Simone de Beauvoir, Eve Sedgwick, Fredric Jameson, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, and Roland Barthes. Bak employs these theorists in order to study Williams not just as a playwright, but as a modernist whose use of the themes of impotence and sterility builds not just on the work of Hemingway, but on such modernist classics as T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*.

Bak persuasively argues that Williams used Hemingway's queer masculine aesthetics as a sounding board for the playwright's own explorations of the topic. More specifically, Bak asserts that Brick is a "Cold War reincarnation" (30) of Jake Barnes, the protagonist of *The Sun Also Rises*. Bak sees both fictional men as queered by an American society that, in reaction to rapid immigration and the resultant fears of the cultural "Other," constructs a masculine existential identity as one of opposition. Heteromascuine America creates a homosexual identity that is separate from homosexual acts, then defines itself in opposition to this identity in order to "protect its homosociality, secure its traffic in women, and sustain its genital economy" (205). Men who either cannot or will not perform their heterosexual identity are cast punningly into a metaphorical "no man's land."

Bak surveys much of the literary criticism surrounding these two characters, showing how much of it revolves around either "proving" a character's heterosexuality or dragging him out of the closet. In so doing, he emphasizes how both Hemingway and Williams produce texts that not only expose the heteromascuine bias within twentieth-century American constructions of masculinity, but also perpetuate those selfsame biases by withholding information concerning their characters' sexuality and so creating a desire in readers and audience members for "definitive" proof. For Bak, the "mystery" of Brick's sexuality is Williams's version of Hemingway's "iceberg theory," in which important events or facts of the story are omitted and only the character's feelings about those now-absent facts remain. Just as the meaning of a Hemingway sentence exists in "its essential lack of words" (93), so also can the meaning of both Jake and Brick be found in their Lacanian lack.

In his chapter on *The Sun Also Rises*, Bak establishes the queer aesthetic of Hemingway that Williams, as a perceptive student, would develop in his own work. Bak details Jake's existential crisis, a crisis that stems directly from the loss of both penis and phallus during World War I. This lack causes a schizophrenic split in identity, as Jake is unable to perform in public his private heterosexual desires and so is queered by society. Bak's theory of the *homo americanus* combines Sartre's existential theory with Butler's melancholic heterosexual. Like Butler, Bak emphasizes the performativity of sexual identity, but uses Sartre to show how the "undeed" can create as much meaning as the deed. Observing that Jake is defined not by his actions, but by his inactions, Bak playfully rewrites Descartes's famous dictum for him as "I did not perform; therefore I am" (67).

In his next two chapters, Bak examines the character of Brick as a rewritten Jake Barnes, but with one significant difference: whereas Jake is physically unable to perform his heterosexuality, Brick, like a latter-day Bartleby, chooses not to. Brick, as an existentialist, rejects any attempt by others to define his sexuality, whether it is his wife Maggie's heterosexual interpellation, his friend Skipper's homosexual declaration, or his father Big Daddy's reconciliation of homosexual acts with heteromascuine identity. It is the cold war split between sexual act and sexual identity that confuses Brick, a split that makes any homosocial, heterosexual male indistinguishable from a non-effeminate homosexual male. Brick's existential attempts to create a sexual identity based on inner truths rather than on those imposed by outside establishment mores result only in rejection and inaction. But, unlike Hemingway's readers, Williams's audience members have no ac-

cess to Brick's inner thoughts and thus are left to speculate on Brick's "true" identity—speculations that mirror the "sneakin' and spyin'" of the play's most obnoxious McCarthyite characters.

Bak's final chapter reads Williams's 1980 play *Clothes for a Summer Hotel* as a postmodern attempt to incorporate the post-Stonewall gay community into a critique of heteronormative society, an attempt that Bak judges a successful failure. While Williams greatly admired the queer aesthetics of Hemingway's fiction, he deplored the homophobia of Hemingway's public persona. *Clothes for a Summer Hotel* re-members these two opposing constructs into one schizophrenic character, revealing an onstage incompatibility that is, in its failure, an acknowledgment that "identity cannot be reduced to the polarities of a binary system" (204).

In his introduction, Bak modestly claims that *Homo Americanus* "will not likely be of great interest to Hemingway scholars" (29). I must respectfully disagree. Although the book is indeed "written for a Williams audience by a Williams scholar" (29), it serves not only to illuminate the two authors it takes as its focus, but also contributes to gay studies, masculinity studies, and modernist studies in general. It is an ambitious work that demonstrates how much drama studies has to offer to the study of American literature.

DAVID ROARK

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

PERFORMING RACE AND TORTURE ON THE EARLY MODERN STAGE. By Ayanna Thompson. Routledge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture. New York: Routledge, 2008; pp. xii + 174. \$116.00 cloth, \$39.95 paper.

In *Performing Race and Torture on the Early Modern Stage*, Ayanna Thompson demonstrates that a semiotic analysis of tortured bodies on the early modern stage can illuminate our understanding of how race was constructed. Informed by performance theory and contemporary scholarship on race, Thompson's monograph focuses on the historical "coalescence" (5) of seventeenth-century dramatic depictions of torture and race, in order to argue that "race developed with contradictory significations in the early modern period: race became both essential and a construction" (3). Her thesis is thought-provoking, as is the scope of the book: while core chapters cover plays by Restoration dramatists (Elkanah Settle, Colley Cibber, Edward Ravenscroft, Thomas Southerne, William Davenant, John Dryden), a final chapter, on

the photographically documented prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib in 2004, extends Thompson's analysis of racialized violence into a cultural moment that is, in her words, "deliberately anachronistic" (122) when placed alongside her other primary texts.

This diachronic frame of reference is intended to establish continuity between contemporary and early modern constructions of race; like the scenes of torture performed on the Restoration stage, the Abu Ghraib images manipulate bodies in order to suggest a particular interpretation of race. In the photographs, Iraqi detainees are portrayed as inherently animalistic, sexually deviant, and powerless. Although these stagings of race attempt to reflect the purported essential nature of "difference" (the racial difference between soldier and prisoner, torturer and victim), their carefully crafted portrayals suggest just the opposite: that race is malleable and performable.

In her readings of Restoration drama and the Abu Ghraib pictures (which she pairs with photographs of lynchings in the United States), Thompson aims to show that representations of race—in particular, those which are violently enacted—reveal an ever-present instability in the way "Otherness" is defined. While acknowledging the need to remain sensitive to "different performance modes from different historical eras" (122), Thompson argues that we also need to attend to the way that culture continues to "vacillate" (28) between essentialist and constructivist definitions of race, because this fluctuation works to create a disempowered racialized Other, especially when it is the subject of violent representation.

Imbricated within Thompson's link between early modern and contemporary conceptions of race is her refutation of the view that "race simply was not a factor on the Restoration stage" (25). The paucity of black characters in Restoration plays (excluding those that were revivals of earlier works) and the fact that performance conventions precluded white actresses from donning blackface do not, Thompson persuasively argues, diminish the importance of race in performances from the period. As she demonstrates in her close readings of Settle's *The Empress of Morocco* (ca.1673), its sequel *The Heir of Morocco* (ca.1682), and Cibber's *Xerxes* (ca.1698), non-English, nonwhite characters are sometimes represented in performance as exotic, villainous, or fundamentally Other without radical alteration of the physical appearance of the actor's body, but by means of context, dialogue, and action. It is precisely this immaterial mode of signification that leads Thompson to assert that, in these plays, race is a factor: it becomes "a matter that is no matter" (the title of chapter 2). In drawing attention to the