

disciples at Emmaus. Kobialka argues that the simple version reveals the movement of thought (gnosologic representation); the expanded Ripoll version is marked by giving a physical or material shape to that which is invisible (the missing body of the earlier versions) in order to emphasize the union of Christ with the community.

These shifts in representational practice culminate in the decrees of Lateran IV. Not only does this Council require that all Christians confess at least once a year and take communion, but it also provides a statement of the doctrine of transubstantiation. Kobialka argues that the issuance of the doctrine asserting the real presence of Christ crowded out the corporeal and mystical modes of the twelfth century by placing emphasis on seeing rather than sensing or imagining. The rulings on Jews, Cathars, and other heretics with regard to the faith created a binary system: the universal church and those who were not of it. Some of the effects of Lateran IV were the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi and the subsequent establishment of the Corpus Christi procession. These focused the sight on the real presence not only within church structures but also in the streets thereby extending the sense of community from that within a monastery or church to the entire Christian community of laypeople and clerics.

Although it is difficult to summarize Kobialka's argument and at times the thread of the argument gets lost in the mass of details, I think he succeeds in challenging the ways we have tried to represent the past in our studies of medieval drama and other ceremony. He is particularly good at showing the ways the body of Christ was performed and how those representations effected the construction of their subjects.

LAWRENCE M. CLOPPER

Linda McJannet. *The Voice of Elizabethan Stage Directions: The Evolution of a Theatrical Code*. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1999. Pp 240.

The title well describes the limited aim of this book, which is to establish that there was a 'code for stage directions associated with plays for the professional theaters' (76) of the Tudor and Stuart period. The argument of the book is designed to show that 'whoever was responsible for the stage directions in plays written for the professional London theaters, the various hands generated and observed, to a great extent, a common code' (21). So however much the content of stage directions might vary, they generally 'observed a set of shared conven-

tions when it came to the *form* in which directions of various kinds were cast' (21). The first part of the book consists of three chapters on page design, starting with the ways in which stage directions were distinguished from the text. This is followed by a brief account of the development of a convention for placing speech prefixes in the left margin or centred, and a much longer chapter on the positioning of mid-scene stage directions – mostly centred – in nine manuscript and twenty-nine printed plays published between 1593 and 1661. Part 2 of the book is concerned with the grammar and rhetoric of stage directions, and begins with a chapter that distinguishes between what the author defines as self-conscious and self-effacing stage directions. Self-effacing directions, ones that avoid the subjunctive or imperative mood, it is argued, developed as the Elizabethan norm. The next chapter is devoted to the form of entries and exits, and concludes that the 'initial entry direction with its codified, impersonal syntax has the most authoritative voice of all Elizabethan directions' (165). A final chapter deals with action, gesture, and special effects in a sample of sixty-one plays, mostly histories. The author thinks such directions wielded 'great authority' with the book-keeper and players, and they form 'records of how a particular group (or groups) realized the play's spectacle' (189).

Linda McJannet argues that stage directions have 'a unique voice with which they address their interpreters' (17), and are 'always initially directed to theater people' (22), who are their first and most dedicated readers. She also claims that the 'mature Elizabethan page design' has a 'mimetic dimension' that suggests 'aspects of an audience's aural and visual experience in the theater'; the speech-prefix on the left and exit on the right represent the 'entry of the character into the readers' ken and his or her subsequent departure from our imaginative field of vision' (69). The problem with this idea is that characters might enter or exit from either side of the stage, or in the centre if there were three doors (she assumes there were only two). There is a problem, too, with the notion of a 'unique voice'. Part 2 of the book, on grammar and rhetoric, begins with the question, 'When the voice of the stage direction speaks, what position does it take relative to the fictive world of the play?' McJannet goes on to say that 'the directions may position themselves' inside or outside that fictive world (111). The grammar and rhetoric of the author caught my attention here and in other such passages in which stage directions are given autonomous life as if they have human attributes and place themselves. Someone, the author, scribe, copyist, book-keeper, actor, editor, printer, or whoever, inserted them, and the self-consciousness or lack of it surely belongs to that person. Linda McJannet's rhetoric helps her to bypass the vexed

question of the authorship of stage directions and treat them simply in terms of conventional norms.

Within its chosen limits the book is scholarly and well organized, but the limits are very constricting. The author presumably was not aware of the impending publication of the *Dictionary of Stage Directions in Drama 1580–1642* compiled by Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson (Cambridge, 1999). The sample of plays on which her claims for a code are based is relatively small, and in her concern to establish norms she ignores the content of stage directions as well as the issue of authorial versus theatrical directions. In discussing entries and exits she argues that formal conventions were more important than content, and that entries ‘observe the conventional syntax and are thus unobtrusive, objective, and authoritative’ (153). In relation to this statement it seems strange that McJannet did not take into consideration the stage ‘plots’ that survive from the Rose theatre. The plot of *The Battle of Alcazar*, for instance, has more elaborate directions than the printed quarto. In the quarto, the entry at 1.2 calls for Muly Mahomet to enter in a chariot with his son, whereas the plot adds his wife Calipolis with him in the chariot and ‘on each side a page’. What then does it mean to claim that stage directions in printed texts are objective and authoritative? The quarto of *The Battle of Alcazar* is a shortened text that streamlines directions and omits much information needed on stage, but shows that it is misleading to describe entries in printed texts as objective and authoritative – they may appear so, but cannot be trusted.

McJannet seeks to reduce the immense variety of directions, now readily accessible in the *Dictionary*, to a single voice or code. Her method tends to obscure differences, and has no room for the occasional startling phrase that seems to give us the author of a play in the act of writing rather than a convention: ‘Then comes, dropping in after all, Apemantus, like himself’. The extraordinary phrase ‘like himself’ quite escapes McJannet’s categories. In her account of entries and exits she is too anxious to see them as all alike: ‘Magisterial in tone, they resemble a magic formula, complete with a sprinkling of Latin terms, that conjures a character to appear, remain, or vanish from the stage’ (147). The notion of a magic formula seems to me unhelpful in that it obscures the great differences between simple entries and calls for characters to rise, descend, run forth, or show (by discovery); and exits are often omitted, and so have no voice. I imagine that the variations between stage directions and their content will continue to intrigue students much more than their rhetorical nature, in spite of Linda McJannet’s efforts.