

first, Christopher Sly is positioned 'aloft' and the musicians are on the main stage. In the second, Hodges puts Sly on the main stage and the musicians aloft to accommodate the argument by the New Cambridge editor that the stage direction for Sly to be 'aloft' is an error.

By being both artist and director, Hodges captures moments that demonstrate the happy confluence of Shakespeare's theatricality and Elizabethan stage conditions: for example, the use of posts for eavesdropping in 4.3 of *Love's Labor's Lost* (fig 32), the use of a trap and recessed curtained space in 5.3 of *Romeo and Juliet* (fig 13), and the rods and pulleys that permit three suns to appear in the sky in 2.1 of *3 Henry VI* (fig 48). For this reader, however, two of the drawings stand out: fig 39, which depicts basic stage furniture for *1 Henry IV*, including a table, two benches, several stools, and a chair; and fig 23, which depicts the interior of the tiring house, including a king and queen poised to enter through the opened stage door. These drawings need no further comment to convey both the economy and energy of the Elizabethan playhouse.

ROSLYN L. KNUTSON

Michal Kobialka. *This Is My Body: Representational Practices in the Early Middle Ages*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999. Pp viii, 313.

Michal Kobialka says in his introduction that his book is not a history of drama but a analysis of how that history has been represented and why it has been so represented. The text that returns from time to time is the 'Quem quaeritis', but equally important is the scriptural verse, 'Hoc est corpus meum'. The two are entwined because Kobialka is interested in a history of the medieval representations of the relation of religious persons to the body of Christ. His point of departure for the representational practices of the subtitle is the claim that the medieval concept of representation differs from the one that we hold, one that derives from Aristotle and Plato.

Kobialka begins with a critique of the criticism on the drama in the twentieth century. He summarizes the work of Chambers and Young on the 'Quem quaeritis' and the desire for origins that it exhibits. After reproducing Hardison's argument on the defects of the evolutionary thesis, he turns to the new research of the second half of the century in order to describe the interests and procedures of the new archival researchers (REED, the Malone Society, and others) and those scholars interested in drama in performance (Wickham and others). Kobialka concludes his analysis by making the argument that the

revisionism of the last fifty years must be continued by taking into consideration the vast literature on the production of history in recent years, the work of Foucault, de Certeau, Geertz, Bourdieu, Derrida, and others. His point is that the writing of history necessarily meshes the present and its interests and points of view in the writing of the history of the past. He suggests that our awareness of this fact may guide us to new ways of representing the past. First, these theoreticians in their various ways should make us question the whole project of a search for origins; origins, he argues, will always be inaccessible. Secondly, we should question whether our understanding of representation of the real is the same as that of medievals. He chooses four moments in the past as sites for an assessment of medieval representation: the tenth century when the *Regularis concordia* was first written; the late eleventh century when the extant copy was made; the twelfth century when there was renewed discussion of the Eucharist, and 1215, the time of the Fourth Lateran Council.

Rather than thinking of the *Regularis concordia* as an archival repository that contains the earliest reference to a dramatic event, Kobialka asks us to think of the whole document as a dynamic site where new monastic practices delimited how representation was defined in England at that time. The *Regularis concordia* is a monastic document, not one that pertains to the secular clergy, and as such it constructs a specific monastic mentality and practice. It is a product of monastic reform, its purpose being to regularize monastic practice throughout England. Kobialka provides a close analysis of the document to show how it constructs the monastic day and place before turning to how it constructs the monastic person, especially through the daily Chapter meetings and frequent confession, both of which are means to knowing the self. When he turns to the rituals described in the *Regularis concordia*, he notes that 'Quem quaeritis' is not unique in having extra-liturgical elements (movement, representation, and so forth) and that its use of the word 'imitation' is found in other descriptions of ceremonies in the document. These details lead him to the conclusion that 'Quem quaeritis' is an observance that externalizes and verbalizes one of the most important feasts in the Christian religion. It does not attempt to represent in post-Renaissance terms a reality through artifice but brings the truth to full light ('Qui facit veritatem venit ad lucem'). In what he refers to as gnosiologic representation, the participant accesses the light of spiritual reality through the ritual participation in a representation of a past event.

In chapter 2, "'Whom Do You Seek?': Fides quaerens intellectum' Kobialka notes that liturgical scholars ignore the temporal gap between the tenth-century origin of the *Regularis concordia* and its eleventh-century copy, as if to

say that the later document is no different from the original one. He turns as a result to the climate in which the document was copied: the new monastic reforms undertaken by the post-conquest Archbishop Lanfranc, who before coming to Canterbury had been engaged in a dispute over the 'real presence' with Berengar of Tours; and the new meditative practices of St Anselm. These two attest to an epistemological and representational shift in the late eleventh century. He describes Lanfranc's monastic reforms which differ from the earlier Anglo-Saxon ones in being based on models from the Continent. Although some English elements are incorporated into Lanfranc's *Constitutions*, many Anglo-Saxon practices are excluded as well. There is no reference to the *Regularis concordia* or the 'Quem quaeritis', though Lanfranc allows for variations in local practice. Kobialka also devotes attention to Lanfranc's dispute with Berengar in order to show how the relationship between the subject and its object, the Eucharist, had changed. Whereas before there were various ways of stating how Christ was present in the Eucharist, the dispute resulted in a delimited notion of the real presence, one that excluded other positions. In addition, Anselmian private meditation created a different subject than that represented in the *Regularis concordia*; indeed, Kobialka claims that as a result of these shifts the *Regularis concordia*, as well as the 'Quem quaeritis', would be understood differently than when they were originally written. He concludes that the *Regularis concordia* speaks about the procedures that guaranteed an outward representation of the most intimate movements of thought in the process of producing truth. The Berengar-Lanfranc Eucharist controversy gave rise to the practices that realigned the body of Christ in heaven, his body and blood present on the altar after the Communion and the sensed reality of bread and wine (147–8). Lanfranc's *Constitutions* were intent on establishing practices that would secure the real presence of Christ within the monastery in order to protect it and its inhabitants.

Discussion of the Eucharist continued in the twelfth century in what Kobialka calls a ternary mode: corporeal, mystical, and ecclesiological represented, respectively, in the expanded 'Quem quaeritis', Hildegard's *Ordo virtutum*, and the *Jeu d'Adam*. All three can be associated with the developing veneration of the host. Kobialka notes that the twelfth-century versions of 'Quem quaeritis' add scenes to the simpler texts: the buying of the ointments, the Hortulanus, the race to the tomb, and Emmaus (Ripoll is his example). These added elements increased the performance of meaning associated with the real presence of Christ within the church. Whereas the 'Quem quaeritis' in the *Regularis concordia* showed the empty tomb where there is no body, the Ripoll example shows the risen Christ in the meeting with Mary and with the

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-