

# Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Spence, Jocelyn and Duggan, Patrick (2016) Performance and .... The Year's Work in Critical and Cultural Theory, 24 (1). pp. 269-293. ISSN 1077-4254

Published by: Oxford University Press

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ywcct/mbw013> <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ywcct/mbw013>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:  
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/42584/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

## **Performance and...**

Jocelyn Spence and Patrick Duggan

In titling our chapter 'Performance and...' our intention is not to privilege performance studies over theatre studies or drama but rather to call to attention the longstanding proposition that performance (studies) 'resists or rejects definition' (Schechner, Richard, 1998, 'What Is 'Performance Studies' Anyway?' in: P. Phelan and J. Lane (eds.), *The Ends of Performance*, NYU Press, p. 360) and as such highlight the potential it holds for interdisciplinary scholarship and the way in which the idea of performance has been conceived fluidly and expansively, both key concerns of all the volumes reviewed here. We are, we hope, at a point in the development of performance and theatre studies where there is an understanding, acceptance and exploration of the mutually constructive and beneficial interweaving of these two 'traditions' of scholarship within the broader field of drama. In the books we look at, both 'theatre' and 'performance' are brought to bear on the matters at hand almost interchangeably, with established text-based dramas taking their place alongside works in the performance art tradition to further arguments pertaining to a variety of disciplines. Such plurality of approach is a defining feature of the works we have chosen to discuss and binds them to a common purpose: the exploration of drama/theatre/performance in, with and between other disciplines and discourses in the pursuit of illuminating the world around us in more meaningful ways.

## **Performance and... Theatre**

The Series Preface to Cathy Turner's text (co-written by Turner herself and Synne Behrndt) clarifies the relationship between theatre and performance that underlies her research on dramaturgy and, to at least some extent, the work of other writers in our discussion:

dramaturgy's historical association with literature, combined with its intrinsically holistic approach to the theatre event, enables movement and comparison across dramatic, postdramatic and other performance forms, without embedding divisions between them. It is also possible to expand the concept of dramaturgy to enable the discussion of performance in a wider, cultural sense. In this respect there are resonances with both sociology and performance studies. (p. 10)

This inclusive approach is reflected in the title of Alex Flynn and Jonas Tinius's edited volume, *Anthropology, Theatre, and Development: The Transformative Potential of Performance*, referring as it does to

‘theatre’ in the context of ‘the transformative potential of performance’. Jordan Geiger’s title, *Entr’acte*, also makes a specifically theatrical reference in the context of performance. As he elaborates in his Introduction, the groundwork for his study lies ‘in Performance Studies proper [...] although we may quickly add that the related language of “theatre”, which may evoke both play and military contestation, lends itself as well to describing both the physical and nonphysical spaces of human and computer interactions’ (pp. 11-12). (More on the human-computer interaction focus below.) Even the forward to Geiger’s text, written by the editors of Palgrave Macmillan’s ‘Avant-Gardes of Performance’ series, baldly states in the very first sentence that ‘interest in experimental, innovative, and politically radical performances continues to animate *theatre and performance studies*’ (Bay-Cheng and Harries 2015, p. xv, our emphasis). Drawing on the books examined in the first part of this chapter, the unfortunate and historically contingent separation between ‘theatre’ and ‘performance’ noted by Marvin Carlson (2008) seems to have been amicably reconciled: the first ‘and’ referred to in the trope of ‘performance and’ is theatre itself.

The six works discussed below are devoted to bringing different disciplines into dialogue with each other, relying on the interdisciplinarity inherent in performance to reach out to areas with very different concerns. The first text, Turner’s *Dramaturgy and Architecture: Theatre, Utopia and the Built Environment*, discusses architecture in relation to dramaturgy. Dramaturgical analysis features strongly across the essays in George Rodosthenous’s *Theatre as Voyeurism: The Pleasures of Watching*, a volume that seeks to extend, pluralise and problematize discourse on the relations between performance and (theories and practices of) voyeurism. Concerns about the way we think about what performance *is* and how we encounter it are central to the third volume in this section, Manuel Vason’s *Double Exposures: Performance as Photography, Photography as Performance*. In the fourth text, *Anthropology, Theatre, and Development: The Transformative Potential of Performance*, Flynn and Tinius use theatre as the lens through which anthropology and development can be brought into productive conversation with each other. In the fifth, *Entr’acte: Performing publics, pervasive media, and architecture*, Geiger examines how human-computer interaction (HCI) and architecture work together to produce publics, an action which in itself is presented as a valid avant-garde of performance. Finally, in *Evolution, Cognition, and Performance*, Bruce McConachie argues that evolution and cognition are necessary frameworks for the continued relevance of theatre and performance studies research. What is striking is not so much which disciplines have been identified as suitable for analysis in terms of performance, but instead the range of strategies these researchers use in those analyses.

## **Dramaturgy and Architecture**

Turner states up front that she is ‘a theatre scholar and not an architect’ (p. 6), whose ‘book grew out of the observation that there are commonalities between dramaturgy and architecture’ (p. 1), leading her to ‘attempt to analyse dramaturgy through the lens of architecture’ (p. 7). Fuelled by the functions of both dramaturgy and architecture to shape people’s relationships to space and therefore to each other in discrete, unique settings, Turner analyses individual theatrical works through this ‘lens of architecture’, in turn contributing to Elinor Fuchs’s call to apply ‘dramaturgical analysis’ to the embodied spaces of everyday life (p. 7). Turner is careful to maintain her focus on bounded works of theatre or performance for this analysis so that the connections she draws between dramaturgy and architecture may then be applied to the potentials for utopias or heterotopias to be modelled (p. 197). This ‘temporary’ division of artistic performance from the performativity of everyday life is necessary to acknowledge ‘the transformative potential of theatre’s alternative worlds’ (p. 4), which is the ultimate aim of her analyses.

A great strength of the volume is the plurality of Turner’s performance examples. In some, architecture or architects form part of the narrative of the play text, while others are created by individuals with training or intense exposure to architecture, and still others were devised in direct response to the experience of living in experimental architectures. She uses these and other connections ‘to propose that here, dramaturgy is *part* of the conceptual and aesthetic development of architecture’ (p. 20). Her six analytical chapters are divided chronologically and address concerns, styles and traditions with particular relevance to both dramaturgy and architecture, including Russian Constructivists, the Bauhaus, and Letterist and Situationist Internationals, and certain works of site-specific theatre. Her conclusion brings architecture firmly into the remit of her own discipline: ‘The most contradictory, shape-shifting of art forms, performance is able to posit heterotopic, dystopic or utopic architectures and multiple ways of living them: at once paradoxically, both impossible and possible.’ (p. 197) This is a carefully argued, carefully structured work of scholarship, approaching the foreign discipline of architecture with the utmost respect for the ways in which it and performance might inform each other to mutual benefit.

## **Performance and (as?) Voyeurism**

The desire to explore the interrelations of two disciplines is also at the core of Rodosthenous’s *Theatre as Voyeurism*, but where Turner’s concern might ultimately be to look for mutual benefits in this exchange, this volume – at least in part – is concerned to look at theatre/performance as a practice (akin to that) of voyeurism, as well as to see how theatre might renegotiate understandings of voyeurism. Given the prevalence of works that only go so far as to poetically map voyeurism

onto performance, the prospect of a book that critically interrogates the 'links' between voyeurism and performance seems a useful and timely addition to the growing body of work on performance and the gaze, spectatorship, immersion and participation. While many of the individual contributions in this book offer excellent scholarship and engaging arguments in this area, the book as a whole unfortunately lacks a sufficiently clear editorial vision to be wholly effective.

Central to this is an Introduction that is too like a literature review to be dynamic and productive. While it is fluidly written and does a very good job of glossing some of the key extant literature in this field, there is little by way of concrete engagement with the territory by the author. As each new (and long) quotation is introduced, there is an increasing desire to hear the input of the author's own ideas and arguments: why is a particular theory useful in this context, or more promisingly, why is it problematic or insufficiently nuanced for their purposes? Indeed, the argumentative purpose of the volume is not well established in the Introduction as fundamental framings are simply absent. We are told that the relation between voyeurism and theatre is pronounced but there is little by way of exposition on why that link is important, why it might be useful to revisit now and ultimately what the volume hopes to contribute to the discipline.

Nevertheless, Rodosthenous's intervention into the complex discourses on voyeurism attempts positively to distance it from sexual deviance to argue that it is 'an intense curiosity which generates a compulsive desire to observe people (un)aware in natural states or performed primal acts and leads to a heightening of pleasure for the viewer' (p. 6). The move is a useful one in broadening the term beyond its quotidian understandings. However, while the author professes a desire for a definition of voyeurism beyond the sexual negativity associated with it in popular discourse and to focus on 'pleasure', the vast majority of the Introduction maintains a spot-lit focus on nudity, naked bodies and sexual titillation. Indeed, Rodosthenous is keen to highlight that the final part of the book 'provides some enticing insights into our interaction with naked bodies and how that interaction can spark voyeuristic impulses' (p. 18). As such, the Introduction of the volume somewhat limits the impact of the rest of it. Nevertheless, the individual essays offer an interesting array of performance analysis that makes the volume ultimately successful.

Laurens De Vos's chapter usefully and with complexity interweaves Foucault with Sartre and Duchamp to complicate the notion of theatre as voyeurism by critically interrogating the fact that voyeurism 'cannot be separated from its secretive nature' (p. 31). As such, De Vos begins to unpick the usefulness of voyeurism as a means to analyse performance precisely because the chapter attends to the problem inherent in linking voyeurism (an action predicated on one party being unaware of the gaze of the other) with theatre (an activity in which all understand that the exchange of gazes is mutual). Through a tight analysis of Jan Fabre's *I Am Blood* (2001), De Vos ultimately

proposes that the link between theatre and/as voyeurism is a useful yet perhaps flawed one. In positioning this chapter at the very beginning of the book, Rodosthenous provides a smart foil to the generally essentialist perspective of the introduction which claims that theatre/performance and voyeurism are somehow inherently linked. Read in sequence this works as a robust dialogic conceptual frame for the volume (albeit one that the reader must discover for themselves).

In 'The Dramaturgies of the Gaze', Eleni Papalexioiu picks up on the complex nature of the mutual exchange of gazes in theatre. Exploring the work of Romeo Castellucci and Societas Raffaello Sanzio, she arrives at an argument that productively complicates understandings of watching and being watched in the theatre. The chapter proposes that Castellucci's theatre is bound to structures of viewing that refuse simplicity by rejecting 'mundane view[s] of nudity or violence', 'dialectical' or 'modular' structures in favour of compositional strategies that force the spectator to create their own 'object of viewing' (p. 64). For Papalexioiu this type of theatrical voyeurism is 'an intense visual experience imprinted on the senses and the brain of the audience' (p. 65).

Part II of the book turns to questions of voyeurism and space. In one of the strongest and most useful contributions, David Shearing interestingly turns to interrogating voyeurism in 'immersive theatre' from a 'scenographic perspective' (p. 72). Starting with an evocative recounting of his experience of Punchdrunk's *The Drowned Man: A Hollywood Fable* (2013) and moving to discuss Rosenberg and Requard's audio-visual production *Electric Hotel* (2010), the essay proposes that 'the use of masks, headphones and the special organisation of the works act as devices of concealment, creating special distances that situate voyeurism within an expanded immersive and intimate context – a field where touch and the promise of touch is an explicit dramaturgical tool' (p. 72). In so doing this essay attends with rigour to the concerns of the volume and critically advances an argument that both highlights the usefulness of voyeurism as an analytical frame for performance analysis and suggests how performance practice might indeed actually create the conditions of voyeurism within the live encounter.

William McEvoy's chapter 'In Between the Visible and the Hidden: Modalities of Seeing in Site-Specific Performance' turns to consider how site-specific productions can operate to efface the 'barriers between self and work' so as to turn spectators into 'voyeurs, writers, and critics' in the same moment. Recalling something of Papalexioiu's sense of the intensity of performance, McEvoy argues that site-specific performance moves beyond 'the empirical logic of the visual' towards a more phenomenological engagement of the senses and memory (p. 106). While much of this is established territory, what McEvoy eloquently does in his analysis is highlight the particularly complex, polysemic nature of site-specific performance. This, he concludes, blurs 'the

subjective-objective binary, allowing self and other, self and external world, to intersect and overlap more fluidly' (p. 106).

From scenography, site and structure the volume turns back to questions of the body, specifically the naked body, in Luk Van den Dries's 'The Pleasure of Looking Behind Curtains'. Part of the usefulness of this essay to wider scholarship is that it acknowledges and engages with the contradictory nature of voyeurism as a component of performance, especially in relation to staged nudity:

Voyeurism seems to contradict the theatrical situation in which we are invited to look at actors, performing naked as part of their aesthetic choices. At the same time we feel sometimes to be positioned in the role of voyeur looking at scenes that exhibit an intimacy, seemingly not meant for our eyes. (p. 112)

Van den Dries's point is that this places us in an encounter with performance that is profoundly 'uneasy' (p. 112). The chapter explores how we might think of encounters with naked bodies in contemporary performance, exemplified in the work of Jan Fabre and Xavier LeRoy. In one of the most straightforward and potent articulations of the importance and usefulness of thinking about theatre and/as voyeurism in the volume, Van den Dries argues that:

the use of the naked body on the contemporary stage is always filled with the condition of Bertolt Brecht's half-curtain: it is aware of the spectator's glance, it toys with his [sic.] viewing behaviour and continuously questions the nature and the consequence of this act of looking. At the same time a 'violent' component is also involved, which ignores the act of merely taking pleasure in this conscious interaction of glances, which one might define as a 'vexed glance'. It is the moment when one is caught in the act, the unveiling, the revelation if you like of what was hidden (p. 116)

While Van den Dries focuses on the contemporary moment, Fiona Bannon explores a range of international performance practices covering a 50-year history. She identifies a tension between 'fervent desire' and 'moralizing habits' of spectators in the context of spectator-performer proxemics and the possible multi-sensory reactions stimulated therein (p. 129). For Bannon, there is a connection between 'aesthetic experiences and relational ethics' which can be illuminated through analysis framed in terms of voyeurism:

Through the guise of voyeurism, we can gaze upon others and, in the process, observe and discriminate with regard power, possession, vulnerability and desire in what is, effectively, a meeting of our own 'being', in relation with others and with our world. (p. 130)

The essay links concretely with Van den Dries's concerns and, working dialogically, expands the reach of the thinking by drawing on a more expanded field to propose that 'as voyeurs of the performers who bare all' spectators are enabled to experience 'moments of reflective pleasure' that help illuminate the productive nature of art as a means of being in and understanding the world (p. 143).

The expanded focus of the first half of the volume is perhaps not quite matched in the second where chapters 7–10 offer a series of essays that range through a number of interesting interrogations of plural performance practices that engage in some way with naked and/or sexualised bodies in one form or another. Each offers genuine insight but we might argue they fall into more expected territory in a book about voyeurism than much of the first half of the volume.

Analysing his own creative practices alongside those of Spencer Tunick and Marina Abramović, Daniël Ploeger's essay develops 'a conceptual approach to nakedness [...] that engages with the different ways bodies may be read by audiences' (p. 147). He goes on (provocatively) to argue that in postmodern culture 'naked bodies in performance art always afford a sexualized reading' (p. 163).

Aaron C. Thomas's 'Viewing the Pornographic Theatre' employs Artaud's concept of the theatre of cruelty alongside Walter Kendrick's *The Secret Museum* to analyse Ann Liv Young's *Cinderella* (2010) to argue for the 'value of the pornographic in the theatre' (p. 168). The essay convincingly argues for pornography to be thought of as a frame of reference, a means of 'naming what happens when a viewer encounters performance that affects him or her on a psychological level' (p. 180).

Turning to interrogate the often problematic objectification of women in musicals, Tim Stephenson's essay offers a refreshingly political take on the topic of naked bodies. Offering a brief but compelling history of the heteronormative agenda of the musical, Stephenson turns to analyse *Hair* and argues that far from being a countercultural, revolutionary piece, it is in fact an evolution of the deeply troubling and problematic perpetuation of patriarchy wrapped up as entertainment seen in many stage musicals.

In the last essay, George Rodosthenous turns to the work of playwright David Greig to explore his ‘dramaturgical skill of turning his audience from passive viewers into unwitting voyeurs’ (p. 211). The argument is concisely made and hinges on the proposition that Greig uses naked bodies as a means to provoke the audience into becoming (politically) self-aware. Rodosthenous’s proposition is that Greig’s work highlights the politicised nature of paying to watch exposed bodies ‘in a legalized environment’. This in turn, echoing some of Bannon’s concerns, means that such watching is not simply about pleasure fulfilment but about a fuller engagement with theatre’s capacity both to think through and make the world around us.

*Theatre as Voyeurism* is an engaging read and each essay offers critical insight into a broad range of interesting and international performance practices. However, it is a shame that editorially the volume did not more tightly bind itself to the promise of the title. Nevertheless, it contributes much to the discipline’s ever growing interest in *performance and*: the gaze, immersion and spectatorship.

### **Photography and Documentation**

While Rodosthenous and his contributors are concerned to explore the politics and ethics of looking from (principally) the spectator perspective, artist and photographer Manuel Vason asks what it means to look at performance through photography. The volume is an imaginative, captivating and (as one might expect from Vason) beautiful attempt to visually and textually interrogate the ways in which photography and live performance (Live Art, theatre, dance, performance) can be in dialogue with one another and how then the practices of each can refract within and productively infect the other. Vason’s work in publication, exhibition and indeed performance has been key to the development of a less distrustful relationship between performance makers and documentation practices, especially photography. In part this has been driven by his careful work both to ensure a sense of performativity in his practice and, as Dominic Johnson makes clear in his contribution to *Double Exposures*, to develop a fundamentally *collaborative* practice with the artists he photographs:

For over a decade, Manuel Vason’s photographic collaborations have been a vital apparatus for artists seeking to experiment with the fundamental tensions between the production of live works and the securing of compelling traces for subsequent encounters by audiences. (p. 22)

While undoubtedly Vason's work can be 'beautiful, commanding and sometimes disconcerting' (p. 22), the attempt in this volume is to move further than the presentation of traces of performances that have happened and, as indicated in the subtitle, to propose that an encounter with carefully curated and created (perhaps even staged) photographs of performance can go some way to being an encounter *with* performance itself. This is a provocative proposition but one that we might argue Vason has been exploring and working towards for a significant part of his career at the vanguard of performance photography and documentation.

It is difficult properly to review this book as an academic text, in part because an encounter with it is bound in the same subjectivity as an encounter with any art object. Nevertheless, attending to its central claim of '*Performance as Photography, Photography as Performance*' seems worthwhile in relation to our 'performance and...' framing.

Since turning away from working in the fashion industry to focus on performance, Vason has managed to work through multiple thorny issues such as who holds copyright of the image created, the tensions between a staged photograph and one captured in the moment of performance, temporality and ephemerality of performance against the fixity of the image. His previous publications *Exposures* (2002) and *Encounters* (2007) attest also to his capacity to develop innovative and productive collaborations that complicate understandings of documentation of live performance and the staging of performances for camera. This new publication undoubtedly extends and interrogates this work further. Working with 42 artists in the construction of each diptych image (of which more below), Vason has worked hard to produce works that challenge the role of photographer and performer in both the construction of the image and in one's encounter with that image. And this is perhaps where the volume comes closest to reaching its performance goals. The collapsing of the performer-photographer relation across the volume asks the reader carefully to consider what it is they are seeing and places the temporal act of that encounter at the centre of experience. As such, the volume does not present a clean 'readable' documentation of a performance but rather it 'stages' a three-way encounter between reader, 'performer' and 'photographer'.

The volume is framed by a series of scholarly and curatorial essays which serve to contextualise the work and to intervene into discourses of performance as photography, photography as performance. While it would have been interesting and productive to have these essays explicitly attend to *how* the volume might be achieving that aim, the writings are nonetheless thoroughly engaging and strengthen the book's long-term usefulness as they serve to historicise Vason's work as well as to present rigorous theoretical reflections that will be helpful to scholars across performance, fine and visual arts. Although there is some repetition across the essays (related to

Vason's history of work), each offers a useful companion to the book. The most successful are Dominic Johnson's lucid and detailed 'genealogy of [Vason's] practice since 2001' (p. 22) and Adrien Sina's performative essay that looks at 'the scope of conceptual and deconstructive practices since the 1970's' (p. 44) in relation to *Double Exposure's* 'experimental and provocative' ambition to deconstruct the performer's and photographer's roles (p. 44). The piece uses a diagrammatic, almost dramaturgical structure to historicise, problematize and playfully reverberate with the images that follow later in the volume.

Once we encounter the images themselves, a clear binary structure emerges that guides all aspects of the project. It is divided into two sections – 'Reversing the Gaze' and 'Double Image'. There are two groups of artists – one Vason has worked with before, one he hasn't. And on each page, two images. In 'Reversing the Gaze', Vason turns to work again with twenty performance artists he had previously collaborated with. Each artist created a diptych of photos that relates specifically to their art practice with one side involving Vason's body instead of the artist's. In 'Double Image', new collaborators work with the photographer to think about their work 'photographically' in order to generate performances that deliberately create related if juxtaposing images.

The structure of the diptych works to put the images into conversation with one another and then with the reader. As such it is the central mechanism through which the volume attempts a performative affect as the viewer is asked to participate in negotiating the liminal space between photographic document or archive and live performance. The resulting volume is interesting and at times frustrating, but the desire to push at the boundaries between documentation and live work is to be commended. Ultimately the book cannot live up to the promise of its subtitle. Instead it provokes a more enlivened engagement with the document which hopefully pushes the viewer towards an interrogation of the politics and practices represented.

### **Anthropology, Theatre and Development**

Where Turner and Rodosthenous both seeks to bring performance into dialogue with another field, and Vason might be seen to be attempting to merge two fields, Flynn and Tinius bring two completely different fields—anthropology and development—into dialogue with each other using theatrical performance as the lens through which they can be understood to relate. As they describe in their introduction:

This collection aims to provide an interdisciplinary analysis of political performance, juxtaposing ethnography and anthropological theory to highlight

how dimensions of aesthetics and politics can interrelate to create new forms of sociality. (p. 3)

Soon thereafter, they modify this proposal, describing ‘the central contribution to the theoretical and ethnographic corpus of this book’ to be the use of theatre as a methodological stance that allows the researchers adequate distance to make sense of their work (p. 3), whether it relates directly to theatrical works or, at times, to politically charged situations that can be understood as theatricalised performances of social functions. In fact, their definition of ‘political performance’ deliberately avoids simple matters of content. For them, performance becomes political when it forms ‘a space where dissent can be articulated’ (p. 4). This definition places their emphasis on rationales and motivations behind particular processes of performance rather than those performance events that have the most impactful outcomes on current political situations. By drawing on ethnography to inform analyses of these processually political performances, Flynn and Tinius argue that the texts in this edited volume result in ‘the elaboration of new collective political subjectivities [...] a process that grounds wider instances of development’ (p. 4). In this way, the editors turn performance into a bridge that can productively link two separate fields.

Flynn and Tinius critique past uses of Theatre for Development (TfD) that aimed merely to disseminate information deemed valuable by colonial or quasi-colonial forces, a policy which continues well into the postcolonial era in some current educational programmes (p. 11). Their interest lies in uses of theatre that empower those who are typically on the receiving end of the development process, so to speak, bringing their voices and interests to the fore. This is accomplished by focusing on process and methodology rather than on a predetermined outcome; they describe these processes as occurring ‘in a free, profoundly embodied, and non-rehearsed way’ (p. 12). They note that this kind of radically open and process-based theatre requires more than just participation, as some participatory projects can be almost indistinguishable in result from the more didactic TfD projects that they critique. This book is in part an attempt to uncover ‘more genuine models of participation’ that ‘can create spaces that incite people to act out their lives and the issues that are important to them in an emergent, rather than prescribed, fashion’ (p. 12). The most important theoretical tool for this activity is their notion of ‘relational reflexivity’, which draws on Judith Butler’s articulation of ‘performativity’, on Chantal Mouffe’s definition of ‘the political’ in terms of process rather than identity, and on relationality as proposed by Nicolas Bourriaud and challenged by Claire Bishop (pp. 5-9). Relational reflexivity leads to the premise of this book, that ‘artists no longer produce political theatre, but instead produce it *politically*’ (p. 9, emphasis in the original).

The contributions to this volume include events that take place outside an intentional, artistic ‘performance’ framework but are analysed as performance inasmuch as they put selves, social relations, and power on display. Jeffrey S. Juris clarifies the rationale and value of working with such events alongside self-conscious ‘performances’ in his own examinations of the ‘macro-level protest events’ such as the Occupy movement and ‘micro-level embodied performances’ that often take place within these larger events. As he points out, those events he identifies as ‘performances vary in relation to the identity and goals of participants, the specific practices and forms, the degree of formality and improvisation, the level of danger and intensity, and the context and scale’ (p. 87). His criteria for different understandings of performance serve his aims to analyse events whose purposes can be argued to be outside of the remit of theatrical performance. In fact, these criteria might complement other contributions to this volume which deal with primarily social performances such as Ananda Breed’s examination of Rwandan law courts, Stavroula Pipyrrou’s analysis of the social performance of power in a form of dance commonly enjoyed by members of the mafia in the south of Italy, or the promises of Caroline Gatt’s proposal for a more ethical and reflexive ‘performative anthropology’.

In fact, one of the most compelling contributions uncovers the critical element of performance inherent in graffiti and other forms of ‘independent public art’ discussed by Rafael Schacter. He begins by briefly analysing the combination of ‘performative invisibility’—that is, the need for graffiti artists to create their artworks in secret—and the ‘artefactual publicity’ of the artworks themselves. His main argument, though, lies in the combination of performative invisibility and ‘artefactual invisibility’ at play in works that are officially kept secret from all but their creators, made known only through carefully guarded word of mouth. Examples include the hidden, illicit spaces created by Adams and Itso in Scandinavia that could only be accessed by being told the secret by someone in the know. Schacter’s argument connects visual art, performance, architecture, storytelling and commitment to communities of practice as ‘a way to reject the increasing instrumentalisation of the public sphere’ and ‘a way of forming a coherent unit from which to reject it’ (p. 216). Following the premise laid down by Flynn and Tinius in their Introduction, Schacter approaches questions of performance, performativity and beauty by analysing what the creators of these works do—primarily as reactions to or interventions in the political realm—rather than by studying the outputs as simple artefacts or events. This approach provides sharp insights, not only into the areas of anthropology and development, but also to performance studies itself.

Other contributions to this volume take as their subject performances whose goals, practices, forms, degrees of formality, context and scale (Juris, Jeffrey S., ‘Embodying Protest: Culture and

Performance within Social Movements’, p. 87) have much in common with theatrical performances outside of TfD or other development scenarios. These include two chapters dedicated to the performances of Pussy Riot, the female Russian performers who have been jailed for their performances of dissent; a discussion of recent political text-based theatre in three Arab countries facing varying degrees of upheaval; a discussion of verbatim theatre; and, perhaps surprisingly, an extremely detailed historical analysis by Clare Foster of ancient Greek theatre practices. At first glance, it might seem improbable that theatrical practices from past millennia could have any bearing on contemporary concerns in anthropology and development. After reading Foster’s chapter, though, what seemed improbable was that the editors had not placed this chapter at the very beginning of the book, to contextualise and give weight to their key claim that performance provides a necessary lens for understanding the political relationships between anthropology and development. Foster argues that current Western concepts of mainstream theatre as a text-based event is a recent aberration. In its origins and throughout most of its history, Foster claims, theatre and performance were phenomena centred on their audiences, not on a text. In fact, it is the ability to repeat or re-perform an event rather than the text itself that has led to our shift of focus away from audiences. This argument is not only relevant to academic conceptualisations of theatrical performance, but also important for negotiating the aesthetic, social, and political landscapes of the twenty-first century.

But a new kind of prompt to question our concepts of theatre and theatre history also exists in the form of the digital and global present, which draws attention to the agency of audiences, collectivity, and publics, and the negotiation of authorities at play in processes of selection, record, and repetition. [...] In a digital world a thing *is* who knows about it. In this view, flash mobs and other forms of collective carnivalesque subversion with political dimensions are theatre *par excellence*, as some scholars have noted (see also Juris, this volume); and the rise of second-screening, plus the extraordinary popularity of a wide variety of alternative ‘live’ screen content in local cinemas in Britain since 2009, suggests the importance of the relational dynamics which had previously been at play in past temporally specific and scarce events at movie *theatres*. A revisioning of theatre as complex social practice is thus a timely correction of its conception as an aesthetic object. Theatre and performance, as collective phenomena *about* multiplicity and indeterminacy, are increasingly useful tools to think with. (pp. 227-228, emphasis in the original)

Foster's analysis should prove to be extraordinarily useful to many students and researchers working in theatre, drama, and performance, even if they have no connection with either anthropology or development. At the same time, it provides timely and carefully argued means of understanding how the choral nature of early performance can inform political interventions.

### **Publics, Media, and Architecture as Avant-Garde Theatre**

Geiger's edited volume, *Entr'acte*, is the culmination of a body of work that began as a panel discussion at a performance conference (Performance Studies International 2010), though Geiger's specialty is architecture, not performance. His approach to the topics of architecture and performance is neither like Turner's careful enfolding of one into the other, nor like Flynn and Tinius's use of one field as a bridge between two others. Instead, Geiger aims to explore the ways that today's publics are shaped through physical interventions, including architecture, and digital interventions, namely pervasive media. He makes frequent reference to the concerns and methods of human-computer interaction (HCI), a field into which performance has made many forays over the years, but where the concerns of performance are still very far from being mainstream. He describes the theory driving this work as providing 'a deceptively simple model for understanding contemporary formations of publics' which 'can be conditioned by rapidly changing forms of and practices with HCI' (p. 25). Sarah Bay-Cheng and Martin Harries offer a foreword to the work to contextualise it within their series, 'Avant-Gardes in Performance'. In it, they write that Geiger's text 'presents an exciting and original challenge to the concepts of performance, media, and the avant-garde by bringing the discourses of architecture and urban space into conversation with cultural and performance theory' (p. xv). In other words, a method of studying the formation of publics or commons, understood primarily through the architecture (physical) and HCI (digital) forces that shape them, is itself positioned as an avant-garde of performance.

Geiger's central concept of the *entr'acte* is derived primarily from the spatial and temporal interval that takes place in the middle of a long performance—though in keeping with his focus on pervasive media, he also cites the 1924 Dadaist film *Entr'acte* by René Clair, which formed part of what Geiger claims to be 'perhaps the first intermedial construction of space-time in performance' (p. 12). Geiger uses the *entr'acte* to highlight 'a space-time of distraction' and 'spectator-actor disruptions' that he sees as defining the ways that urban residents interact with each other in the concrete spatiality and ephemeral mediatisation of urban environments today (p. 12). Performance as a concept is thus embedded in the foundation of his approach. Geiger himself refers to works by Augusto Boal, The Builders Association and Josef Beuys to anchor his

argument. One contribution examines the construction of an audiovisual installation to accompany a music performance (Adrian Blackwell and Eduardo Aquino's 'Between plateau and mirror: A sound and projection field for Daniel Lanois' "Later That Night at the Drive-in"); and Ricardo Dominguez writes from the point of view of the creator of digital/virtual theatrical events. Beyond these examples, though, the idea of performance is employed less as a set of practices and methods for the presentation of a preconceived art event and more as a means of understanding how publics are structured by the physical and digital systems they live within. In this way, *Entr'acte* is the furthest from Turner's straightforward approach to the combination of performance with other fields. But the contributions in this volume are in many cases valuable, both for stretching our understanding of what performance might mean and for seeing performance at work in the very different fields of HCI, media studies, cultural studies, architecture and urban studies.

One thing that sets this text apart from those that are more elaborately or self-consciously rooted in the performance literature is its lack of an overarching, overtly idealistic objective. Where Turner is keenly interested in the potential for utopias or heterotopias to emerge from the conjunction of theatre and architecture, and the contributions to Flynn and Tinus's text are attuned to the transformative potentials of political performance, the texts in Geiger's volume are more diverse in their attitudes towards to the effects that the *entr'acte* might have on the lives of the 'spectators' who form the publics being studied (p. 15). Nashid Nabian's chapter, with a title so positive that it can only be read tongue in cheek, is a dire warning against naïveté in the face of promises of a better future through digital connectivity. She asks, 'is it safe to assume that media democratization naturally paves the ground for sociopolitical democracy? My answer is a bitter "No" with a capital N!' (p. 66). This level of passion surely comes from a sincere desire to make the world a better place, yet it does not seek out a heterotopic space or propose a politically performative mechanism for responding to the danger she perceives. Benjamin H. Bratton's contribution is less animated in its negativity yet similarly suspicious of the status quo. On the other hand, Omar Khan argues optimistically for the wisdom of digitally connected collectives, with architecture taking a role in heightening opportunities for members of the public to interact in positive ways. Malcolm McCullough's contribution similarly sees 'bottom-up' (p. 181) public interactions as participatory engagement with the commons that can allow for 'an ethics of situated information' (p. 179). Jonathan Massey and Brett Snyder's chapter on the physical and digital strategies adopted in the Occupy movement is one more case in point: it ends with a very brief look forward to the (positive) potential for the continuing growth of digital technologies in urban spaces to further public engagement with the political process. Their chapter complements Juris's chapter in *Anthropology, Theatre, and Development*, which has a strong focus on the strategies and

perceptions of performance per se, and consequently a tendency to argue for several pages (pp. 98-101) about the limited but non-negligible possibilities for performance to contribute to social movements.

### **Theatre, Performance and Performativity**

One of the more interesting consequences of bringing theatrical performance into dialogue with different disciplines is the resulting interplay between performance per se and performativity. Our initial argument about these texts was their inclusivity, aligning works of theatre with more loosely designed performance events to establish connections with other disciplines. This grouping of more 'theatrical' works alongside more 'performative' events might entail a similarly inclusive attitude towards concepts of performativity in everyday life, and it might be assumed that an emphasis on more ubiquitous and quotidian 'performances' of performativity would help to connect the concerns of theatre and performance researchers with those from entirely separate disciplines. However, the authors and editors of three of these texts – those by Turner, Flynn and Tinius, and Geiger – distance themselves from performativity to at least some degree.

The definitions of performativity used in these texts fall well within the bounds of what is commonly accepted within the field: they draw primarily from the 'performative utterances' theorised by J.L. Austin, in which some types of speech can not only describe but actually act upon the world (1962), particularly as this idea is elaborated by Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity (2002). Architecture, in particular, might be approached through the lens of performativity, as the built environment affords and constrains different ways of conducting one's life and therefore plays an active role in occasioning particular ways of being. Indeed, Turner's text makes various references to the performativity of architecture: in the 'synthesis of object and action' to be seen in Ibsen (p. 41) as well as the performance-inflected 'performative interventions' into everyday life promoted by the Situationists (p. 150), including the *dérive* (p. 162). Turner's description of NVA's ongoing work with a formerly derelict Scottish seminary building reflects an expansive view of the term 'performativity', conveying her meaning of an 'architecture [that] refuses to congeal into a fixed location, but participates in performance' (p. 189). Aside from these few, brief mentions, though, Turner consciously averts her theorising from notions of performativity. In her view, not only is the border between 'performance' and 'performativity' a loose one, but 'performativity' can open up the field of enquiry to virtually any encounter among people in the context of their built environment. The result would be 'to dismiss the transformative potential of theatre's alternative worlds' (p. 4). She defines dramaturgy as that which 'refashions or intensifies the space and time of the everyday into something "extra-daily"' (p. 1). Only after

establishing the relationship between dramaturgy and architecture might there be space ‘to understand how [dramaturgy] takes its place within, or indeed contests the development of, that everyday dramaturgy’ (p. 3), the performativity of everyday life. Turner’s choice of focus has the side effect of removing performativity almost entirely from consideration.

In contrast, Flynn and Tinius explicitly trace how the difference between performance and performativity leads to the central theoretical premise of their work, ‘relational reflexivity’. Among several explanations of how they use the term ‘performance’ is their statement that it directs attention to the existence of an audience for a given ‘reflexive and artistic gesture’ (p. 7). More precisely, it indicates that the person making this ‘reflexive and artistic gesture’ has both a conscious intention for that gesture and the capacity (and intention) to reflect on that gesture. Flynn and Tinius’s ‘relational reflexivity’ is composed of these foci: on the relationship between performers full of conscious intention and the audiences that co-constitute their performance, and on the process of reflecting on the means, experience and result of that performance. Given the currency of performativity as an ingredient in building theory and unpicking practice in performance studies, intermedial studies, and beyond, this is an interesting shift.

The contributions to this text all emphasise ‘the *how* and *what*’ of performance over the fact that through performance, some effect in the real world is ‘*done*’ (p. 7, emphasis in the original). Tinius makes this clear in his own chapter on Adem Köstereli’s work with *Theater an der Ruhr* to create a piece of theatre with refugees living nearby. Tinius ties his concern for ‘the *reflection on performance*—its metaperformative dimension’ (p. 172, emphasis in the original) to the question of how to ‘conceptualise the reflexive and self-cultivating dimensions of performance’ (p. 173). Köstereli views self-reflection regarding his own work as the driving political-aesthetic force of his projects. In Köstereli’s theatre as well as Tinius’s writing about that work, the self-reflexive process of creation drives the matter of the performance itself and overwhelms the performative implications of any one member’s performative change of identity from refugee to theatre-maker.

Even when the link between performance and performativity is not so clearly delineated, its implications can be powerfully felt. Schacter’s chapter on independent public art in effect defines the concepts of performance and performativity in reverse, beginning with the effect of the performative act (the graffiti witnessed by others in the morning sunshine). This graffiti, or other work of independent public art, was brought into being by a performance not simply in the sense that the action of painting was performed, but through the many sociocultural, political and aesthetic constraints placed on that action. These performances are not witnessed, at least not if they are successfully completed, and other works of independent public art that Schacter discusses may never be witnessed at all. This does not stop the performance of creating them from being

more important than the effects produced, especially to the artists themselves. Through these performances, the artists engage in a powerfully performative act, that of creating a community of artists and staking a claim to membership in that community (p. 213). While the performative act of community building is politically empowering and the driving force for its inclusion in discussions of anthropology and development, it is Flynn and Tinius's 'how' of performance that forms the core of Schacter's analysis. While Schacter uses the terms 'performance' and 'performative' to describe both of the phenomena that we separate out, we believe that the differentiation we make here maps to the editors' concept of relational reflexivity and its implications for discussion of performance in other disciplines.

Finally, and perhaps most surprisingly, the text that explicitly investigates the formations of 'performing publics'—Geiger's *Entr'acte*—makes virtually no mention of 'performativity' at all. Dominguez refers to a 'performative matrix' that is generated by instances of 'electronic disturbance' (p. 81) such as the theatrical and political interventions of the Electronic Disturbance Theater, while Nabian writes briefly of performativity in reference to objects, whether physical or digital, that have the potential to act on the world and therefore have been, or could be subject to, a process of design. Blackwell and Aquino, on the other hand, use the term to refer to the ability of their chosen space to afford and imply certain means of interaction in the context of artistic performance. However, we find performativity in the Austinian or Butlerian sense to be strongly implied in Geiger's Introduction. He discusses the ways in which people form publics by acting in relation to each other and to novel technologies (p. 11), drawing on these interactions to trace how commons are created. He describes his central theory of the *entr'acte* 'as something that was always medial, architectural, social, and performative' (p. 13). Additionally, he draws heavily on Jon McKenzie's *Perform or Else*, which has performativity at its 'kernel' due to the duality observed by Butler of possessing the capacity for 'both experimentation and normativity' (McKenzie, Jon, 2002. *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance*, London: Routledge, p. ix). The treatment of performativity in all three of these texts speaks of an implicit faith in theatrical performance to engage with other disciplines on its own terms, without using the everyday, identity-shaping, discourse-driven concept of 'performativity' to act as a bridge.

### **Evolution, Cognition and Performance**

Where these three texts either sidestep Butlerian performativity or define their approach in opposition to it, one performance monograph published this year goes so far as to reject as false the premises on which it rests. Bruce McConachie's *Evolution, Cognition, and Performance* makes the bold assertion that theatre and performance studies should reorient themselves towards 'the

evolutionary and cognitive sciences' and reject any theoretical position that cannot be supported by established or likely findings in that field (p. 12). This entails the wholesale refusal to engage with many theories that underpin broad swathes of current theatre and performance studies. For example, he dismisses Butler's approach entirely and claims that all types of speech make measurable impacts, thereby rendering all Austinian and Butlerian theories of performativity moot.

McConachie singles out three primary targets for the clean sweep of performance studies that he proposes:

several of us have successfully demonstrated that the assumptions of Saussurian semiotics are ill-founded, that the poststructuralism of Derrida and others does not accord well with cognitive realities, and that the psychoanalytic tradition, from Freud to Lacan to Butler and Zizek [sic.], is inadequate and misleading from a scientific point of view. On the other hand, many of the new realities revealed by evolutionary and cognitive studies do jibe with aspects of phenomenology and varieties of materialism. In addition to posing challenges to still-current theories, those of us working in cognition and performance have successfully questioned assumptions about the willing suspension of disbelief, the attribution of meanings to performances, the rationalism behind *Verfremdungseffekt*, and many other conventional ideas and strategies in our field. (p. 10)

McConachie also has no time for anything that he sees as based in social constructivism:

The social constructivist accounts of Erving Goffman, Michel Foucault, Victor Turner, and many other sociologists, historians, and anthropologists who have influenced performance studies fit comfortably within what John Barkow, Leda Cosmides, and John Tooby attacked as the "Standard Social Science Model" (SSSM) of the human mind. (p. 9)

Throughout this book, McConachie traces the various ways in which evolutionary biology has disrupted this model. He notes the artificial divide between arts and sciences promoted by 'Enlightenment faculty psychology' (p. 4) and by C.P. Snow's famous 'two cultures' (p. 7), a divide that is continually degraded as scientific advances prove the deep interconnections between that

which is biologically given to the human species and those particulars of socio-cultural conditioning.

McConachie's sweeping statements about social constructivism, behaviourism, semiotics, poststructuralism, psychoanalysis, and performativity are centred on their effects on the field of performance studies. He decries the tendency of many performance researchers to rely on the "blank-slate" assumptions' of the social constructivists that deny a role for 'biocultural universals' (p. 13) that may prove to underpin the human propensity for performance across such domains as theatre, play, sports and ritual. Worse yet, it seems, are theoretical systems such as poststructuralism that have not been connected to any evolutionary or biological foundations 'because these orientations understand human language rather than mindful bodies as the foundation of biocultures and meanings' (p. 28). He calls for these to be not only abandoned but actively discarded, lest the entire field of performance studies disappear:

If we stay with most of the orthodoxies of High Theory from the 1980s, biophobe reactionaries will welcome us in the trenches, but our 'knowledge' will become increasingly irrelevant. The result will likely be the further marginalization of performance studies within the academy and perhaps its eventual demise. The most relevant historical precedent for our situation is probably the transition from the late medieval period to the renaissance. (p. 17)

The most obvious question to us is whether McConachie can produce a convincing argument for such a profound shift in perspective, to which we can only say that some will respond with an emphatic 'yes' and others, like Nabian in her very different context, with 'a bitter "No" with a capital N!' (2015, p. 66). McConachie has been careful to underscore the relative youth of evolutionary biology as a field of enquiry and the tentative nature of many of the conclusions it has drawn so far (pp. 24-25). Rather than attempting to base his argument on the few solid findings applicable to performance studies, he has posited a near future in which the more tentative ones have been well established, and the many conjectures that might be made in the wake of what has been learned so far have been successfully explored. If all of these scenarios come to pass, as he believes they will, and performance as an evolved biocultural process 'is the foundational activity from which theater, rituals, sports, and other performative activities emerged' (p. 19), then any field of study that considers a performative activity will be able to turn to performance studies as a reliable source for their own theorising. This would mark an inversion of the interdisciplinarity noted by Patrice Pavis, in which performance studies makes use of a vast range of social science

approaches to understand the workings of performative events (2001, p. 154). As McConachie acerbically points out, a reorientation on this level ‘cannot be met by yet more monographs on gamelan music in Java or avant-garde theater in New York, as important as such work may be’ (p. 19). Again, there is certain to be enthusiastic support for McConachie’s calls, just as there is certain to be an equally vociferous defence of the positions he rejects. For these reasons if nothing else, this text provides a worthwhile contribution to the field.

It may seem odd to discuss a call for a purely science-based approach to performance in a publication structured around critical and cultural theory. However, while McConachie strongly recommends the wholesale rejection of certain theoretical approaches, he finds that others align well with the reorientation he advocates. His primary criterion for the validity of any theory is whether it supports or contradicts Enaction, ‘the paradigm of choice for many cognitive scientists’ (p. 21). Enaction rejects the overemphasis on cognitive processes evidenced in models that liken human behaviour to the functions of computer programs. Instead, it recognises cognitive factors alongside the embodied nature of human perception and action, a perspective that invites attention to elements of experience that are fundamentally biological (physically evolved) and social (culturally conditioned). Concepts that might be preserved within the Enaction framework include liminality, framing, restored behaviour, ritual, and ethics (p. 28); these and others would be joined by the new knowledge gained from explorations based in evolutionary biology, which implies a focus on the primacy of action (p. 29), affect and emotion (p. 98), preconscious processes of spectatorship (p. 131), and ‘a pragmatic ethics based in Darwinian naturalism’ (p. 168).

There is reason to believe that these approaches might not only strengthen the work of theatre and performance researchers but also facilitate the application of findings from our field to other disciplines. This is particularly relevant given the focus on HCI in the contributions to Geiger’s text and the increasing importance of digital technologies in both everyday life and theatrical performance. For example, a number of important parallels between performance studies and HCI already exist (see e.g., Spence, Jocelyn, 2016. *Performative Experience Design*. London: Springer), but many HCI researchers find it impractical to familiarise themselves with semiotics, poststructuralism, psychoanalysis and other such theoretical foundations necessary for a full understanding of many of the theories that theatre and performance studies have to offer. Whether these approaches are ultimately worthy of attention or not, they can for all practical purposes be impenetrable to researchers in fields where their epistemologies are less prevalent. It is also worth noting that the move towards a more physically embodied and socio-culturally situated perspective on the interactions among humans and technologies that is central to the Enaction paradigm has been underway for the past twenty years and more in HCI. Conversely, it is tempting to challenge

McConachie's assertion that machines do not act (p. 63) with examples of self-generating, though admittedly human-instigated, interactive digital art created and theorised within HCI. Though efforts to improve the transfer of knowledge between theatre and performance studies and other disciplines are secondary to McConachie's call for the fundamental reorientation of performance studies towards specific scientific fields, those efforts could hardly fail to improve performance studies' relevance in the academic community, which he perceives to be under imminent threat.

McConachie's monograph also speaks to some of the other texts considered in this chapter. For example, from the viewpoint of evolutionary biology, McConachie traces the development of performance in broad strokes, including of course a brief discussion of ancient Greek drama, the topic of Foster's chapter in *Anthropology, Theatre, and Development*. We can imagine that the Enaction paradigm might well support Foster's way of constructing 'Athenian drama, which flourished at the same time as the city's brief experiment with *demokratia*, [as] the enactment and symbol of precisely the *challenge* of collective decision-making' (Foster, p. 231, emphasis in the original), an embodied and socially constrained process of meaning-making in which individual Athenians had agency. However, Foster's text would seem to challenge some of McConachie's other assertions. He traces the most significant change in performance since the High Paleolithic to the development of writing (p. 58; see also p. 73). However, Foster explicitly ties the development of theatre as we know it today not to writing but to re-performance, which develops expectations amongst audiences and creates the potential for the performance to exist as a politicised entity of its own rather than an emerging, performative enaction of a public. It is entirely possible that these two positions are not as contradictory as they appear: Foster presumably wrote without the concerns of evolutionary biology to guide her arguments, and McConachie's broad argument does not have the scope to delve into detail on the subtleties revealed in Foster's chapter. Potential disagreements such as these, though, raise fascinating questions as to how other researchers will react to the Enaction paradigm.

Lacking any significant background in cognitive science or evolutionary biology, we often find ourselves questioning some of McConachie's assertions. As noted above, he himself underscores the tentative nature of many of the scientific conclusions he uses as a basis for his work. However, this leads us to wish that he had included more arguments against the positions he takes. It is easy enough to understand why a researcher who has spent decades reasoning from a Foucauldian perspective might reject his arguments, but surely other researchers working within the framework of assumptions he has made would also question some of his assertions from time to time. One small example is his way of referring to mirror neurons and the uptake of the science related to this phenomenon in performance studies. At first, he explains how these researchers relied on the

mirror neuron system without paying due attention to ‘the complexities of empathy and so-called Theory of Mind’, then ‘generally ignored the fact that scientists were still struggling to validate the existence of mirror neurons in humans’ (p. 22). However, in later chapters, McConachie himself uses mirror neurons as part of his explanation of the biological process of co-creating or perceiving performance (p. 61, p. 121). His later claim that spectators of mediatised performances ‘probably have lower attention spans for performances than previous generations of audiences’ due to the distractions that surround a person watching content at home (p. 135) ignores the raucous experience of forming an audience for theatre productions in the seventeenth century or for less ‘highbrow’ performances of the past century. Whether these prove to be minor inconsistencies or major stumbling blocks remains to be seen, and we are eager to see it – as we are eager to see the research community’s response to all six texts we have discussed here.

### **Books Reviewed**

Flynn, Alex and Jonas Tinius, eds. 2015. *Anthropology, theatre, and development: The transformative potential of performance*. Palgrave Macmillan. [2015] pp. 320. hb £65 ISBN 9 7811 3735 0596.

Geiger, Jordan, ed. *Entr’acte: Performing publics, pervasive media, and architecture*. Palgrave Macmillan. [2015] pp. 224. hb £60 ISBN 9 7811 3743 3947.

McConachie, Bruce. *Evolution, Cognition, and Performance*. Cambridge University Press. [2015] pp. 225. hb £64.99 ISBN 9 7811 0709 1399.

Rodosthenous, George, ed. *Theatre as Voyeurism: The Pleasures of Watching*. Palgrave Macmillan. [2015] pp. 240. hb £44.99 ISBN 9 7811 3747 8801.

Turner, Cathy. *Dramaturgy and architecture: Theatre, utopia and the built environment*. Palgrave Macmillan. [2015] pp. 268. hb £55 ISBN 9 7802 3036 4028.

Vason, Manuel, with David Evand, eds.. *Double Exposures. Performance as Photography, Photography as Performance*. Live Art Development Agency; Intellect. [2015] pp. 200. hb £24.95 ISBN 9 7817 8320 4090.