and manner of intended use. He reminds the reader how much of this material was part of an on-going oral tradition with its diverse and multiple forms in the medieval church and religious communities, a tradition that is complex and often confusing to those beginning study in this area. One area he briefly touches upon, the role of women in religious communities and their forms of use, is an often overlooked issue. His use of numerous tables and summaries is a helpful device in assisting the reader to identify, if not always understand the reasons for, the diverse orders of celebration from century to century, region to region, or community to community. When one has to know, apart from the experiential knowledge gained by repeated use within a worshipping community, the meaning of a "double of the second class" or the order of the second nocturn at matins on summer ferias, Harper at least charts out for the reader what this means in practical terms and is not fearful of asking very basic questions. The very complexities of such arcane information may make the reader grudgingly sympathetic to the bewildered, sixteenth-century protestors who decried priestcraft and monkery, by which often they meant the mere technical expertise employed for a millennium in the forms of celebrating the Western liturgy. Since Harper seems to address this reference manual to a wider, non-theological readership, it would be useful for an English-speaking audience to have reference to Marion J. Hatchett's *Sanctifying Life, Time and Space: An Introduction to Liturgical Study* (1976); the liturgical texts in the handy one-volume, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (1961) by Bard Thompson; and the charming, historical vignettes in Massey H. Shepherd's *At All Times and in All Places. The Study of Liturgy* and Harper's book are useful reminders of Tyrrell's insight that the heart of religion, Christianity included, is less in the formal creeds than in the rituals and attitudes of worship.

Royal W. Rhodes
Kenyon College

True Rites and Maimed Rites: Ritual and Anti-Ritual in Shakespeare and His Age. Eds. Linda Woodbridge and Edward Berry. Champaign, IL: U. of Illinois P, 1992. 303. Notes, index. $44.95 (hardcover) ISBN 0-252-01897-4; $15.95 (paperback) ISBN 0-252-06243-4.

This volume's array of ritual-related articles on Shakespeare is highly readable, not only as a result of its clear print, ample margins, and running headers, etc., but also as a result of the consciously lucid prose in which it is written. Authored by Shakespearean scholars, several of whom have published on ritual previously, the eleven essays describe ways in which Elizabethan rites energize and structure the drama, as well as ways in

which the drama constitutes a ritualized experience for its audiences. If a single thesis could be constructed to fit *True Rites*, it would conceptualize Shakespeare's appropriation of ancient and Elizabethan rituals as a means of diagnosing and dramatizing threats to social stability. These dramatized rituals can at times constitute social order and at other times—as they become empty form—threaten it by offering their practitioners false security.

The Introduction—organized around the tropes of fertility rites, scapegoating, carnival, and rites of passage—refers to many theorists, including Sir James Frazer, the Cambridge Ritualists, C. L. Barber, Arnold van Gennep, Victor Turner, Mary Douglas, Keith Thomas, Mikhail Bakhtin, and René Girard. Consistent with the absorption of recent Shakespearean criticism with structures of Renaissance political power, the Introduction and the essays probe the plays for links between ritual and politics. Although the object of these essays is to investigate ritual and rites in Shakespeare, the goal is often to argue points about the political structures that these rituals belie. Thus the work of New Historicists, such as Stephen Greenblatt, and Feminists, such as Carol Neely, is engaged with that of theorists of ritual.

Taken as a whole, *True Rites* inadvertently raises a methodological question: is it possible in a study of drama to separate ritual from myth? The editors believe it is. The Introduction states that "Except in one essay, myth has been divorced from ritual, suggesting the dissolution of that critical joint stock company Myth-and-Ritual Criticism" (1). (The exception is Jeanne Addison Roberts' "Shakespeare's Maimed Birth Rites," built on the premise that the patriarchal occlusion of the prehistoric Great Goddess bequeathed Shakespeare's society with a reductive view of women which inevitably distorted representations of the birth process.) As I will shortly illustrate, the divorce is not granted. At the same time that the Introduction delimits the focus to ritual, it expands the boundaries of ritual to include discursive forms: "While some of our contributors discuss overtly ceremonial ritual...the majority are more interested in the mental universe of a culture deep dyed in ritual" (29). My question, then, might be modified: is it possible to examine the cultural implications of rituals without including considerations of the relationship between ritual and myth?

To an extent the dissolution of the joint stock company does occur, for the essays refer repeatedly to ritual, rites, and ceremonies, and rarely to well-established myths. Those essays that focus most strictly on ritual clearly demonstrate that ritual is on intimate terms with political practices and the distribution of power. Michael Bristol ("Charivari and Comedy of Abjection...") reads Othello as a dramatization of the ritual of charivari, "a practice of noisy festive abuse in which a community enacted its objection to inappropriate marriages..." (83). Phyllis Gorfain ("Riddling as Ritual Remedy in *Measure for Measure*") understands rid-

dles as a means to "transform external asymmetrical social power into equality" (111). Bruce Young ("Ritual as an Instrument of Grace...") argues that while certain rituals lend themselves as tools of political oppression, the ritual of parental blessing operates as a tool for liberating and empowering family members. And Gillian Murray Kendall ("Ritual and Identity: The Edgar-Edmund Combat...") demonstrates that *King Lear* displays a world in which ritual has lost its power to restore political order.

Most of the remaining essays invoke mythological elements, in one form or another. Sometimes the role of mythology is brief. For example, Michael Neill ("'Feasts Put Down Funerals': Death and Ritual in Renaissance Comedy") attributes the Renaissance mixing of tragic and comic genres in part to the influence of the resurrection myth dramatized by Euripides' *Alcestis* (63-64). Often "myth" is used to refer to Tudor ideology. For example, William C. Carroll ("'The Form of Law': Ritual and Succession in *Richard III*") argues that "From one perspective, it may appear that *Richard III* perfectly enacts the Tudor myth of succession...and yet...even that principle, that 'form of law,' is compromised in the play" (203). Likewise, Deborah Willis ("The Monarch and the Sacred...") concludes that nuances in the ceremonies during which Queen Elizabeth laid her hands on the sick modified the mythical divine right of kings (and queens). Similarly, Linda Woodbridge ("Palisading the Body Politic") labels the central concern of her essay as a "mythology" alleging that "England [is] protected by her saltwater girdle" (280).

At times the mythological elements discovered have more to do with the structure of the plays than with their themes. For example, Naomi Conn Liebler ("The Mockery King of Snow...") argues that *Richard II* demythologizes the illusory difference that the play itself sets up between the villain Richard and the hero Bolingbroke. Finally, Shakespeare's treatment of history is described as a form of mythography. Mark Rose ("Conjuring Caesar...") states that through *Julius Caesar*, "our knowledge of events is represented in the drama as a magical necessity embedded in history" with the result that "dramatic irony is raised to a metaphysical level and presented as fate" (264).

Myth, then, has a marginal role in *True Rites*, but its presence exemplifies the difficulty of divorcing ritual from myth, at least in literary studies. What makes a divorce plausible is the uniqueness of the period under study. In the highly transitional period of Elizabethan-Jacobean England, ritual—losing its religious mystique—was rapidly being politicized, and myth—partially emptied of its metaphysical significance—was being aestheticized. What makes the divorce of ritual from myth impossible is that their common ancestry in the origins of culture endows them with a shared, but waning, power to stabilize a given society. These implications of myth-ritual relationships are discussed in the latter half of a book which appeared the same year as *True Rites*: René Girard's *A*

Theater of Envy: William Shakespeare (Oxford, 1992). Girard's discussions, emphasizing Shakespeare's intuitions of the origins of cultural order, nicely complement the emphasis of *True Rites* on political negotiations.

Louis Burkhardt
University of Colorado, Boulder

Performance in the Texts of Mallarmé: The Passage from Art to Ritual. Mary Lewis Shaw. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993. 277. $39.50 (hardcover) ISBN 0-271-0807-5.

Mary Lewis Shaw's incisive study, *Performance in the Texts of Mallarmé,* speaks in an appropriately Mallarmé an voice: its style is oblique, its arguments refined and *recherch,* its conclusions illuminating and intriguing. And though the poet shunned the explicative in any form, we can be certain that Mallarmé would have found Shaw's deftly argued expositions to his liking; like the best of Mallarmé, Shaw's book both exasperates and exhilarates.

Despite the book's dense prose and close argumentation, the author's thesis is disarmingly straightforward: she argues in the first few pages of the book "that Mallarmé looked to theatrical performances as a form of ritual" (10), with ritual defined in a temporal and metaphysical context insisting on a "human (or other corporeal/spiritual) presence..." (10). Readily recognizing a fundamental contradiction in her study, the author admits that "it may seem surprising that I should emphasize the importance of temporal and corporeal human presence" in an artist "more concerned with absence" (15) than with presence. She argues that "'absence' is itself evoked as 'presence' by virtue of a syntax that portrays it as the coming into being of an essence..." (15) Thus Shaw denies an apparent contradiction in Symbolist studies in general, by conceiving of "presence-in-absence," a "marriage of contraries," which, with other conflations, namely, "identity-in-difference," "unity-in-duality," and "wholeness-in-fragmentation" form the oppositional language of her critical methodology. But these contradictions, or seeming oppositions, only echo Mallarmé's own appreciation of a *"crainte contradictoire ou souhait de voir trop et pas assez..."* (63).

This last phrase is excerpted from Shaw's discussion of Mallarmé's short essay on dance, a chapter which, like so much of the author's book, contains a wealth of original insights. Discussing the "oxymoronic character of dance," Shaw concludes that "the absence-in-presence of the dancing figure implies a presence-in-absence of the literary text" (53), a conclusion Mallarmé would undoubtedly have embraced. Or again, Shaw reminds us that Mallarmé compared dance to "hieroglyphs" (54), because he

CONTRIBUTORS

ALBERT ALHADEFF is an Associate Professor in the History of Art Department of Fine Arts, University of Colorado at Boulder. He is author of "Minne and Meunier: Subterranean Visions and the Blue Summits of the Soul," (*Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts*, 1989), "The Great Awakening: le milieu belge," (*Arts Magazine* 1980), "George Minne, Narcissism and Symbolist Sculpture," *Studies in Western Art, Acts of the XXII International Congress of the History of Art*, and "George Minne, Maeterlinck's fin de siècle Illustrator," *Annales de la Fondation Maurice Maeterlinck*,1986.

BOBBY C. ALEXANDER teaches in the School of Social Sciences at the University of Texas at Dallas. His most recent book is *Televangelism Reconsidered: Ritual in the Search for Human Community* (Scholars Press 1994).

ALEXANDER H. BOLYANATZ is a Lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at the University of California, San Diego, and an Anthropology Consultant for the Summer Institute of Linguistics. His fieldwork among Sursurunga speakers on New Ireland, Papua New Guinea has thus far produced "Legitimacy, Coercion and Leadership Among the Sursurunga of Southern New Ireland," *Ethnology*, 1994.

GUY L. BECK teaches at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. A specialist in Hinduism, is is also a professional musicologist, with music degrees from Bangya Sangit Parishad in Calcutta and Syracuse University, as well as the Ph.D. in Religious Studies from Syracuse. Professor Beck is a classically trained concert pianist as well as a performer of Hindustani vocal music. His current projects include translations of Sanskrit and Bengali hymns and research into North Indian temple music. His book *Sonic Theology: Hinduism and Sacred Sound* was published in 1993 by the University of South Carolina Press.

LOUIS BURKHARDT currently teaches and designs courses for the University of Colorado at Boulder. His dissertation is on the Elizabethan playhouse as a locus of ritual and desire.

ROBERT F. CAMPANY is a specialist in Chinese religions and the method and theory of the cross-cultural study of religion. His forthcoming book, *Chinese Accounts of Anomalies: A Study in Religious Cosmography*, will be published by SUNY Press. He has published "Xunzi and Durkheim as Theorists of Ritual Practice" in Frank Reynolds and David Tracy, eds., *Discourse and Practice* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992).