Theatre audiences engage uniquely with performance and that engagement is inextricably linked to memory. Memory in turn exercises power over the audience and how the relationship between performers/performance and spectator can be understood. Helen Freshwater, in her examination of the discourse relating to theatre audiences presents two challenges with regard to memory: "the tendency to confuse individual and group response" and "the persistent circulation of exaggerated and unsubstantiated claims about the theatre's influence and impact."[1] The discourse Freshwater examines also encounters the power of memory present when we read about performance. Writing and reading about performance as embodied gestures of an extended audience can then be performative in itself. Performance reviews serve as an example of performative embodied gestures that create audience primarily with the memory of the reviewer, coupled with the cultural forms Freshwater highlights. Looking at reviews from a recent publication of *Theatre Journal*, we see reviewers create phantom audiences with their writing by using stereotypes, and the juxtaposition of the witnessed performance with what is considered "other."

*Theatre Journal* editor Jen Parker-Starbuck opens the 68:1 issue with a note that dwells on instances of forgetting. In addition to the "narratives of forgetting" in this journal issue, the reviews included deliberately look to "when forgetting can mean exclusion, or oversight, when forgetting can allow you to bracket off ways of thinking. When what has been forgotten can be richly remembered."[2] Paul Connerton's scholarship on the various modes of forgetting refers to one type as "structural amnesia." He explains that particular structural conventions—like those present in the theatre—require a form of forgetting by virtue of how they are organized and exercised.[3] Parker-Starbuck seems to be acknowledging this amnesia and provoking more memory-creation in this journal issue. The performance reviewers whose work is included illustrate not only how audiences collectively forget and collectively remember, but also how a single author can present a review *as* collective.

Marvin Carlson's pursuit of how theatre "utilizes the recycling of material to encourage particular structures of reception in its potential audiences" and the frequently observed idea of what Schechner has termed "twice-behaved behavior" are active within the performance review.[4] Just as the live performance is, as Carlson puts it, "haunted" by

the preexisting dramatic text and previous performances, so the performance review is "haunted" by the memories assumed to be held collective, yet flowing from the reviewer's pen. A difference between looking at live performance versus a review is that review readers often have little or no knowledge or memory of the preexisting performances, whereas Carlson notes how audiences usually come to a performance with some sort of relationship to the preexisting text. Diana Taylor illustrates these assumptions about audience reception, claiming that "[t]o say something *is* a performance amounts to an ontological affirmation, though a thoroughly localized one," and that, "[w]hat one society considers a performance might be a nonevent elsewhere."[5] The performance review, then, as a post-existing text, must create for itself a knowing audience. The haunting in performance reviews is different than Carlson's iteration because the phantom audiences created by performance reviews are not ghosts of the past, but of the present. In addition to focusing on the sense of return the productions have themselves, writing about performance evokes a sense of stasis—of where we are now in this moment—in the form of an audience that both does and does not exist.

Audience as a product rather than participant, or even producer, can be understood as tangential to the production of memory. A difference between memory production and audience production that is easily recognizable is that memory has been more recently understood to be archived, whereas audiences themselves are understood to retain their ephemerality. The detritus of performance has been analyzed as a critical component in the archive of memory, but not so for audience creation. Matthew Reason states that, "in the discourses surrounding live performance, ideas of disappearance and transience mark one set of recurring imagery, but they are accompanied by a mirroring, complementary yet contradictory, discourse of documentation."[6] In other words, as the performance creates memory, the memory keeps the performance alive. The performance review in this process is the logical extension (and in its own way, detritus) of an informed audience member's memory.

It is the next step that remains to be examined. I argue that reviews create phantom audiences which in turn start a parallel cycle to actual memory creation that involves opinions and feelings that may or may not have actually existed as a reaction to the performance. My term "phantom audience" refers to what is created by the reviewer

and reader during the process of writing, exporting and "consuming" the review. In order to perform a review, the reviewer must make claims not only about what they saw in a performance, but what the audience as a whole witnessed. Unable to embody the diversity of an entire audience, the reviewer must claim authority by assuming they have it already. As a piece of archival information, a performance review could claim a certain amount of authority itself; and yet, the reader encounters only a single witness's account in a performance review. The scarcity of memory documentation of that particular performance puts greater weight on the review's influence. Given the power a review has as a particular archival memory mechanism, it ends up creating a phantom audience—an invisible presence of perception that both can and does not exist. Some of the assumptions a reviewer makes could be true, but the reader is unable to confirm the assumptions. In this way, the review conjures an audience, and therefore an audience memory, in order to perform its role as an authoritative memory archive.

Reviews create audiences that simultaneously never existed and always existed. They are phantom audiences. A phantom audience can reinforce or denounce the performance being discussed in order to allow for easier associations for the reader. Performance review readers of *Theatre Journal* are a particularly delimited audience themselves and require access to phantom audiences they can recognize in order to relate to the performance being described.

One of the reviewers included here, William Boles, creates a phantom audience by defining it in contrast to himself. When explaining a play that was performed as a video game, he states that, "the technical components of the production favored a younger generation which is more accustomed to the multitasking involved in experiencing a production like this one."[7] The phantom audience created with his statement is privileged, Western and younger. Diana Taylor, in her look at memory as cultural practice, investigates the Mestizaje as a microcosm that demonstrates how memories are "transmitted from one generation to another through performative practices that include (among other things) ritual, bodily and linguistic practices."[8] Boles, too, emphasizes this generational gifting by claiming to be of a previous transmission. We know this was not completely true for the production Boles attended, since he affirms he is older and was there. However, by claiming to know the audience for whom the piece

was intended, the performance review is haunted by a non-existent audience formed through extreme notions founded in personal assumptions and binary oppositions.

Within the text of the review, a reviewer often voices assumptions that there is a shared cultural consciousness around the performance topic or execution. This audience-consciousness has a limited range for response because of the reviewer's own limitations. For example, the term "twenty-first century audience" is often connected to a perspective influenced by more liberal political ideas. This in and of itself may not color a review that speaks to aesthetic concerns with a production's lighting choices, but it could greatly impact a review about the performance of gender in a production of a play about homosexuality.

The performance reviews I analyze share a particular interest in forgetting and in how today's audience should be reacting to the specific production being reviewed. This is understandable, since a performance review is often seen as an extension of the audience who cannot be there. The language used to distinguish the twenty-first century perceptions creates a phantom twenty-first century audience by laying claim to a collective memory and consciousness that is carried into the theatre or other performance space. The authors of these reviews write with assumptions about what "twenty-first century audience" means and layer those meanings in their summaries and commentary.

As an example of this phenomenon, Aaron Thomas, in his review of a production of a new opera set during the American Civil War entitled *Crossing,* claims that the opera's composer "makes a plea for the continued influence of the seemingly dusty theatrical form of opera on twenty-first-century theatre."[9] He ends by saying that the subsequent ovation at the close of the performance he attended proved the audience agreed that opera "was not dead."[10] Mirroring his argument about the Civil War's continued influence, he wishes to make the same claim for opera by using the fact that a twenty-first century audience was present and appeared to enjoy the performance. Thomas initially insinuates that the twenty-first century audience is one that does not value opera, but uses his single data point of applause to prove the opposite. Thomas's treatment yields at least two phantom audiences that then haunt his text. One phantom audience is utopic in its appreciation of what Thomas dubs a lost art. The other sees little worth in opera. These audiences both do and do not exist in that there is some basis for

the opera-hating stereotype Thomas is using and yet the audience of which he was a part did not appear to fit into that stereotype.

Thomas emphasizes how the opera "attempts to situate the ongoing effects of that conflict [the American Civil War] on our lives."[11] This statement highlights the assumption that the audience present for the event was comprised of United States citizens who share a common history, memory and reaction to that war. Thomas continues to investigate the dichotomy he sees the opera making "between the present-day United States and our complex, war-torn past."[12] By evoking a collective association between the audience and the Civil War, Thomas is creating new memory about how we will continue to remember that historial period.

Just as performance, according to Taylor, "constitutes the methodological lens that enables scholars to analyze events *as* performance," I argue we use the same lens for analyzing reviews.[13] Even without any specific connection to a setting or period, we are given an understanding, or memory, of the happenings by how they are treated theatrically. This understanding is analogous to a performance reception. Thomas's review of *Crossing*, therefore, colors not only what we associate with the production, but also what we associate with opera and the Civil War itself. Using phrases such as "how might beauty win over despair?" Thomas is reminding us—even those of us who have never attended an opera—what we supposedly love about the genre.[14] By engaging with the question of how today's audience can relate to our "war-torn past," he underlines for the reader what we need to continue to associate with war—that it tears, that it rips, that it diminishes and that we must come out of it on the other side, better.

Another example that highlights the assumptions made about a twenty-first century audience is Sean Bartley's review of a new interpretation of *Oklahoma.* Bartley connects the daring changes that were made for the performance of a well-known piece of musical theatre canon to an imaginary twenty-first century audience who requires newness. Despite the avant-garde nature of the piece, Bartley criticizes some of the changes as missing the mark: "Played in the twenty-first century for an audience that was quite literally placed within the action, the sexual coquetry and euphemism of Hammerstein's scenes often fell away."[15] Speaking for the audience as a whole, Bartley claims they were desensitized to the innuendo and in doing so creates a phantom

audience that were just that and its opposite. Bartley writes into existence opposing phantom audiences just as Thomas's review of *Crossing* voiced assumptions which created disparate audiences on extreme ends of a particular spectrum.

One way to think about the relationship between audience, reviewer and phantom audience is as steps in a distillation process. The performance itself communicates directly to an audience, who distills what they witness into a multiplicity of responses. The interpretation of those responses, influenced by the reviewer's individual response and biases, breaks down the performance into meanings and associations that stem from currently held stereotypes in our contemporary culture. Those meanings and associations are then further condensed into a concentrated version of how an audience *could have* processed the performance.

Another way the performance reviewer creates phantom audiences is by defining what they believe the audience is not. Another play reviewed in this issue is *Hand to God,* the story of a teenage boy and how a puppet uses power from the devil to control him. Kerri Ann Considine writes in her review of *Hand to God* that, "the discomfiting juxtaposition of puppet and puppeteer […] raised important questions about human agency in relation to the more sinister aspects of our nature."[16] Reviews evoke memories and emotions in response to binary juxtapositions such as a well-known American musical done in an unorthodox, minimalist manner or a puppetry performance that confronts the devil's control over humans. Considine uses the jarring juxtaposition of child-like puppets and demons represented in the play to tug on the audience's assumed idea of what it is to wrestle with the evils of humanity. She makes the decision for us that the appearance of innocence is calming, while that which challenges innocence is communally understood by the audience as the opposite.

Susan Kattwinkel, who wrote reviews for three different productions performed at the Spoleto Festival USA, refers to the festival audiences as mostly local people and notes "the contrast of their conservative political and artistic temperaments with the more progressive or international material and styles of the performers."[17]  Though intended as a preface to an explanation of some strong audience responses, this type of statement also creates a divide between the performance artists, painted as being liberal, and the audience, seen as conservative. Kattwinkel is not claiming that the audiences at the

Spoleto Festival were all conservative. However, with her own juxtapositioning of two extreme positions she creates a phantom audience who is entirely conservative.

Contrary to Considine's negative associations with the juxtaposition of opposites, Kattwinkel explains how the Spoleto Festival uses juxtaposition positively to create context for the audiences to understand new and different performance. Kattwinkel also uses juxtaposition by creating an audience-memory that highlights what about the performances was, or is assumed to be, "other." She explains how the *kunqu* performance of *Paradise Interrupted* was, "surrounded by the naturalistic movement of the […] performers and the heavier Western influence of their vocals," making the claim that we as a twenty-first century, Northern American audience should associate heaviness with Western vocality and naturalistic movement from Chinese performance.[18]

The last production Kattwinkel reviews is *Taylor Mac's 24-Decade History of Popular Music* which grants the opportunity to create conservative phantom audiences by juxtaposing Taylor Mac, whose preferred pronoun is judy, with a stereotype of established conservative opinion. Kattwinkel explains how Mac's "'Songs of the American Right' […] gave judy ample opportunity to needle the audience for their (assumed) political views, and to assert both judy's personal politics and judy's knowledge of the development of American political arguments."[19] Kattwinkel goes on to say that "Mac repeated several times that judy's job was not to teach, but to 'remind us of things we have forgotten, repressed, buried or had buried for us.'"[20] Kattwinkel mentions Taylor Mac's solicitation for an assumed, collective audience memory and in doing so she conjures an audience who has such a memory to offer. Both Considine's and Kattwinkel's reviews are examples that illustrate how the text of a performance review creates a phantom audience that haunts in retrospect.

Connerton's seven types of forgetting reminds us of the inherent need to forget in order to perceive performance. One of his modes of forgetting is constitutive in the formation of a new identity and emphasizes "the gain that accrues to those who know how to discard memories that serve no practicable purpose in the management of one's current identity and ongoing purposes."[21] The phantom audience can also be considered a manifestation of a new identity created for the reader—an embodied memory whose gesture evokes memory within the performance review text. Taylor asserts that,

"performances function as vital acts of transfer, transmitting social knowledge, memory, and a sense of identity," and therefore reviews written about those performances provide a snapshot of this transfer.[22] The insinuations, commentary and assumptions written within and between the lines of the reviews provide glimpses at the phantom audiences created, each frozen in context.

Particularly relatable contexts include the recent financial crises across the globe. William Boles writes reviews for two plays that deal with this issue. His reviews create, among others, a First World phantom audience that does not see its own privilege and needs a wake-up call. This audience is created in part when Boles discusses a recurring part of the play, *How to Hold Your Breath,* describing it as a, "not-so-subtle poke at the lazy Western notion of relying upon help from other sources rather than facing a crisis head on through self-determination and strength."[23] Despite the fact that Boles' presence at the two plays refutes that an entire audience such as this existed at the actual event, the review creates another imaginary group of people who make up the phantom audience. Another way to think about what these reviews create is as many separate audiences, each singularly fixated on a particular area of the political/social/class/etc. spectrums.

Acknowledging the racial and class context we live in, Lindsey R. Swindall, who reviewed a production of *American Moor*, agrees with the character in the one-man show when he "point[ed] out that 'people in our culture' have no place for and 'no tools to deal with' a black man who raises his voice."[24] Swindall makes the choice to forefront a claim about "people in our culture," and by doing so is creating an imaginary—and yet all too real—audience who represents the culture of intolerance described. Swindall explains how the actor on stage speaks outwardly to a disembodied voice of a director, commenting that, "having the director seemingly situated within the audience made it feel as though the director's lines might represent conventional ideas about race, as if he spoke on behalf of the masses."[25] Swindall's statements create phantoms that resonate with stereotypes and extreme positions on issues of race. It should also be understood that much like the actual performances, the imaginary audiences created do not operate in a vacuum, but represent intersectionality writ large.

Paul Adolphsen also confronts race in his review on the anti-apartheid play, *Born in the R.S.A.* At the outset of his review he makes sure to state that the original

performance in 1985 featured, "a multiracial cast of young South African actors."[26] Adolphsen implies that the occurrence of multiracial casting was not the norm since at the time of the original production racial classifications would have made it very difficult. He also implies that this is not true today. Adolphsen makes it quite explicit how the performance he witnessed was haunted by the ghost of the original and in so doing he creates a phantom audience with his writing that relishes how progressive things have supposedly become. Adolphsen also evokes progressive feelings with his question, "What is the purpose of resistance theatre once the object of its critique no longer exists or has undergone significant change?"[27] No one would argue that things are the same as they were, but it is the particular words Adolphsen uses and the manner and tone in which he delivers them in his review that creates an imaginary, somewhat self-congratulatory, audience of phantoms who hold similar views on the subject matter of the play. His admittance toward the end of the review distances this phantom audience from what it is not: "through their committed performances, Ntshinga's cast illuminated the daily dance between betrayal and loyalty, culpability and innocence demanded by apartheid's illogic—moves no doubt familiar to South African audiences living in a still largely segregated country."[28] This statement and others in the review voice a comparison that shows what the production's audience was not. Much like Bartley and Kattwinkel, Adolphsen creates more than one phantom audience in the way he describes the actual audience. His statements about the gap between the original Cape Town audience and today's create the space for both to exist.

Theatre, Carlson claims, "provide[s] society with the most tangible records of its attempts to understand its own operations."[29] In this way, performance reviews create for us a figment of an audience whose societal connections are often reduced to extreme stereotype based on the reactionary account of a specifically motivated reviewer. In other words, to whatever degree the reviewer places himself or herself on a spectrum with regards to political position or socio-economical privilege (also of course influenced by class, race, gender, ideology, etc.) such are the phantom audiences fanatically in line with or severely opposed to the same perspectives. This means that there is the potential to create an infinite number of phantom audiences because "like the memory of each individual, [the audience] is also subject to continual adjustment and modification as the

memory is recalled in new circumstances and contexts."[30] Indeed, the very fact of the audience being present at the performance seems to grant the reviewer authority over what that audience feels.

Theatre audience scholar Susan Bennett points out that "if we consider theatre's role in any given cultural system, and then the audience's relationship to both the generally held concept of theatre and to specific theatre products, we are more likely to obtain a fuller comprehension of the production-reception relationship."[31] The context and circumstances the reviewer experiences while writing the review may be decidedly different from what they were during the production or during a reader's read, and the connections to theatre's role also continue to change. All experiences in question can be understood to be in flux.

Sometimes the production itself invites flux, as in Harry Partch's musical event entitled, *Delusion of the Fury: A Ritual of Dream and Delusion*. According to reviewer Matthew Robert Moore, "Partch's orchestration asks us to consider what has been written out of the Western musical tradition, while the absence of language in this deeply meaningful 'dream and delusion' casts doubt on the rational, logocentric values of a dramatic tradition that equally prescribes the limits of contemporary perception."[32] Moore continues to create a Western phantom audience by his frequent references to how the performance challenged or moved away from Western theatrical norms. He writes about aspects such as the "deleterious bias toward conflict that dominates our theatrical history," the "preoccupation of the Western moral drama" and how "both acts […] undermin[ed] the binary, conflict-based reality that Western drama reproduces."[33] Moore creates a world where the performance he witnessed can only be viewed as different from the phantom audience's norm and he claims that the performance "expos[ed] the limitations of our conditioned perception."[34] However, the use of "our" does not draw the reader into the audience at the production, but instead creates a new "them" who feels those limitations more deeply since they are described and shaped by so few words.

Moore's collective "our" is a good example of a reviewer's attempt at making an audience of their readers. Readers recognize and acknowledge moves like these as being inclusive. Phantom audiences on the other hand are perceived unconsciously as a repetition in the same way that performances are haunted by past performances. Readers

align or distance themselves from this or that phantom audience in how they choose to relate to the performance being reviewed. As scholars like Taylor and Carlson use the haunting of performance to explain how theatrical *composition* is conditioned, the phantom audiences that haunt the performance review show how theatrical *reception* is conditioned. We are dependent upon the distillation process of performance reviewing to understand how to witness and process as an audience. Phantom audiences are products of reviews that must exist in order for us to realize and acknowledge our supportive position in the process.

Performances in nontraditional spaces such as *The Glas Nocturne*, performed in the directors' home and witnessed by ten spectators, tend to challenge this process. In her review of the play, Jeanmarie Higgins notes several times how the production used "the power of domestic objects to summon the dead."[35] The intimate space of a home conjures a multitude of associations for a reader who was not present for the production. While the effect for the actual audience, according to Higgins, was to provide "simultaneously homelike and foreign experiences," the home descriptions narrow the meanings of "home" and "foreign."[36] This review situates the phantom audience in a Western and developed nation. In addition, the "hailing of the dead onto the stage space," while described as one of the foreign aspects of the performance, could be understood very differently by cultures that keep the dead in their homes as a part of their tradition. For them, death may feel more familiar rather than its antithesis, as Higgins seems to suggest is the normal reception. As such, Higgin's treatment of the performance in her review situates the phantom audience very specifically, thereby reinforcing Western privilege and perspective.

Lindsay Brandon Hunter describes another nontraditional performance, *My One Demand*, as one that is "exploring the permeability between a performance and the world in which it takes place."[37] Specifically, the performance included relayed film, in-person performance and live stream online. This merging, while becoming more common, is nevertheless treated by Hunter as still different enough to warrant description of it as an "othered" performance. She says the performance, "did not feature a robust narrative arc; instead the performers told episodic stories of connection or its lack thereof."[38] The review was peppered with proverbial "insteads" that clearly labeled the production as

something different than what might be expected by an audience. Hunter's comments did not admonish the idea of expecting traditional performance, but they seemed to display expectations of their own. Her expectations created both a phantom audience of people ready for anything and one who believes traditional components (i.e., a "robust narrative arc") should be mandatory.

Phantom audiences exist because real audiences exist. Despite the focus in this article on extremes, the multiplicity of phantom audiences created by reviews differ more subtly. I start my approach in this way since it is easier to understand the notion of phantom audiences when we probe more obvious assumptions. The reductive and at times harmful effects of stereotypes that help to form phantom audiences operate in our society for real reasons. In order to navigate and move within our world, we must make assumptions. This look at reviews and the phantom audiences they create is not intended to demonize the process, but only to create another introspective window—or way of knowing—through which we can analyze how it is we choose to perform our role as spectators and scholars. I myself have biases, opinions and expectations that affect the way I approach this very topic of performative reviews. Acknowledging so, I offer this investigation as a springboard for examining how we witness when we are secondary viewers.

The witnessing that is chronicled in performance reviews provides research into how we establish and perform memory for others. Grasping at the wisps of ephemera we have no hope in actually holding, we instead extend our hand with our writing and point to what has been, our finger aimed toward where, when and how that performance took place—not threatened by the disappearance, but reveling in the memory, in order to establish such memory's importance as something worthy of research. The phantom audiences created by performance reviews offer another important look at how we see ourselves, others and how we are all connected. It is essential that we acknowledge these phantoms in order to respect and appreciate spectatorship more holistically.

---

[1] Helen Freshwater, *Theatre and Audience* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 5.

[2] Jen Parker-Starbuck, "Editorial Comment," *Theatre Journal* 68:1 (2016): vii.

[3] Paul Connerton, "Seven Types of Forgetting," *Memory Studies* (2008): 64.

[4] Marvin Carlson, *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre as Memory Machine* (University of Michigan Press, 2003), 16.

[5] Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Duke University Press, 2003), 3.

[6] Matthew Reason, "Archive or Memory? The Detritus of Live Performance," *New Theatre Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (2003): 83.

[7] William C. Boles, "Performance Review: How to Hold your Breath; Game," *Theatre Journal* 68, no 1 (2016): 107.

[8] Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire,* 108.

[9] Aaron C. Thomas, "Performance Review: Crossing," *Theatre Journal* 68, no 1 (2016): 96-97.

[10] Ibid., 97.

[11] Ibid., 95.

[12] Ibid., 95.

[13] Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire,* 3.

[14] Thomas, "Crossing," 96.

[15] Sean Bartley, "Performance Review: Oklahoma!," *Theatre Journal* 68:1 (2016): 98.

[16] Kerri Ann Considine, "Performance Review: Hand to God," *Theatre Journal* 68:1 (2016): 103.

[17] Susan Kattwinkel, "Performance Review: Paradise Interrupted; Romeo and Juliet; Taylor Mac's 24-Decade History of Popular Music: Songs of the American Right," *Theatre Journal* 68, no.1 (2016): 100.

[18] Ibid., 101.

[19] Ibid., 102.

[20] Ibid., 102-103.

[21] Connerton, "Seven Types of Forgetting," 63.

[22] Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire,* 3-4.

[23] Boles, "Breath, Game," 106.

[24] Lindsey R. Swindall, "Performance Review: American Moor," *Theatre Journal* 68, no.1 (2016): 108.

[25] Ibid., 109.

[26] Paul Adolphsen, "Performance Review: Born in the R.S.A.," *Theatre Journal* 68, no 1 (2016): 109.

[27] Ibid., 109.

[28] Ibid., 111.

[29] Carlson, *The Haunted Stage*, 2.

[30] Ibid.,

[31] Susan Bennett, *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 93.

[32] Matthew Robert Moore, "Performance Review: Delusion of the Fury: A Ritual of Dream and Delusion," *Theatre Journal* 68, no 1 (2016): 112.

[33] Moore, "Delusion of the Fury," 112-113.

[34] Ibid., 114.

[35] Jeanmarie Higgins, "Performance Review: The Glas Nocturne," *Theatre Journal* 68, no 1 (2016): 115.

[36] Ibid., 114.

[37] Lindsay Brandon Hunter, "Performance Review: My One Demand," *Theatre Journal* 68, no 1 (2016): 117.

[38] Ibid., 116.