

5. Of the 180 works by Jakobson that Ross lists in the Appendix (435–453), all of six (3%) had Jewish themes (11)—as many as Spanish-themed works—and until the 1960s, his unfamiliarity with Jewish traditions is also quite evident (e.g., 61–2, 205, 210–1).

6. Of course, “archiving” in this sense contradicts Taylor’s definition in *The Archive and the Repertoire* (2003), making one wonder to what purpose Ross (2015, 423) cites this theory.

7. Ross’s claim that Jakobson was a “modernist” has been popular for decades, as evinced by Solomon Volkov’s *St. Petersburg: A Cultural History* (1995, esp. 506).

Zvezdochkin, Valeriy. 2007. *Tvorchestvo Leonida Yakobsona* [*The Creativity of Leonid Jakobson*]. Sankt Peterburg: Sankt-Peterburgskiy gumanitarniy universitet profsoyuzov.

Dramaturgy in the Making: A User’s Guide for Theatre Practitioners

by Katalin Trencsényi. 2015. London: Bloomsbury Publishing. 326 pp., notes, select bibliography, index. \$91.99 cloth, ISBN: 9781472576750; \$29.93 paper, ISBN: 9781408155653. doi:10.1017/S0149767717000250

Works Cited

- Croft, Claire. 2009. “Ballet Nations: The New York City Ballet’s 1962 US State Department-Sponsored Tour of the Soviet Union.” *Theatre Journal* 61(3): 421–442.
- Figes, Orlando. 2002. *Natasha’s Dance*. New York: Picador.
- Pinkus, Benjamin. 1984. *The Soviet Government and the Jews, 1948–1967: A Documented Study*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Plisetskaya, Maya. 2001. *I, Maya Plisetskaya*. Translated by Antonina W. Bouis. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Souritz, Elizabeth. 1990. *Soviet Choreographers in the 1920s*. Translated by Lynn Visson, edited by Sally Baner. London: Dance Books.
- Swift, Mary Grace. 1968. *The Art of the Dance in the U.S.S.R.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Taylor, Diana. 2003. *The Archive and the Repertoire*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Vidal, Fernando. 2003. “Contextual Biography and the Evolving Systems Approach to Creativity.” *Creativity Research Journal* 15 (1): 73–82.
- Volkov, Solomon. 1995. *St. Petersburg: A Cultural History*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Winkler, Martin M. 2007. “Introduction.” In *Spartacus: Film and History*, edited by Martin M. Winkler (1–13). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zozulina, Nataliya. 2010. *Teatr Leonida Yakobsona* [*The Theater of Leonid Jakobson*]. Sankt Peterburg: Liki Rossiy.

The relationship between dance and dramaturgy is not a new phenomenon, but it has received nascent attention and conversation in the United States in the past decade as evidenced through examples such as the *TDR/The Drama Review* documented collaboration between scholar Susan Manning and choreographer Reggie Wilson on Wilson’s most recent work, *Moses(es)* (Manning 2015), forums such as Chicago Dancemakers’ *Cultural Conversations: Dance + Dramaturgy* (May 9, 2015), and Society of Dance History Scholar’s 2011 conference entitled *Dance Dramaturgy: Catalyst, Perspective, and Memory*. Despite this growing dialogue, much mystique remains in place for dance dramaturgy because of dramaturgy’s origins in theater and dramatic text. How does one act as dramaturg for dance? Furthermore, does dance need a dramaturg? This latter question is one that Katalin Trencsényi attempts to answer in her book *Dramaturgy in the Making: A User’s Guide for Theatre Practitioners*. Although the book’s primary emphasis is on theater, dance is the subject of its own section. In addition, the depth and breadth of case studies can serve a dance practitioner or scholar in thinking across a variety of contexts, from traditional to more experimental practices.

Trencsényi is a seasoned freelance dramaturg working in London. The book is foregrounded as a manual, hence its title. However, while Trencsényi generally follows the four-step process developed by dramaturg Mira Rafalowicz when describing her dramaturgical case studies, she is concerned less with defining the role of a dramaturg than in thinking about how the work of the dramaturg has functioned historically and in the present. The book employs

a comparative methodology using case studies supported by textual analysis, factual evidence, and theater and performance theories. This allows the book to work in multiple ways: it provides a history of the development of the dramaturg from institutional settings to inside the rehearsal room, gives voice to a breadth of current practitioners, and provides case studies of the processes of specific dramaturgical projects in different contexts. This approach of what it *looks like* rather than what it *is* allows the reader to see how the work of the dramaturg has unfolded not only temporally but spatially as well.

Due to this focus, there are considerations of the work of dramaturgy that do not necessarily correlate to a strict role or title, for example, artistic director, literary manager, critic, or curator. As such, this framework is less concerned with the bearer of the role and more focused on how the work of dramaturgy transpires. *Dramaturgy in the Making* is divided into three sections: institutional dramaturgy, production dramaturgy, and dance dramaturgy. Each section consists of several chapters that provide historical and theoretical overviews of particular practices as well as detailed case studies from the field. In this way the book moves between history, theory, and practice, with Trencsényi providing synthesis and analysis.

Although broad in scope, geographically the work is limited mainly to a European/North American context. There are, however, notable moments of cross-cultural examinations. In particular, the section on dance highlights the work of Akram Khan with his dramaturg Ruth Little; the work of Denise Fujiwara and Natsu Nakajima is discussed in relation to dramaturg Elizabeth Langley. These examples, although not explicitly focused on examining cross-cultural exchange, allow space to think about the hybridization of forms and the divergent ways dramaturgs can serve both process and end product.

Trencsényi follows the development of Akram Khan's 2011 solo *DESH*, which moves between Britain and Bangladesh and explores identity, land, and home. This case study reveals the process through which the work was developed. For instance, Khan spends a considerable amount of time on research and development, and set choreography is not often implemented until the final stage of the process. Little served as both observer and participant, offering

feedback and keeping Khan on task in considering the role and use of text and language. Notable is the fact that Khan took the whole creative team to Bangladesh to conduct on-site research with each individual spending time collecting, gathering, and researching the environment before reconvening and sharing findings. This case study provides a lens through which to consider how the dance-making process stretches beyond the actual choreography, examining the labor that takes place to inform choreographic and production-based choices as well. This procedurally focused lens highlights the minutiae of the creative process, but also foregrounds what kinds of development and research can occur across a span of time with the ample resources of an institutional company structure, which is not always prevalent in the lives of many contemporary choreographers.

Although not set up as such, the solo work, *Sumida River*, set on Denise Fujiwara by Natsu Nakajima, serves as a potent contrast to Khan's process and the philosophies of their respective dramaturgs. This case study highlights a product-led approach to dance dramaturgy as Elizabeth Langley, a seasoned dancer and educator, eschews the insertion of the dramaturg into the creative process and instead prefers to focus on refining the end result. Nakajima set the work of *Sumida River* onto Fujiwara in 1994, but the work took five years to further develop for performance. The process of learning the work was challenging for Fujiwara in part due to the pedagogical approach by Japan-based butoh choreographer Natsu Nakajima as well as due to the cross-cultural challenges between their philosophies of performance. Langley likens herself to a "life coach" summarizing her personal philosophy as such: "hands off the content and the choreography but hands on those underpinning elements that create potency in every single moment" (251). She worked with Fujiwara to deconstruct and reconstruct the choreography while also serving as a type of liaison. Through Langley's understanding of the source material of the solo as well as her awareness of the difficulties Fujiwara was encountering in this cross-cultural exchange, Langley was able to ask questions and refine material that strengthened Fujiwara's performance appeasing both dancer and choreographer.

The historical sections on dance dramaturgy offer two views of the development of

the practice and role. The first chapter considers the development of the philosophy and poetics of choreography. Trencsényi traces from Lucian of Samosata's *On Dance*, which compares and contrasts pantomime dancing, to postclassical tragedy in the second century AD. Trencsényi then provides a truncated history through the royal courts of Italy all the way to American modern dance and the writings of Doris Humphrey. She culminates here, perhaps assuming the reader will have knowledge of postmodern dance and the ways in which that specific lineage feeds into current conceptions of dance dramaturgy. However, she picks up aspects of that lineage as she considers the development of collaboration in movement-based work in the following chapter. This is seen through the first official role of dance dramaturgy as evidenced in Pina Bausch's *Tanztheater*, the collaborative work of Merce Cunningham and John Cage, and the critical writing of Jill Johnston alongside the work of Judson Dance pioneers. This further demonstrates how the *work* of dramaturgy transpires through a variety of contexts and has laid the groundwork for current practices.

On the other end of the spectrum is Trencsényi's consideration of the role of institutional dramaturgy. In this context the dramaturgical work serves not only the director or playwright at hand but additionally institutional spaces and repertoires. The reader can see how the work of dramaturgy moves across and within varying hierarchies in mainly national theater spaces. Trencsényi's trajectory of the work of the dramaturg moves not only linearly in terms of time, but spatially as well. Trencsényi refers to this as micro versus macro dramaturgy.

Particular consideration is given to the role of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and Brecht and the development of German theater. Probably less familiar to dance audiences, Lessing, in his role as critic-turned-insider, shows the close kinship between criticism and the development of Western theater. His attuned eye as a critic assisted the development of not only what was seen on stage, but of German drama as a whole through the establishment of Hamburg National Theater. In a more contemporary context, the variety of roles that comprise present-day theater spaces showcase the macro-dramaturgy

Trencsényi refers to. The confluence of institutional roles such as producer, curator, literary manager, and artistic director highlights how the *work* of dramaturgy happens beyond the scope of the stage when considering how repertory for a theater is established as well as the relationship between theater spaces and their respective audiences. Here, Trencsényi provides both case studies and anecdotal information to trace the varying ways these roles work as a type of dramaturgy mainly in the context of national theater spaces.

Trencsényi returns to one of the book's driving questions, namely, why does dance need a dramaturg? Her answer is that dance does not need a dramaturg per se, but benefits from the role and presence of a dramaturg in the rehearsal room. She states, "Choreographers don't 'need' dramaturgs; they don't lack something they don't have. Yet the dramaturg's presence in the room and their 'difference' (from the rest of the makers) can offer a dialogue relationship that can prove indispensable for the creative process" (257). For Trencsényi, one central component of dramaturgy is that it is dependent and comprised of relationships (between directors, choreographers, audiences, and dancers). Trencsényi suggests that dramaturgy forms and shifts in relationship to how artistic spaces and practices develop over time. Her frameworks serve those seeking an understanding of how dramaturgical work occurs as well as those who seek to understand the ways in which dramaturgical labor produces performance works, affects institutions, and informs the landscape of theater presentation today.

Randi Evans

University of California, Berkeley

Works Cited

- Chicago Dancemakers Forum. 2015. *Cultural Conversations: Dance + Dramaturgy*, May 9. Available at: <http://seechicagodance.com/event/cultural-conversations-dance-dramaturgy-presented-chicago-dancemakers-forum>.
- Manning, Susan. 2015. "On Reggie Wilson and *Moses(es)*." *The Drama Review (Special Issue)* 59 (1): 12–60.