

`THERE'S SCARCE A THING BUT IS BOTH LOVED AND
LOATHED': *THE CHANGELING* I.i.91-129

One of the most striking occurrences in the early scenes of Middleton and Rowley's *The Changeling* is Beatrice's extraordinarily vehement reaction to her father's servant, De Flores. Let us briefly consider what leads up to her first attack on him.

Alsemero has already fallen in love with Beatrice when the play starts, and he cancels his planned trip to Malta as a result. Beatrice, more unusually, thinks of him as 'the man was meant me' (I.i.84)¹ even though only five days before she had agreed to become betrothed to Alonzo de Piracquo. Alsemero and Beatrice are presented as besotted with each other when we first see them together in I.i, and Alsemero's friend Jasperino decides he might as well forget about further travel and instead try to seduce Beatrice's waiting-woman Diaphanta. It is at this sexually charged moment that De Flores enters.

De Flores addresses Beatrice with 'Lady, your father –', obviously intending to say more, but is immediately interrupted by Beatrice with the words 'Is in health I hope' (I.i.91). From De Flores's aside a little later (99-106) it seems clear that he tries to get physically close to Beatrice as often as he can, but when we hear Beatrice's 'Is in health I hope' we do not, as an audience, know anything other than that De Flores appears to be offering perfectly reasonable information to Beatrice about her father, Vermandero. Beatrice's interruption seems rude and quite beside the point. De Flores answers with 'Your eye shall instantly instruct you lady. / He's coming hitherward' (93-4).

This answer does not need to be interpreted as indicating anything negative about De Flores. He may, in effect, be saying: 'He is indeed in fine condition, as you yourself can verify when he comes here in a moment – in fact, I was trying to tell you of his imminent arrival'. There is no evidence that Vermandero actually instructed De Flores to announce his coming, but the audience may readily see the servant as helpful, both to Vermandero and Beatrice, in doing so. Yet Beatrice reacts with

What needed then
Your duteous preface? I had rather
He had come unexpected: you must stall
A good presence with unnecessary blabbing,
And how welcome for your part you are
I'm sure you know. (94-9)

¹ We quote throughout from Joost Daalder's New Mermaids edition of Thomas Middleton and William Rowley, *The Changeling* (London and New York, 1990, repr. 1997).

The predominant point of Beatrice's speech appears to be that she wants to make it abundantly plain to De Flores that his presence is *not* welcome to her; indeed, she implies that he should know as much by now.

What is not clear is just why he is so unwelcome. Later, Beatrice repeatedly blames his face. A theatre audience can see from De Flores's first entrance that his face is marred by a skin condition, something which leads Beatrice to refer to him as a 'standing toad-pool' in II.i.58.² When, towards the end of the play, Beatrice admits explicitly, though only to herself, that she loves him, she still expresses distaste for his face: 'His face loathes one, / But look upon his care, who would not love him?' (V.i.70-1). There are indications, however, that it is not just the physical ugliness of De Flores's face which puts her off. De Flores, who often proves himself to be an excellent analyst, says that she 'At no hand can abide the sight of me, / As if danger or ill luck hung in my looks' (II.i.35-6), which Beatrice appears to confirm in an aside a little later: 'This ominous, ill-faced fellow more disturbs me / Than all my other passions' (II.i.53-4).

It is thus tempting to explain Beatrice's revulsion as caused by De Flores's face, and not just by her distaste for the skin condition but, beyond that, by a sense on her part that somehow his loathsome face spells disaster to her. And so, the course of events in the play makes clear, it does. It is not, of course, as though he would have harmed her in any case: we know that she herself sets the tragic events in motion by hiring him as an assassin. But this does not mean that her fear of him is unjustified. As she puts it in one of her last speeches: 'My loathing / Was prophet to the rest, but ne'er believed' (V.iii.156-7). Despite her use of the passive voice, as though *someone else* should have believed her loathing (a locution which is so expressive of her divided nature), we can for ourselves acknowledge that *she* should have acted on her misgivings. This remains so even if we see her loathing as partly caused by an unconscious realization on her part that what she reacts to in De Flores is not only his own evil but some sort of representation, or mirror, of her own.

We can be sure that it is not just his face which she hates. If that were the case, De Flores's reaction to her 'how welcome for your part you are / I'm sure you know' (I.i.98-9) would make little sense. He says in an aside:

Will't never mend, this scorn,
One side nor other? Must I be enjoined
To follow still whilst she flies from me? Well,
Fates, do your worst; I'll please myself with sight
Of her, at all opportunities,
If but to spite her anger. I know she had
Rather see me dead than living — and yet
She knows no cause for't but a peevish will. (99-106)

² It is intriguing to speculate on the cause of this skin problem. It may be due to syphilis, as Daalder suggests in his 'Note to the Fifth Impression (1995)', which is included in the 5th and 6th impressions of his edition on p. viii. There is no reason for believing, however, that Beatrice is aware of the cause, whatever it may be.

In line 100, 'One side nor other' is a very interesting phrase. Daalder comments in his edition: 'on the one side or the other (probably: because either she stops scorning me or I stop creating that attitude in her)'. There is more to be said. 'One side nor other' suggests an extraordinarily close connection between De Flores and Beatrice. De Flores goes on to expand on the idea of an inextricable link when he says: 'Must I be enjoined / To follow still whilst she flies from me?' (100-1). Superficially, this looks like a simple description of De Flores's own compulsion, but the phrase implies something more. In 'To follow still whilst she flies', *whilst* hints that the following and the fleeing are mutually dependent actions; and *still* gives a picture of the following and fleeing continuing interminably. Perhaps *enjoined*, too, in the previous line, develops an expectation of some powerful bond between Beatrice and De Flores. Within the bounds of the sentence, then, the future lovers are seen to be joined intrinsically, caught forever in a process of reaction and counter-reaction. As well, De Flores's sense that Beatrice's scorn may never mend 'One side nor other' may imply that her apparent loathing of him has part of its cause on her side, i.e. in her mind or nature. He appears to realize, even if not quite articulately, that her scorn is in part 'internal', within Beatrice – is something which it is not in his power to remove, no matter what he does.

Yet De Flores's discernment extends beyond even this. He seems to recognize, or at least sense, that Beatrice's problem is that she loathes him without knowing why. He says: 'I know she had / Rather see me dead than living – and yet / She knows no cause for't but a peevish will' (104-6). Daalder's gloss on line 106 is solely concerned with Beatrice's 'peevish' will – as though, if only we can grasp the exact meanings and implications of that difficult adjective, we may also discover just what inspires Beatrice's loathing. Yet, however important the word 'peevish' is here, what is ultimately more interesting and significant is that De Flores says 'She *knows* no cause for't but a peevish will' (our emphasis). Curiously, De Flores almost speaks as though he is Beatrice's father-confessor or psychiatrist – as though she has told him what, in her conscious mind, motivates her to loathe him, even though what she 'knows' does not provide an adequate explanation. There seems a hint here (present in the language used by the dramatists even if not necessarily intended by De Flores) that there is another reason, which Beatrice does *not* know. There is, apparently, an obscure – perhaps unconscious – reason why, at least on the surface, Beatrice detests De Flores. We are not yet made aware what that reason may be, but we *are* made aware that it exists. 'She *knows* no cause for't' sounds a small alarm bell, alerts our suspicions about Beatrice, and directs our attention to the evidently important question of what the heroine of this play does and does not know. Beatrice, De Flores asserts, does not *know* what moves her to hate him (other than a 'peevish will'), but that she does display hatred towards him is beyond doubt, and there *is* a reason for it, even if she is ignorant of its nature.

The notion that there is a reason for Beatrice's seeming hatred which remains unknown to the woman herself also steers the audience toward the possibility that all is not what it seems: that perhaps Beatrice does not en-

tirely hate De Flores, and that somehow her lack of knowledge of her motivation makes her hatred less than complete. Even Alsemero is obviously surprised by her strange outburst in lines 94-9, saying : 'You seemed displeased, lady, on the sudden' (107).

The evidence so far does not allow an onlooker or reader to come to the firm conclusion that Beatrice's visible, conscious loathing is in some way, or to some extent, a manifestation of unconscious love. Nevertheless, even Beatrice herself is puzzled by her vehement conscious reaction to De Flores, as her next speech to Alsemero makes plain:

Your pardon, sir; 'tis my infirmity.
Nor can I other reason render you
Than his or hers, or some particular thing
They must abandon as a deadly poison
Which to a thousand other tastes were wholesome.
Such to mine eyes is that same fellow there,
The same that report speaks of, the basilisk. (108-14)

Beatrice's explanation that her displeasure is – or is due to – her 'infirmity' (108) points in the direction of something seemingly quite different from what she asserts in her later, oft-repeated claims, viz. that it is just De Flores's face which she hates. Here, she confesses that she cannot give Alsemero any reason for her loathing other than some ill-defined sense that to her De Flores is like a 'deadly poison' (111), even though to others his presence might be 'wholesome' (112). Although there is a reference to the effect of De Flores's face in her mention of 'the basilisk' (114), the most significant thing in this speech is her conscious admission that De Flores's impact on her is mysterious, and perhaps to be explained as merely evidence of an 'infirmity'.

A complacent spectator or reader might at this point go along with Beatrice's conscious thought process, and conclude that her reaction to De Flores is simply the result of an irrational aversion. A more thoughtful person would, nevertheless, wonder why it is that *she* is so strongly affected by him even if others are not: later, we find unambiguous proof that her conscious loathing is closely bound up with unconscious desire, although we never discover why Diaphanta, for example, is not fascinated by De Flores. On the surface, Beatrice's unusual dislike of De Flores seems a little like an allergy. That is how it is seen by Arthur L. Little in a recent discussion,³ and that is how Alsemero sees it too. The rather innocent Alsemero's view is that there is nothing abnormal about Beatrice's reaction:

This is a frequent frailty in our nature.
There's scarce a man amongst a thousand found
But hath his imperfection: one distastes
The scent of roses, which to infinites
Most pleasing is, and odoriferous;

³ "Transshaped" women: virginity and hysteria in *The Changeling*, in James Redmond, ed., *Madness in Drama* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 27.

One oil, the enemy of poison;
Another wine, the cheerer of the heart
And lively refresher of the countenance.
Indeed this fault, if so it be, is general:
There's scarce a thing but is both loved and loathed.
Myself, I must confess, have the same frailty. (115-125)

Beatrice then asks:

And what might be your poison, sir? I am bold with you.

To which Alsemero replies:

What might be your desire perhaps: a cherry. (126-7)

Little takes it⁴ that De Flores leaves the scene after line 106 (which does not actually happen: he is still on stage at I.i.223, when Beatrice drops her glove), after which

the conversation between Beatrice and Alsemero changes into the subject of health and illness, and Beatrice speaks of DeFlores as her 'infirmity' and 'deadly poison' [108, 111]. And once Alsemero pontificates on the commonness of man and woman's allergic imperfections [115-251, admitting to his own allergic reactions to cherries [127], he and Beatrice betray their entanglement in physical sexuality. Their dispositions are seemingly the same: both are allergic to sexual things. The sexual nature of Beatrice's allergy to DeFlores is scripted into DeFlores's name which refers either to 'defloration' or more pointedly to 'deflowerer'. Alsemero focuses his sexual infirmity on cherries.^[a] His allergy to sexuality is further accentuated by his choosing aphrodisiac objects, when he casually and extemporaneously tries to name some of the allergic imperfections found in the population more generally [117-22]. His sexual subtext is The Song of Songs: 'O that you would kiss me with the kisses of your mouth! For your love is better than wine, your anointing oils are fragrant, your name is oil poured out; / therefore the maidens love you' and 'I am a rose of Sharon, a lily of the valleys. / As a lily among brambles so is my love among maidens' (1.1-2, 2.1-2). The Song (as subtext or intertext) betrays the sexual underpinnings of the conversation here between Beatrice and Alsemero.^[b]

^[a] On the subject of cherries, A.R. Braunmuller has referred me to Thomas Dekker, John Ford, Rowley et al., *The Witch of Edmonton* (1623): 'Well, I'll have a witch. I have loved a witch ever since I played at cherry-pit', *Three Jacobean Witchcraft Plays*, ed. Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1986), III, I, 18-19. It has been suggested that there is the possibility of a connection between 'cherry' and female genitalia, because in the child's game known as 'cherry-pit' the 'cherry-pit' was the name given to the hole in which the pits were tossed. See Thisbe's line to Pyramus in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 'My cherry lips have often kiss'd thy stones' (V, i, 192), which plays with images of sexual intercourse and oral sex – the former is relevant to my argument here: *The Signet Classic Shakespeare edition*, ed. Wolfgang Clemen (New York and London: New American Library, 1963). Also see

⁴ The lengthy quotation which follows is from Little, p. 27. We designate his two footnotes in this passage, which we quote, as ^[a] and ^[b] to avoid confusion with our own footnotes. Little quotes *The Changeling* from N.W. Bawcutt's Revels edition (London, 1958; repr. Manchester, 1975). As the line numbers in Bawcutt's edition are not identical to those in Daalder's, we have for the sake of convenience substituted Daalder's line numbers (within square brackets) for Bawcutt's.

`cherry-pit' in *OED* and *Webster's Third International Dictionary*. The latter defines `cherry' as hymen and virginity, def. 5.

^[b] The New Oxford Annotated Bible, Revised Standard Version, 1973. The Song of Songs may also be considered an appropriate choice for Alsemero, since the physical eroticism of the Song is often marginalized by or made secondary to more allegorical exegeses. Such allegorizing conveniently allows Alsemero to talk about/through sexuality without ever really naming the subject itself.

Little produces a great deal of value here, both in the quoted passage itself and in the two footnotes (^[a] and ^[b]), but we believe that his material can be put to more effective and precise use than he has yet done. In our view, the dramatists have a far more sophisticated understanding of what Beatrice and Alsemero say than the speakers themselves. Beatrice does seem to have some vague sense that De Flores is like a poison to her, but rather than relating this to anything specific within him or her, she reflects that she is, to use Little's language, merely `allergic' to De Flores. He is, for some obscure reason, a `deadly poison' (111) to *her*, but might well be `wholesome' (112) to a thousand other tastes. Alsemero elaborates on this idea. There is nothing peculiar about being allergic to something, he assures her: some people are allergic to e.g. roses, which are most pleasing to others, and so on. He himself, it turns out, is allergic to cherries.

Little's reference to The Song of Songs seems to us apposite. We are doubtful that the naive Alsemero himself can be supposed to have that in mind when referring to roses, oil, and wine. Like Little, however, we do think that these objects are not only allergenic to some (though not to others), but are also, at the same time, `aphrodisiac objects'; the dramatists presumably use the language of The Song of Songs to establish that association in our – the audience's – minds. In hearing Alsemero's speech, a Renaissance audience would have recalled The Song of Songs more readily than a modern one. For that matter, spectators of the period could have thought of roses, oil, and wine as sexual even without any recollection of The Song of Songs. Gordon Williams, in his extensive dictionary of sexual language, shows in great detail that to a Renaissance audience a rose quite commonly signified something sexual, as (1) `the flower of sexuality', (2) an image for `maidenhead', and (3) an image for `whore'. `Oil', he demonstrates, was often used for `semen' or `vaginal emission'. Wine was frequently alluded to as an aphrodisiac.⁵ To us, it seems that the dramatists present *Alsemero* as speaking about allergies, while *the audience* is meant to become aware of sexual implications in his speech. There is a profound reason for this. The dramatists are less interested in using Alsemero to make unintended sexual jokes than in making us aware of the fact that he is *unconsciously* speaking about aphrodisiac objects. The ironic discrepancy between what he is consciously thinking about and

⁵ See `rose', `oil', and `wine', in Gordon Williams, *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespearean and Stuart Literature*, 3 vols. (London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1994).

what he unconsciously reveals reaches its most telling manifestation when he says that what is his poison is exactly what might be Beatrice's desire: 'a cherry' (127). In the note on line 127 in his edition, Daalder designated the cherry as 'sexy'. Little's note ^[a] provides further information about the sexual implications, although we are still not convinced that, in 1622, the word could be taken to refer to 'hymen' or 'virginity'. Gordon Williams lists 'cherry' as an image for 'sexual organ'. His examples make plain that it could be thought of as male or female. It could also refer, he says, to a woman's nipple.

But why is an audience entitled to think of words like 'roses', 'oil', 'wine', and 'cherry' as alluding to sexual matters here? We suggest that this is a matter of dramatic context, the scene being so constructed that sex is never far from the audience's mind. At the beginning of the play, in his very first speech (I.i.1-12), Alsemero already thought of Beatrice as Eve, the centuries-old archetypal temptress. Not much later we see him greeting Beatrice with a kiss. Jasperino remarks on the apparent change in his sexually-naive friend :

How now! the laws of the Medes are changed, sure!
Salute a woman? He kisses too. Wonderful! Where learnt
he this? And does it perfectly too; in my conscience, he ne'er
rehearsed it before. (i.i.57-60)

Such touches make us aware that Alsemero is going through a process of sexual development which involves profound and even baffling change ('the laws of the Medes' were supposedly immutable; cf. Daniel 6:8), in a way which is only partly conscious. He is sexually inexperienced,⁶ and afraid of sex, but also drawn to it. At the same time he is powerfully attracted to Beatrice. Jasperino, for his part, is sexually aroused by Diaphanta (II.89-91). De Flores, too, soon after he enters, reveals his sense that he is forced to follow Beatrice while she tries to avoid him. We can see the intensity of his sexual feeling for her well before his name is first mentioned in line 224, when Vermandero urges De Flores to pick up the glove which Beatrice has dropped.

It is at that later point that a spectator or reader is likely to begin entertaining serious intellectual suspicions that Beatrice has an unconscious sexual interest in De Flores. But Beatrice's initial reaction to him and her subsequent conversation with Alsemero already reveal more than has commonly been assumed. When Alsemero pontificates (to use Little's expression) on people's allergies, in response to Beatrice's expressed distaste for De Flores, we know he is doing this as someone attracted to her. Similarly, we know that Beatrice's strong reaction to De Flores does not merely spring from some vague 'infirmity' (108), as she avers. We are aware that De Flores is sexually drawn to her, and even at the most innocuous level it is natural for us to wonder if her loathing for him is connected with that fact. At first most of

⁶ Jasperino points out in I.i.36-9: 'Lover I'm sure y'are none, the stoic was / Found in you long ago; your mother nor / Best friends, who have set snares of beauty (ay, / And choice ones, too) could never trap you that way.'

us probably think of her as finding him physically off-putting, and as not 'welcome' (98), because she does not like his sexually-based attentions. But this also means that we quite readily come to think of the language as sexually charged. It is thus not fanciful to think of Alsemero's images of roses etc. as sexual, so long as we realize that this does not mean that Alsemero *himself* is drawing attention to their sexual nature. On the contrary, the dramatists are doing this, and by implication calling attention to Alsemero's naivety.⁷ When Alsemero says that his 'poison' is a 'cherry' what matters is not so much that we try to identify very precisely just what sexual sense that word has but that we acknowledge that, in addition to its literal sense, it does have sexual connotations, and that *Alsemero is not aware of that second, sexual sense*.

In short, then, Alsemero thinks he is simply talking about a stone fruit, but in the sexually charged context of this scene, the dramatists imply, we are to see his concern with cherries as an unconscious preoccupation with sex (indeed, it would be not too inaccurate to gloss 'cherry' here as 'sex'). The further implication is that what most people find attractive is something which Alsemero has not yet come to terms with, something he as yet unconsciously resists. His unconscious difficulty with sex seems to be 'translated', so to speak, into a conscious dislike of the stone fruit that he *thinks* he is talking about. It is not that he is not consciously attracted to Beatrice; we have seen that he is. But the whole process of sexual initiation frightens him – in ways that are not wholly within the compass of his conscious mind.

The same buried anxiety seems to underlie the words with which he opens the play:

'Twas in the temple where I first beheld her,
And now again the same. What omen yet
Follows of that? (I.i.1-3)

Later, when Alsemero discovers Beatrice's evil, he says: "'Twas in my fears at first' (V.iii.76). We might think that he means there that *she* (i.e. the evil which he intuitively senses in her) frightened him, and that sense is not excluded, but Alsemero himself speaks of the potent impact of 'blood and beauty' which sparked off his mistaken devotion for her (V.iii.74). With hindsight,

⁷ We are well aware that not all critics share our view of Alsemero as sexually naive, though we feel that the evidence clearly presents him that way. Later in the play, Beatrice is no doubt quite mistaken when she thinks of him as a 'wise man' and a 'cunning gamester' (IV.i.10,17) in relation to the matter of virginity. Marjorie Garber, in 'The insincerity of women', Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan and Peter Stallybrass, eds., *Subject and Object in English Renaissance Culture* (Cambridge, 1996) – concurs with Beatrice's judgement (p. 351) without paying attention to the dramatists' portrayal of Alsemero early in the play. When Alsemero says of glass M, used in the virginity test, that 'It has that secret virtue it ne'er missed, sir, / Upon a virgin' (IV.ii.139-40) it is unlikely that he is even pretending to speak about his own encounters with virgins, though Garber refers to his 'vaunted experience and knowledge' (p. 352).

he feels that he should have listened to the intuitive voice which told him that a sexual liaison with her would harm him.

The most important line in Alsemero's speech about allergies is, we believe, 'There's scarce a thing but is both loved and loathed', which is tellingly followed by 'Myself, I must confess, have the same frailty' (I.i.124-5). From Alsemero's point of view, these lines perhaps mean: 'There is hardly anything which does not have the property of inspiring love in some people, yet, in those who are allergic to it, it may cause the opposite effect, namely loathing. I must confess that I, too, have my allergy to a particular thing'. But 'There's scarce a thing but is both loved and loathed' can have quite a different sense which, unbeknownst to Alsemero, is in fact the more revealing one, viz. 'There's scarce a thing which cannot be loved and loathed by the same person'. The frailty which Alsemero confesses to having is no doubt in that case to be taken, by the audience, as referring to his *unconscious* 'allergy' to sex, symbolized by the cherry which he loathes. Yet at a *conscious* level he loves sex: Jasperino has informed us not long before that Alsemero was kissing Beatrice 'perfectly' (I.i.59) by way of greeting, and he does not show himself sexually inhibited on his wedding night.

Alsemero also raises the possibility that a cherry may at the same time be Beatrice's 'desire' (127). This suggests (though he does not intend it to) that what *he* unconsciously loathes, i.e. sex, is what *she* unconsciously desires. And that reading of course fits the situation very exactly. Consciously, Alsemero displays sexual love towards Beatrice while unconsciously he is afraid of her, or at least of her sexual impact. With Beatrice's feelings for De Flores matters are the other way round. Again, sex is 'both loved and loathed'. She loathes De Flores at a conscious level, as her speeches in this scene have made very plain. But unconsciously she desires her cherry. Consciously, she says in response to Alsemero:

I am no enemy to any creature
My memory has but yon gentleman. (128-9)

In other words, on the surface De Flores is her 'poison'. She consciously resists his impact, but unconsciously she is drawn to him as though to a 'cherry'. The strength of his appeal is the greater precisely because it *is* unconscious: in Freudian terms, she 'represses' it, but it cannot go away, and overwhelms her with the more force.⁸ As she does not understand its nature,

⁸ It is curious that Beatrice seems to be quite capable of acknowledging her appetite for Alsemero. Even when she has had, and is continuing to have, sex with De Flores, she is still sufficiently attracted to Alsemero to reflect, when her substitute Diaphanta is just about to sleep with Alsemero on her wedding night: 'My woman's preparing yonder / For her sweet voyage, which grieves me to lose' (IV.ii.122-3). This curious statement suggests that at a conscious level she is fully ready to admit sexual interest in Alsemero, but not in De Flores. Presumably her feeling for Alsemero strikes her as natural and proper, while the ugly (and socially inferior) De Flores sparks off a more evil, bestial kind of longing which is much stronger than what she can feel for Alsemero but which she finds it impossible to admit to her conscious mind.

it continues to harm her even after she and De Flores embark on a sexual relationship. Her misunderstanding of her feelings for him is all too pathetically plain quite late in the play when she says of De Flores: 'His face loathes one, / But look upon his care, who would not love him?' (V.i.70-1). The idea that she loves him because of his 'care' seems like a pure rationalization.

'There's scarce a thing but is both loved and loathed'. That ringing, alliterative phrase, 'loved and loathed', touches on the familiar notion that love and hate are intimately related and even interchangeable. Beatrice and Alsemero think, wrongly, of love and loathing as two quite distinct feelings. The dramatists, however, draw attention to the connection between the two, and delineate that connection as something that we moderns would describe in Freudian terms: while the one feeling is in the conscious mind, its connected opposite is in the unconscious. And it is the resulting tension which so much of the play presents and explores with rare power and insight.

Flinders University of South Australia
Kyoto University, Japan

JOOST DAALDER
ANTONY TELFORD MOORE