

Zambrano experimentó con respecto a Unamuno. María Zambrano reconoce esta deuda en numerosas ocasiones. Por ejemplo, se refiere a Unamuno como “padre antes que nada” (107); o recuerda a Unamuno y Machado al mismo nivel que la figura paterna de Blas Zambrano: “y vi a los tres como tres altas torres” (199).

Por esta razón, *Unamuno* invita además a revisar la relación de María Zambrano con su maestro Ortega y Gasset. Se trata de un asunto que recientemente ha empezado a ser planteado por los zambranistas. Si bien es cierto que María Zambrano mantuvo durante toda su trayectoria una relación de respeto intelectual hacia la figura de su maestro Ortega, también lo es que tal relación no estuvo exenta de fisuras. El volumen *Unamuno* brinda reunidas las reflexiones de María Zambrano sobre una figura que, en más ocasiones de las que se ha creído hasta ahora, sirvió de contrapunto ante el peso del maestro Ortega. Sin duda alguna, la “pasión de paternidad perdurable” (107) de Unamuno sobre María Zambrano ha de ser considerada con más detenimiento en los próximos años. Como se deja leer entre líneas en *Unamuno*, acaso María Zambrano no haya sido tan orteguiana como hasta ahora se ha pensado. No en vano ella misma reivindica, desde las primeras líneas de este volumen, “que sea permitido y aun exigido el escribir sobre Unamuno” (29).

Goretti Ramírez

Universidad Concordia. Montreal, Canadá

LONDON, John, ed. *Theatre under the Nazis*. Manchester-New York: Manchester University Press, 2000. 356 pp. (ISBN: 0-7190-5991-7)

This is not a conference volume though the six essays have the uneven feel of one, but a collection of essays organised and edited by John London. It is not a revisionist apology for Nazi theatre but an attempt to offer a differentiated and accurate picture by analysing individual aspects in detail. It seems apposite to deal with the chapters one by one.

William Niven examines the *Thing-play* (*Thingspiel*), which was singled out in 1933 in the regime's first flush enthusiasm as the *genre* for official promotion. The *Thing* is recorded by Tacitus as an open-air assembly at which the Germanic tribes took collective decisions, and Carl Niessen, a theatre historian, coined the term *Thing-play* for large-scale, open air pageants which essentially revived the Communist *Massenfestspiel* that had flourished briefly in the Weimar Republic. *Thing*-plays were designed to raise the “national-moral” consciousness, and associations were formed to provide the huge casts. An example such as Richard Euringer's *German Passion* vilified the Weimar Republic as a Communist-Jewish-pacifist-liberal conspiracy with all the ecstatic assertiveness of Expressionism. 15 outdoor arenas (*Thingplätze*) were built by 1935. Berlin's had a capacity of 24500. Exorbitant costs and poor quality scripts soon caused misgivings, and Niven speculates that the uncontrolled tub-thumping at these mass events may have seemed subversive once the re-

gime was firmly established. In October 1935 it was forbidden to associate the NSDAP with the *Thing*-play. This Nazi genre, if not stillborn, had died in infancy.

Glen Gadberry's survey of "The Historical Plays of the Third Reich" is a catalogue of dire material. Reich dramaturg Rainer Schlösser's 1934 pronouncement that any historical subject could be renewed by exposure to the light of the regime's "natural and legitimate myth of blood and honour" generated a veritable flood of costume plays (*Historienstücke*), historical dramas (*geschichtliche Dramen*) and history plays (*historische Schauspiele*). For Gadberry the history play is the most significant. In theory it identified the present and future in the past and elevated its subject matter in ideological, politically militant style into the "super-real" realm of national socialist understanding. Predictably no significant play was written within this remit. Gadberry analyses Hanns Johst's popular *Thomas Paine* as the prototype. He looks at several pot-boilers with British subjects, Mirko Jelusich's *Oliver Cromwell*, and Gerhard Aichinger's *Kleinod in Silbersee gefasst*, which he mistranslates as *Jewel fetched from the Silver Sea*, failing to recognise the famous line from *Richard II*. Some French plays with French subjects (*Richelieu*, *Marie Charlotte Corday*) and some with German ones are briefly summarised. Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* was apparently widely performed until the tyrannicide theme became too hot in 1941 and Goebbels personally banned it. Gadberry takes contemporary reviews at face value and concludes that these history plays were embedded in the classical repertoire and "performed with commitment, style, and substance fully in tune with the traditions of twentieth-century German stage art". This might have been the place to engage with the views of Kortner or Brecht on that subject.

For Erik Levi the case of opera exemplifies the ambiguities and contradictions of cultural policies in the Third Reich. Richard Strauss is on or off depending on whether his librettist is Jewish (Zweig) or half-Jewish (Hofmannsthal). In the beginning there were orchestrated demonstrations of the kind that drove Kurt Weill's *Silverlake* off the stage shortly after its successful premiere, but this strident anti-modernism should not obscure the fact that the financial crisis of 1929 had curtailed the modern repertoire long before Hitler came to power, and the retreat from modernism is comparable in France, Switzerland and the U.S. in the Nazi years. Mozart and Wagner were annexed for Nazi purposes, in the former's case largely with a view to replacing da Ponte's degenerate Jewish libretti. Wagner became the spiritual godfather of Nazism. Siegfried was presented as Young Germany, sweeping aside the bourgeois-Marxist state, while Hagen slipped into the role of stab-in-the-back Weimar politician. Levi indicates the difficulty of assessing successful new works by Orff, Egk or Gerster. Does Nazi approval mean that theirs are Nazi works, especially in the light of their continued post-war success in East and West Germany? Levi's carefully differentiated assessment has many illustrative examples.

From September 22 1933 Jews were excluded from membership of the *Kammer* (chambers) which controlled theatre, film, radio, music, literature, the visual arts and the press. This made Jewish personnel unemployable in the "Arianized" theatre.

The *Jüdischer Kulturbund* (Jewish Cultural League, 1933-1944) was set up in Berlin with branches in Hamburg, the Ruhr, Silesia, etc., and provided alternative work. Where previous research has focused on the status of the *Kulturbund*, either as a Nazi placebo or an act of Jewish self-assertion, Rebecca Rovit uses archival evidence and interviews with surviving participants to build up a picture of its activities and achievements. She illustrates the workings of censorship from correspondence between Kurt Singer, head of the *Kulturbund*, and *Reichsdramaturg*-Rainer Schlösser, and shows that the parameters for the Jewish theatre were immeasurably tighter than for German theatre. Jews were banned from performing any play by an author of German or Austrian descent. Plays were submitted for advance approval, and Rovit shows that the censor's decisions were erratic and occasionally inscrutable. *Die Jagd Gottes* by Emil Bernhard, the first play that Singer submitted, showed a Jewish village terrorised by Cossacks. The censor overlooked the ideologically reprehensible Jewish "messianism" of the piece, but banned it because of the probable inference that the Cossacks represented the Nazis. A scene between Perdita and Polixenes in *The Winter's Tale* was banned because their metaphorical discussion of horticultural grafting conflicted with Nazi notions of racial purity. Rovit's conclusions are cautious. In the recollection of performers the *Kulturbund* theatre was a haven, not a ghetto, and the evidence is that its productions did affect its audiences. It was, she concludes, a constant challenge to both Jews and Nazis.

John London shows that the European repertoire enshrined in Goethe's concept of "world literature" continued to be performed, though a good German now had to be judicious in his choice of foreigners. Shakespeare was the most frequently performed dramatist after Schiller, and London examines the controversy surrounding Hans Rothe's modernised translations which were banned by Goebbels in 1936 in an act of reverence for the established Schlegel-Tieck versions. Spanish Golden Age drama was cultivated, with Lope de Vega, in whose case modernisation was actively encouraged, preferred to Calderón. The great character actor Heinrich George starred in a celebrated production of *The Mayor of Zalamea* that chimed nicely with Nazi notions of *Blut und Boden* and popular justice. Italy received positive discrimination with productions of Mussolini's *Hundred Days* and *Villafanica*. Goldoni was Nazi Germany's favourite Italian, while Pirandello, who had been prominent in the Weimar Republic, languished. G. B. Shaw, the Irish playwright was a favourite of both Goebbels and Hitler. The latter rated *St Joan* above Schiller's *Maid of Orleans* because Shaw was able to "see history and expose it". French plays were banned, with the occasional exception of Molière.

Characteristically it was a German priority to set up a network of theatres in the countries they occupied. William Abbey and Katherina Havekamp give a succinct survey of these, which ranged from *Fronttheater* for the troops to requisitioned theatres with full German companies in assimilated areas like Poland, Czechoslovakia or Alsace-Lorraine. These served the local German-speaking population as well as the forces. Lille lay in a military enclave from 1940 to 1945 and its theatre was gro-

omed to be the centrepiece of the German cultural programme in France. Its director dealt directly with Goebbels and Schlösser and it was generously funded by the army, the Propaganda Ministry and the city of Lille. It was effectively a *Stadttheater* which offered drama, opera, operetta and dance, and in its three years staged 3889 performances, touring all over Belgium and northern France. Abbey and Havekamp consider its failure to reach the local population to be a serious weakness.

This informative volume has an extensive bibliography.

Hugh Rorrison
Edimburgo

EGIDO, Aurora, y María del Carmen MARÍN PINA, coords. *Baltasar Gracián: estado de la cuestión y nuevas perspectivas*. Zaragoza: Gobierno de Aragón, Departamento de cultura y Turismo, Instituto Fernando el Católico, Excma. Diputación de Zaragoza, 2001. 229 pp. (ISBN: 84-7820-640-x)

En los últimos años las publicaciones en torno a Baltasar Gracián han crecido enormemente. Para no perderse se hacía necesaria una recapitulación y una evaluación como la que ofrece el volumen coordinado por Aurora Egido y María Carmen Marín. Fruto de una labor colectiva, las distintas secciones responden al título y nos ofrecen el estado de la cuestión sobre la vida y cada una de las obras de Gracián, incluyendo una bibliografía final a la que remiten todos los capítulos, y recordando o abriendo también nuevos campos necesitados de estudio, en especial el de las ediciones críticas.

El capítulo primero, a cargo de Jorge M. Ayala, sobre la vida de Gracián, muestra las variaciones que ha experimentado la imagen del escritor aragonés en los tres siglos y medio desde su muerte, resaltando los hallazgos documentales de Adolfo Coster y Miguel Batllori. El capítulo pasa revista a la "imagen" de Gracián, primero en España, después en Francia y Alemania. Entre las contribuciones del "gracianismo" moderno se destacan sobre todo las biografías de Miguel Romera-Navarro, Evaristo Correa Calderón y Miguel Batllori, sin olvidar a Ricardo del Arco y Gavas, Benito Pelegrín, Constancio Eguía Ruiz y, recientemente, las investigaciones de Belén Boloqui Larraza, que desvelan la existencia real del hermano de Baltasar, Lorenzo Gracián.

El capítulo dedicado a la primera obra de Gracián, *El Héroe*, el "libro enano" con el que espera formar "un varón gigante", corresponde a M^a Carmen Marín Pina. A pesar de gozar de numerosas ediciones y traducciones dentro y fuera de España, *El Héroe* ha recibido escasa atención crítica y apenas cuenta con estudios específicos.

En este nuevo espejo manual o tratado político-moral se plasman las nociones grecorromanas sobre el concepto de héroe, pero siempre con una visión práctica de la sabiduría, según han destacado Aurora Egido y Elena Cantarino.

La crítica ha abordado la obra desde perspectivas muy variadas: como reflejo de los saberes de la Antigüedad, en conexión con la agudeza de ingenio, con la teoría moderna del individuo, como interpretación de las relaciones humanas en términos