

Editorial

The editorial board of *Platform* was particularly curious as to the sort of submissions that this issue of the journal would receive. The last two issues have been themed (“Theatres of Resistance” and “Receiving Reception”), and we were interested to see whether an open issue would hold the same appeal to contributors. We’re happy to say that the result is an exciting cross-section of new scholarship. The contributors to this issue come from various disciplinary backgrounds, make use of different critical perspectives, and deal with a diverse range of subjects. What they have in common, however, is a genuinely original take on their various topics. In each case, the authors approach familiar areas of inquiry in ways that shed light on old issues and raise new and intriguing questions.

In Theron Schmidt’s article “Richard Maxwell and the Paradox of Theatre,” the author takes a close look at the “emotionally detached” acting style that characterises Maxwell’s productions. Through a highly articulate, thoughtful, and above all penetrating analysis of the plays themselves and of Maxwell’s own commentary on the productions, Schmidt argues that rather than acting as commentary on fiction and reality, the New York City Player’s performance style instead serves as a living metaphor for the act of acting itself.

Neema Parvini, on the other hand, takes a much more literary approach to the reception of N.F. Simpson’s productions. Through a close reading of Simpson’s works and a comparative analysis of Simpson and his contemporaries, Parvini argues that Simpson’s writings have been given short critical shrift by scholars and reviewers who insist on categorizing his work as either “Absurdist” or belonging to the “Comedy of Menace.” For Parvini, the question of the plays’ genre is far less relevant than the social commentary that he sees as central to Simpson’s work.

Mary Daily and Dani Abulhawa each take very different approaches to the concept of performance. Daily’s article on mascot performance both considers the origins of familiar sports icons such as Baldwin, the Boston College Eagle, and deconstructs their contemporary performance from a materialist perspective. Drawing heavily on Marx, Daily illustrates the fetishized nature of the modern mascot, and points out the commodification of the performers who enact the mascot role. Abulhawa’s article, by contrast, examines the performative nature of skateboarding through a feminist lens. Conceptualising the marginal position of female skateboarders as an “edgeland” that is neither mainstream nor fully integrated into the skateboarding subculture, she uses Judith Butler’s theories of gender construction as a way of beginning to approach and understand the “performance” of the female boarder.

Natalia Theodoridou’s article moves us into the theatre of Classical Greece. Combining modern queer theories with traditional approaches to the study of Classical literature, Theodoridou offers a new take on cross-dressing in Euripides’ *Bacchae*. Using an approach that is similar, in many ways, to those of the other contributors, Theodoridou argues for a reading of the *Bacchae* as a play which acts as a critique of the society and institution that produced it.

Finally, Steph Harrop’s article on her practice-based research into Ezra Pound’s version of the *Trachiniae* challenges dominant notions of both the translator and the text, suggesting a much more dynamic relationship between the actor and her script. Through a combination of approaches that include an analysis of the translation itself and a

thorough examination of Pound's writings on the topic of translation, Harrop argues for a performance practice that makes use of both the words and the layout of the translation to motivate the choreography of a performance.

All the articles engage with, and challenge, existing scholarship while also offering new approaches to the topic they undertake. Each piece is a passionate and enthusiastic effort to reexamine not only the specific subject, but also the critical perspectives that have hitherto been used in such examinations. Cumulatively, these papers represent the perspectives of a new generation of scholars determined to both learn from and to question the work that has been done in the past.

As ever, the editors would like to thank the Department of Drama and Theatre at Royal Holloway, the University of Plymouth Press, Routledge, Intellect Books, and all of the peer and academic reviewers who have helped to bring this issue together.

Rachel Clements and Jim Ellison
(Issue Editors)