

events. yet even then we should be careful to have these “insights” designated as hypotheses that deserve to be checked out with the people concerned.

Also, it is clear that each protagonist is offered a number of enactments and that on a given weekend only one, or at the most two, protagonists (“explorers”) will receive the full attention of the group. The desire to act felt by the others who are asked to play supporting roles goes unmet. Nevertheless, it might be of value to some psychodramatists to view another, related (though derivative) approach. Nerin spells out many of his principles (pp. 130–137), but I tend to find them a bit simplistic, although quite noble in intention.

Apparently, this approach has become part of the self-help network associated with such groups as Al-Anon and Adult Children of Alcoholics. There may be a growing network for this synthesis of marathon encounter weekend, psychodrama, Satir’s type of humanistic family therapy, and “personal mythology” work. In the long run, I expect to see more of this in the community, the church, and the general self-help movement. But I am uneasy, in the same way I was uneasy with the explosive growth of the encounter group of the 1970s. Basic principles of therapy and group dynamics were ignored back then (such as failing to have people in conflict role reverse), and I suspect an equal number of principles are being ignored in this work.

Although *Family Reconstruction* is intriguing, I find myself confirmed in my belief that psychodrama is indeed a highly complex process requiring all the training the current certification process demands. However, I am reminded that (a) there are lots of people out there leading psychodramas, sometimes under that name, sometimes by a different name—not that this is anything new; and (b) it is not unlikely that the quality of these enactment processes are several cuts below the standards of practice in our field.

My strategy is to encourage such practitioners not to call their craft psychodrama (which, thankfully, this author does not do) but to go on to learn about psychodrama, especially its underlying principles. I would be interested in readers’ ideas regarding the best way to cope with this inevitable dilution of our craft.

ADAM BLATNER
Austin, Texas

Persona and Performance: The Meaning of Role in Drama, Therapy, and Everyday Life. (1993). Robert J. Landy. 278 pp. Hardcover, \$23.95.
Available from Guilford Publications, Inc., 72 Spring St., NY 10012.

This book is relevant for psychodramatists as well as drama therapists because it deepens and extends the theoretical foundations of role theory,

which lies at the basis of psychodramatic work. The author is the director of the graduate drama-therapy program at New York University, one of two such programs in the United States, and is an eminent leader in his field and the author of previous books on drama therapy.

Landy explores the varieties of roles, using allusions to theatrical roles or those derived from myths and fairy tales. Most of these references would be familiar to any educated person, but a fair number require some acquaintance with the literature of the theater.

After an overview of the origins of the role concept and its developmental psychology, Landy explain his "role method," which involves his having patients imagine themselves in various roles derived from the cultural conserve of stories in which they are able to improvise and explore those roles as metaphors for aspects of their own dynamics. It is an approach that would seem to require a fair amount of intelligence and at least a moderate degree of imaginativeness and spontaneity. The middle part of the book presents an example of his work with one young man over an extended period of time.

Landy then finishes the book by presenting his taxonomy of a wide range of social roles. This descriptive approach seems closer to the work of the social psychologists, and although it may give psychodramatists an overview, it is more aimed at offering drama therapists or dramatists a listing and description of the variety of available characters.

I had a number of minor concerns: The book omitted reference to a fair number of workers in the area of role theory, ranging from George Kelly's "personal construct theory" to the classical texts by Bruce Biddle. Landy's ideas about archetypes being somewhat equivalent to role types is, in my opinion, an inadequate reading of the numinous, mysterious, and somewhat more primal nature of archetypes. For example, the father archetype, which expresses a sociobiological instinct along with its associated imagery, can be expressed in a wide range of social roles that function as vehicles for this archetype—supervisor, teacher, model, governor, policeman, and so forth. (Of course, other archetypes often affect these roles, also.)

I thought the author also misunderstood Moreno in several aspects: First, as a matter of fact, Moreno was not specially trained in psychiatry. He was a general physician with special interests in philosophy, social reform, and the revitalization of the function of theater in culture. It was out of his experiments with the Theatre of Spontaneity and after he came to the United States in the late 1920s that he began to increase his work in the general area of psychiatry. And even then, Moreno never confined himself to this more conventional socioeconomic role of psychotherapist—he always maintained that his work applied far beyond the context of the medical model.

Even more significant, I think Landy's appreciation of Moreno's contribution to role theory misses its real essence: The psyche functions simultane-

ously on multiple levels, and its ability to be helped to play the “meta-roles” of “co-director” or participant-observer of its own activity allows the person to become liberated from the cultural conserve or personal habits that defined his or her roles (Blatner, 1991).

Thus, *Persona and Performance* may serve as a useful supplement in the library of the psychodramatist, but it cannot be said to be either comprehensive or definitive in presenting the kinds of theoretical material that explains how psychodrama operates. It is more adapted to his own method of drama therapy, which, it should be noted, is not the only approach in this relatively recent field (Emunah, 1994).

Psychodrama and drama therapy have areas of overlap and also ways that they are distinct. Yet each can be informed by the other. The literature in drama therapy belongs also in the library of training programs in psychodrama, and I would suggest that the training of drama therapists should incorporate more use of the literature in the field of psychodrama.

REFERENCES

- Blatner, A. (1991). Role dynamics. *Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama & Sociometry*, 44, 33–40.
- Emunah, R. (1994). *Acting for real: Drama therapy theory and practice*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

ADAM BLATNER
Austin, Texas