Beyond loquaciousness: *Arcadia*'s dramatic efficiency

For Tom Stoppard, “drama is an event”\(^1\), which seems a paradoxical statement when one considers the conspicuous amount of text in *Arcadia*, a comedy of ideas. How do complex scientific arguments become entertaining? How does language become a dramatic event? This paper means to question whether the play's volubility restrains dramatic efficiency and entertainment.

In *Arcadia*, the naturalistic convention of socio-political fiction and a psychological plot, the old linear unfolding of events, have been supplanted by complex scientific debates on algorithms, iteration and thermodynamics. The ingredients are served with an artful dramatic structure swinging between the present (1993) and the early nineteenth century. They are seasoned with an almost detective investigation on Byron’s romantic biography, on a distracted Hermit roaming the Arcadian gardens of Sidley Park one hundred and eighty years before. Can an emotional response be expected from the audience beyond intellectual gratification and the relief of elaborate humour? We shall first survey the play's various components, which require rhetorical density from subject matter to dramatic structure via orderly chaos. We will then look for clues inside the text that make the clues which make the performance dramatic beyond verbal prolixity.

**Bulky material for a talkative play.**

Why do the various subject matters imply rhetorical abundance? In *Arcadia*, complex scientific topics, a detective story plot and the double time period are three interrelated constituents, which require clear argumentation. It is challenging to sum up *Arcadia* as it implies explaining the cryptic mathematical riddles, which beset thirteen-year old Thomasina, one of the main characters of the 1809 plot. The young prodigy is apt to articulate her intuitions on Fermat’s last theorem, and to engage on iterated algorithm demonstration —today known as fractal geometry— before embarking on a provisional illustration of the second law of thermodynamics. And yet, *Arcadia* is no lecture on recondite mathematics. The young lady's unexpected remark which opens the play clearly indicates that geometry is not her first preoccupation: “Septimus, what is carnal embrace?” (*Arcadia*, p. 4\(^2\)).

The scientific substance, in *Arcadia*, is wittily interrupted by intervals on love dallying, which make the intellectual matter more palatable. Geometry and physics are part of a complex network of romantic speculation discussed alternately by the Sidley Park inhabitants and the present time characters. A detective story strategy is at work, hinging on the alternate use of several techniques: urgent query, interruption, delay, incompleteness. The whole process implies ample verbal exposition for semantic clarity.

Let us take an example of overlapping subjects: in scene one, hardly has Fermat’s last theorem been hinted at than Thomasina branches out onto the Rice Pudding reflection (an illustration of the Second Law of Thermodynamics), itself inducing a comment on Newton’s law. But those observations are no sooner addressed than they are interrupted by more urgent preoccupations: Chater’s discovery of his wife’s adultery launches out a new inquiry on the melodramatic tryst, itself interrupted by Lady Croom bursting in with her “troops” (p. 20) about the landscape gardening revolution. Thomasina’s initial maths problem is only resumed a hundred pages later at the end of the play, in the final scene (scene 7 p. 106) before the crowning waltzing and kissing
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scene with Septimus. Left puzzled at the beginning of the play over Thomasina's research, the audience is offered the first lengthy mathematical demonstration half through the play (pp. 58-66) exposed in the form of a didactic Plato-like dialogue by the present time characters Valentine and Hannah as they read Thomasina's maths “primer”. Scientific concern in the second half of the play is then addressed whenever Valentine is present, but only fragmentarily so, in the midst of Hannah and Bernard's contrary pursuits on Byron's romance, on the Sidley Park Hermit, on literature and landscape gardening at the turn of the 19th century.

A substantial amount of text is required to make a non-initiated audience privy to both the scientific questions and the complexities of the detective plot, itself dependent on the pendulum time structure swinging between the two periods. If maths riddles require loquacious developments, the intricacies of a suspenseful story also involve detailed information.

The Press reviews of both the 1993 National Theatre creation\(^3\) and the 1998 French version at the Comédie-Française\(^4\), testify to an equally warm-hearted and reluctant audience response to such bulky paraphernalia. French director Philippe Adrien points the “Vertigo” effect of the play:

> How can such play be possible? [...] When I first read the dialogues in *Arcadia*, I was particularly struck at the huge part played by philosophical matters and such like debates on science — physics and mathematics, on history — gardens and literature. The playwright overtly takes the risk to divert part of the interest generally driven at the plot and characters to the intellectual content of their preoccupations\(^5\).

How can scientific topics be handled dramatically to become successfully entertaining? Science has been in vogue in British drama ever since the 1990\(^{ies}\): to quote but a few, Caryl Churchill's play *A Number* (2002) is about human cloning, Michael Frayn's *Copenhagen* (1998) dramatises a moral debate on nuclear weapons, David Zellnick contemplates monkey study in *Serendib* (2007). In these plays generally addressed as socio-political, scientific probing is the basis for ethical speculation and the re-assessment of moral values. *Arcadia* touches on neither scientific drama nor documentary drama (*verbatim* drama), its almost surrealistic extravagance poles apart from the realistic and didactic framework of a David Hare play (*Stuff Happens*, 2004; *The Power of Yes*, 2009). Stoppard's play stands apart as a comedy, its scientific gist a springboard for dramatic entertainment\(^6\), albeit touching on metaphysical questions (free choice versus determinism, order and chaos, love and death). If Chaos Theory happened to be particularly trendy in the 1990\(^{ies}\) what with the current interest for Quantum physics, it was a happy coincidence for Stoppard that the answer to Fermat's unsolved theorem\(^7\) came out within a year after the creation of the play.

Stoppard subordinates scientific matter to the dramatic process that makes the play eventful: investigation does not only probe scientific subject matter, it works as a structural drive, the


\(^4\) *Arcadia*, text adapted in French by Jean-Marie Besset, staged by Philippe Adrien, November 26, 1998.


\(^7\) Sir Andrew Wiles solved Fermat's Last Theorem in 1993, a few months after *Arcadia* opened, and was awarded the Fermat prize in 1995.
mainspring of *Arcadia*'s plot.

**A back-and-forth (in)quest.**

Surprisingly enough, *Arcadia*'s scientific paraphernalia is not the most verbose subject. The prolixity of the play owes less to the intellectual density of each theme than to their accumulation, fractional handling and to the recurrent loops on the questions. This jocund hotchpotch is enlivened by a detective plot structure, which ambles along the sinuous tracks of the trag-romantic events that took place between 1809 (*Arcadia*, Scenes 1, 3 and 6) 1812 (*Arcadia*, Scene 7) and the present time (*Arcadia*, Scenes 2, 4, 5, 7).

Investigation in itself is a demonstrative process, involving the exposition of motives and circumstances, the language of conjecture and speculation, the need for justification and debate. The detective plot balances between demonstrative *aufklärung* and suspenseful expectation, which makes the play dramatically exciting. The double time-period is a source of dramatic irony as the audience is given a vantage point over the characters: its humorous drive extenuates the verbose propensity of the play.

The *topos* of the quest informs the play not only thematically, but also structurally: the alternating time structure of the play adds up to suspense by securing, each time, fragmentary knowledge on both the scientific enigmas and the amorous riddles. The audience delights in gradually putting together fragments of a puzzle often concealed to the characters themselves. Bernard’s mistaken assumptions about Byron and the Chaters is a delightful episode of dramatic irony. Last but not least, the whole system is oiled with Stoppard's favourite verbal pyrotechnics. Although language displays itself in wit, wit in *Arcadia* does not weigh down on the text; on the contrary, it cuts short protracted developments, and sustains the allegro liveliness of the play, ensuring the buoyant rhythm which keeps the audience on the alert. If *Jumpers* is a theatrical and spectacular stunt, *Arcadia* is a rhetorical form of acrobatics, which manages to “flick intellectual matter into the air so spectacularly that it becomes entertaining”8. Our point here is not to probe into the play's successful wit – which has been the object of many a studies – but to address the play from its rhetorical thrust to its emotional touch.

**From scientific research to chaos.**

The various scientific theories explored by either Thomasina or Valentine boil down to a similar conclusion: chaos. Does chaos add up to the play's verbal prolixity?

Thomasina’s intuition of the proof for Fermat's last theorem leads to her discovering the fundamentals of iterated algorithm – the endless pattern of self-similarity today known as the theory of fractals. However inconclusive, her paper drawings announce the iterative process made possible by computers. Valentine test-proofs Thomasina’s scribbled calculations with his computer two hundred years later, working out his own statistics on the Park's grouse to illustrate chaos theory (scene four p. 62: “real data is messy”).

Iteration and fractals are the endless reproduction of similar images: in *Arcadia*, they could read as an expanded metaphor for Stoppard's paradoxical approach to drama: his plays both answer the canon of classical drama to some extent– and involve its subversion in a postmodern handling. If
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we take the figure of iteration as a metaphor, it would refer to classical drama as a mirror image held up to nature (invoking a classical way of acting, which “suits the action to the word, the word to the action” as Hamlet recommends (Act 3, Scene 2, line 17). But iteration would also be an apt motive for metadramatic strategies and self-reflexive drama.

Thomasina's rejection of Newtonian theory prefigures Deterministic Chaos—the science which reveals the apparent randomness of highly ordered mathematical processes. Her demonstration of the second law of thermodynamics also leads to the theory of chaos: in both the examples she takes—rice pudding and the steam engine in the garden, Thomasina proposes an illustration of entropy (jam cannot be unstirred, energy once emitted cannot be recovered). Entropy, the dissipation of energy, can be contemplated as yet another form of chaos.

From Deterministic chaos to romantic chaos.

“Chaos” is a paradigm which informs the play both thematically and structurally: it first refers to unpredictability in scientific knowledge, but also to disorderly romantic quibbles. As they debate mathematics and unsolved mysteries, the characters' major motive for dispute is chaotic love, a highly conventional source of romantic comedy resting on an eventful plot. Thomasina's sexual inquiry in the opening line of the play is an appetiser for the scientific menu (“Septimus, what is carnal embrace”? (p. 4)). The tone of a tongue-in-cheek comedy of ideas is given, with scientific reflections applied to sentimental musings, sustained by the Romantic atmosphere seeping in the 1809 classical landscape.

With no surprise, Newton's law of attraction fails to formulate the random workings of love:

**Chloë**: [...] The universe is deterministic all right, just like Newton said, I mean it's trying to be, but the only thing going wrong is people fancying people who aren't supposed to be in that part of the plan.

**Valentine**: Ah. The attraction that Newton left out. (*Arcadia*, (2.7, p. 100))

The audience is tossed along the vagaries of the characters' quest on either romantic intrigues or scientific conjectures so much so that the quest itself comes to matter more than the answer to the quest: “It's wanting to know that makes us matter”, says Hannah (p. 102). The quest is a dramatic device per se: it is “drama” as “action” in its etymological sense. *Arcadia* is no fastidious lecturing, since the scientific exposés are subordinated to the love equations that bind and oppose the protagonists: in other words, although the play is talkative, it contains its own strategy to circumvent any verbose excess. Mathematical exchanges serve dramatic action, meant to be articulated dramatically.

The Quest.

Questioning is both literalised and dramatised: it is Thomasina's feature as a precocious genius and as a young lady pricked by the mysteries of love. Her language is essentially characterized by interrogation: “What do you mean?” (p. 5), “if you do not teach me” (p. 6), “tell me more” (p. 7),

9. See “Manil Suri explains the mathematics behind Tom Stoppard's play *Arcadia*”: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iM0cR7qvmgY](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iM0cR7qvmgY) last visit 20/11/2011.
“finding a proof for Fermat’s last theorem” (p. 4). When these questions are not literal and genuine, they are rhetorical and tongue-in-cheek (“How is a ruined child different from a ruined castle”? (p. 17). Questions of physics and the romantic physical quest are mixed. Both the factual events in the dramatic text and the visual signs in the theatrical text are combined to form the syntagmatic chain of the story in Arcadia: the alternating time structure works like a shuttle back-and-forth on a horizontal line-track towards a prospective resolution. Because the answers to the various riddles do not come in easily, the audience looks to securing causal relations between the signs in the two time periods: Arcadia follows the principle of the syntagmatic consciousness as prior to the paradigmatic, with priority given to the linear pursuit of action rather than the vertical contemplation allowed by poetry or philosophical reflection: the audience is given no pause, no time to rest and ponder over the meaning of intellectual abstractions or moral debating.

The fractional physics questions preclude in-depth reflection and metaphysical doubt is approached but tentatively:

The syntagmatic consciousness no longer sees the sign in its perspective, it foresees it in its extension: its antecedent or consequent links, the bridges it extends to other signs. [...] Functional imagination [...] nourishes all those works whose fabrication, by arrangement of discontinuous and mobile elements, constitutes the spectacle itself: poetry, epic theatre, serial music, and structural compositions, from Mondrian to Butor. [...] It is the syntagmatic consciousness which actually permits us to conceive cybernetic ‘programs’.

The structuralist reading proposed above links the functioning of rhetoric to that of cybernetic ‘programs’, which happen to be one of the figures in Arcadia: the syntagmatic structure is an appropriate pattern to approach the play's mathematical and scientific paraphernalia. The characters' various forms of quest (mathematical, philosophical, romantic) all result in flawed knowledge and dissatisfaction. Hannah and Bernard’s claims to discover the truth of the past prove to be wrong. If some of Thomasina's intuitions turn out to be true (thermodynamics, the iterative calculus for “the New Geometry of Irregular Forms” (p. 59)), she fails to anticipate her premature death: her belief that “the formula for all the future [...] must exist” (p. 9) is tragically debunked. The various scientific debates end up with the paradoxical “unpredictability of determinism”.

Chaos theory precludes all form of certainty about the future so that what matters is the quest as a suspenseful and dramatic device, with its own rhetoric of “plotting” and “scheming”, to use idioms also applying to the language of landscape gardening (Septimus: Mr Noakes [...] a visionary who can move mountains and cause lakes, but in the scheme of the garden he is as the serpent (Arcadia, p. 8)). Stoppard reverses the detective story pattern: the audience is lured into trying to “discover the point of the story”, but the epistemological drive turns out to be fruitless or unsatisfactory. Revolving around Deterministic Chaos, Arcadia questions whether the future is predictable but also whether the past can be known. If the play were to teach a lesson, it might read like the following conclusion drawn by archaeologists: “We were doing field research to produce the proof for something already identified. But when you seriously contemplate the past,
you realise it is essentially unknown to us. The quest, together with speech, fails to make sense, illustrating Wittgenstein’s questioning the referential function of language. The difficulty for language to signify is illustrated in the self-reflexivity of the play, namely in wit.

“The event and the text”

“Wit strips language of its naturalistic trammels and creates theatrical distance: beyond laughter, we admire the verbal stunt. Stoppard’s theatre has consistently been criticized as “far too cerebral, too emotionally barren: all head and no heart.” How can talkative intellectual matter on the one hand, and wit on the other become eventful? The playwright’s answer is that drama should be a “story-telling event.” In Arcadia, if the characters’ quest matters more than their flimsy or erroneous answers, for the audience, “The truth of the tale is in the telling, not in the tale itself.” Wit is part of the telling strategy, but its “linguistic foregrounding” is no sufficient tool to “prevent people from leaving their seats before the entertainment is over.” We know Arcadia has been both praised and rejected for its intellectual brilliancy with the audience shirking the verbose dimension of the play. Stoppard’s conception of the “story-telling event” is paradoxical since drama is a supposedly non-narrative form and the performance of an action. Can Arcadia become an event other than the epiphany of language performing its excellence? As Stoppard says: “One can get all intellectual and be metaphysical [...] but in the end you are telling a story. [...] I like the notion of theatre as recreational.”

After Arcadia’s New York tour in 1995, a theatre critic declared that “[The play]’s brought out the subtle and obvious underpinnings of sexual attraction, distraction and reaction that anchor and fuel Stoppard’s dizzyingly delightful intellectual fireworks.

Are there any textual signs in the dramatic text which call for an “emotional” rather than “intellectual” performance? Can we assess the play’s expressive function of language beyond its referential function on scientific and intellectual matter? Stoppard’s conception of drama as “event” questions the efficiency of the performative function in his plays. Do words do things in Arcadia besides performing themselves? Can we say that “speech is act”? We shall look at some

14. “On allait chercher sur le terrain l’illustration de quelque chose qui était déjà connu. Or dès que l’on traite sérieusement du passé, on prend conscience qu’il nous est essentiellement inconnu”. In Laurence Olivier, “Contre le fantasme de Pompéi”, Mouvement numéro 61, p. 91.
http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/e/a/1995/10/19/STYLE7338.dtl&ao=all#ixzz1d244n7PQ:
aspects in performance as directions for further analysis.

“From thinking to feeling”?

Stoppard has acknowledged that the text in *Arcadia* is slightly drawn-out and that it weighs down on the pace of the action (“I’d like to take three minutes out of the first act, it doesn’t look like much — it’s just a hundred beats — but it makes a difference”). Director David Leveaux also argues that: “lines echo one other, and if a beat arrives even fractionally later than it ought to, it can affect the emotional response, particularly in a play of this complexity. You don’t want a moment in *Arcadia* when anybody sits back.”

The quest in *Arcadia* can become dramatic if propelling the characters and the audience forward with bouncy and spirited tempo. The flying rhythm culminates in the final scene played staccato with the simultaneity of the two time periods and the presence of all the characters.

Stage directors and actors are invited to scrutinize the dramatic text (dialogue and stage directions) for theatrical clues to turn the intellectual exercise into a more racy event. The romance in *Arcadia* brings in the buoyant rhythm of comedy — albeit conventional and unsurprising — to make up for the intellectual density of the subject matter. What binds the characters together in *Arcadia* is the romantic quest, which criss-crosses their scientific reflections. The physics-metaphysical quest is connected to sexual matter, the whole submitted to chaos:

Chloë: The future is all programmed like a computer — that’s a proper theory, isn’t it? [...] But it doesn’t work, does it?
Valentine: No. It turns out the maths is different.
Chloë: No, it’s all because of sex.

*Arcadia* dramatises the conflict between Newtonian rationalism and romantic sentimentality, and its characters are all seen to gravitate around the central question of love, romance, and passion, some deploring the “decline from thinking to feeling” (*Arcadia*, p. 39), some loath to admit “the action of bodies in heat” (*Arcadia*, p. 114), and others curious about “the attraction that Newton left out” (p. 100). The play's repeated leaps from scientific concern to sentimental prickings create a jerky rhythm, which sustains the audience's interest. To reduce *Arcadia* to intellectual recreation will miss the point in performance and fail to make the text become an event. Romantic affairs wink at Shakespeare’s romance but also at Chekhov’s pathos: love is more than often unreturned (Thomaisina’s love for Septimus, Septimus’s secret interest in Lady Croom, Chloë’s attraction to Bernard), or it is aimed at the wrong person (Bernard, Valentine and Gus’s infatuation with Hannah), not to mention light banter à la Marivaux: Mrs Chater's pursuit of Septimus and Byron before she is seduced by Captain Brice; Lady Croom’s affair with Byron, Count Zelinsky, and eventually Septimus.

Characters are given little psychological depth, but when their emotional state breaks through, it is in the conventional Comedy of Manners vein (ingenious Thomasina, appealing Septimus, exacting Lady Croom, earnest M.Chater, peevish Hannah, jocund Bernard). Stoppard acknowledges
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27. A reference to: “Hannah: The decline from thinking to feeling” (*Arcadia*, 1, 2, p. 39).
29 Ibid.
that his characters “are only brought into existence because of [his] desire to express certain ideas”, but he adds that “[actors] have to deduce their characters from what they say”.

**Stage indications?**

The few indications concerning the characters describe their mood, temper, and emotional disposition. They work as dramatically potent clues about the power struggle between the characters. For example, Thomasina and Septimus's verbal exchange is first and foremost a contest, however intellectual and learned. The young lady challenges her tutor, she expertsly steers the conversation and pricks Septimus' s curiosity on the Chater affair in the first scene. Their second long exchange (scene 3) is a heated rivalry in knowledge culminating in two short sections of stichomythia (pp. 49 and 51). The emotional intensity of their cerebral contest is as important as the contents of their exchange, the scientific gist. Thomasina's tongue-in-cheek hint at carnal love adds up to her sensuous inclination, which she displays in the final waltz with Septimus, a climactic emotional scene.

A similar heated intensity opposes Hannah and Bernard: wit is a rhetorical battle which does contain a sexual charge paradoxically drawing them together above Hannah's rebuttal (their quibble is vicariously reminiscent of Beatrice and Benedick's battle of wits in Shakespeare’s *Much Ado About Nothing*): “I thought there was a lot of sexual energy there, didn’t you?” insists Chloë (*Arcadia*, p. 46). Deictic clues appear whenever the dialogue between the protagonists becomes heated. They explicitly assert the characters’ need to stigmatize one another (for instance Lady Croom and Septimus, pp. 95-96, Hannah and Bernard almost always). The deictic clues in which the pronouns “I” and “You” abound, are a lively and dramatic relief from the extended scientific explanations: “deixis is what allows language an ‘active' and dialogic function rather than a descriptive and choric role: it is instituted at the origins of the drama as the necessary condition of a non-narrative form of world-creating discourse”.

More generally, the stage directions about characterization come in when the text itself does not implicitly signify the dramatic effect to be produced. They are acting directions when a humorous or surprise effect typical of the conventional comedy of manners is expected: for example when Bernard and Hannah speak for effect (pp. 29, 39, 67, 79, 80), sometimes making a show of their utterance in a metadramatic way: Bernard is no mean performer, he is pleased with the effect of his peroration. (p. 80). Characters may speak derisively (p. 9), sadly (p. 12), crisply (p. 13) answering the wrong question, out of his depth (p. 17), thrilled (p. 20), smiling (p. 24), irritated, fastidiously (p. 78).

Another category of stage directions weigh more on action than on psychology: they describe a precise choreography of door opening, object moving, which are dramatically significant in the detective story plot. These proxemic signs enrich the “story-telling” dimension of the play to make it eventful but say little of the characters' relations.

The handling of the same objects by characters from both periods, endows them with a form of sensuousness: when Valentine strokes the tortoise (scene five, p. 72), and when “Hannah is leafing though Mr Noakes’ s sketchbook” (scene two, p. 22), the physical presence of the 1809 characters is felt by proxy. The twentieth century characters sensuously trespass on the privacy of the early nineteenth century characters when handling the objects that have survived them.
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The expressive dimension of the performance in *Arcadia* hinges on rhythm, emotional clichés and occasional deictic reference. They create the buoyancy necessary to fill in the bareness of the stage. In *Arcadia*, great care is taken to describe the sparse stagecraft and what the audience will not see: the curtain rises on a bare study room, with uncurtained windows deceptively inviting us to look out onto Sidley Park, which remains invisible, together with the drawings on the sketchbook studied by almost every character. The bareness of the setting is a functional necessity to allow the audience to take in the gradual collection of objects on the table, where sketchbook, coffee mug, quills and a computer appear side by side in both periods.

What Roland Barthes calls the “informational polyphony” of drama, is carefully orchestrated where clarity of information is needed. The cold setting rests our eyes to counterbalance the play's extravagance in subject matter, characters, structure, wit and intellectual plethora. The visual pyrotechnics of *Jumpers* would drown the verbal fireworks in *Arcadia*. The empty stage works as a blank page for the audience's imagination to fill in the gaps of representation and to take their own active part in the quest: Lord Croom, Byron, Mrs Chater only exist offstage for instance. The transformation of the stately garden from the Arcadian perfection of classicism to Romantic wilderness has to be imagined by the audience, constructed in their minds' eyes by conjuring up the opposite cultural background.

If ideas were flesh and all conception carnal, Tom Stoppard would be the sexiest writer of the modern stage: a successful performance of *Arcadia* needs to be sensuous beyond the intellectual and the conventional comedy. It is a challenge for stage-directors and actors: a number of pitfalls await them such as a “melodramatic interpretation of the characters, [...] inappropriate to the subtler nuances of the play.”

The marriage of intellect, romance and wit can be a failure “when the narrative becomes too insistent: For God's sake theatre is about watching the action, and not being told about it.” Stoppard has often declared that *Arcadia* was not his best play but his “luckiest”. In performance, a loud comedy spirit too often eclipses the dark overtones of *Arcadia* in which the young heroine dies tragically and her almost as young tutor becomes mad. A play beset by the question of unpredictability culminating in epistemological doubt might allow more space for uncertainty to be enacted in performance as emotional turmoil. The purely recreational mood may be qualified by carefully devised moments of anxiety, which would leave the audience restless. Most stage directions opt for sparkling and glittering light effects when some indirection and opacity may at times be more effective than deceptive transparency to seize *Arcadia*’s mystery.

Christine KIEHL (Université Lumière Lyon 2)
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33. Robert Hurwitt, “*Arcadia* in full bloom at ACT. Exceptional cast brings Stoppard comedy to life”, *San Francisco Examiner*, October 19, 1995. [http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/e/a/1995/10/19/STYLE7338.dtl&ao=all#ixzz1d244n7PQ](http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/e/a/1995/10/19/STYLE7338.dtl&ao=all#ixzz1d244n7PQ)
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