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Place, space, and homeplace have taken on increasing conceptual significance for performance studies practitioners. Despite a wealth of research, there are few theoretical models within the discipline to which researchers of homeplace can appeal for scholarly guidance. In this paper, I survey recent essays about home, place, and space within two major disciplinary journals to create such a model. Using my own experience with homeplace and performance as a frame, I outline four major orientations toward homeplace displayed within recent performance studies literature. Though my goal is far from exhaustive, I aim both to describe the variety of research projects being undertaken as well as to present readers with a useful theoretical model of performance and homeplace.

According to Gaston Bachelard, “all really inhabited space bears the essence of the notion of home” (5). Though I have inhabited several spaces, when I think of home I think of one place. In my imagination I return to my wooden, box-framed bed with shelves for a headboard, the bed my father made, in the room in the basement of the house my father built, on the land by the sea my grandparents so generously gifted to he and my mother. I yearn for my island home, my Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia. I long for her rugged shores teetering on the edge of Canada’s east coast. This is my homeplace, the place where I belong. “Homeplace,” a term made influential by feminist cultural theorist bell hooks, designates not just a space to live, but also a place to learn how and who to be. Speaking of African Americans specifically, hooks points to the potential for homeplace to be “that space where we return for renewal and self-recovery, where we can heal our wounds and become whole” (49). As a white performer and scholar I find myself, for my sake and the sake of others in need of renewal, continually called to the place I call home. Much of my work has been inspired by my relationship with this place, this island called Cape Breton.

Whenever I have decided to go—theoretically and through performance—to my homeplace, I have felt as if I were traveling without a map. It is as if each time performance studies folk journey toward homeplace, we do so for the first time, cutting a path through the wilderness to the warm hearth (or cold stillness) of home. Or else we look for guidance to theorists of place and space beyond our disciplinary borders—to the work of Gaston Bachelard, Michel de Certeau, Lucy Lippard, or Henri Lefebvre.
(just to name a few). I am not one to strictly uphold disciplinary borders, but in reaching for these fine theorists I fear we overlook the work in our own backyard. Performance studies scholars are engaging with place, space, and home in interesting and productive ways. In Cindy M. Spurlock’s words, “During the past 25 years, scholars in rhetorical and performance studies have increasingly turned a critical eye toward the significance of place and its role as more than mere scene or backdrop for communicative action” (7). It is time to redraw the map to include these works alongside more celebrated philosophers of place.

Homeplace is difficult to locate, particularly in the current historical context of globalization, technological travel, and the fetishization of mobility. Several scholars point to 21st century North America as a milieu of profound confusion about place. The idea that “Few of us in contemporary North American society know our place” is pervasive and furthers my fascination with homeplace almost out of spite (Lippard 9). It is as if I want to prove that this narrative of placelessness is only one among many, that some of us do know our place, and that I know mine. This narrative is palpable. I cannot ignore that Leslie Hill asks: “Is the twenty-first century, then, the century of placelessness? (3), and Dwight Conquergood argues that, “we now think of ‘place’ as a heavily trafficked intersection, a port of call and exchange, instead of circumscribed territory” (“Performance Studies” 145). I cannot ignore Catherine Becker and Frederick C. Corey’s argument that: “In a country that is comprised of conquerors, immigrants, transplants, and others, place is often a contested and difficult concept to locate” (213). In the face of this narrative, it is no wonder writing and performing about homeplace seems such a solitary enterprise. I consider myself among the lucky few whose undeniable attachments to place render its elusive nature difficult to comprehend. Homeplace has an obvious location for me. The problem, of course, is that my homeplace may very well be different from yours not only in terms of physical location, but also in emotional tenor, subjective impact, and material consequences. In spite of myself, I must admit homeplace is ironically, frustratingly, difficult to locate.

Like many ambiguous concepts, it is also extremely important. Building upon bell hooks, D. Soyini Madison positions homeplace as “the location from which we come to voice,” linking it to the formation of identity and power (particularly for African American women). From homespaces come “theories of the flesh”—“specialized knowledges” that are the result of real, lived experiences (Madison, “Occupation” 213-14). Madison turns to performance to access and share these embodied theories. Places are embodied; we experience them sensuously and provocatively, even if our culture has taught us not to. The places and spaces we inhabit throughout our lives affect us as we affect them. Madison states: “I love performance most when I enter into it, when it calls me forward shamelessly, across those hard edged maps into spaces where I must go. Terrains that are foreign, scary, uninhabitable, but necessary.
I must go to them to know myself more, to know you, more” (“Performing” 108). Performance is at once a call to knowledge and a way to get there. It is an embodied methodology from which to investigate homeplace.

Performance is, ironically, as difficult to locate as place: it rarely sits still, and it is prone to ephemerality. In Conquergood’s words, it is “an essentially contested concept” that “privileges threshold-crossing, shape-shifting, and boundary-violating figures, such as shamans, tricksters, and jokers, who value the carnivalesque over the canonical, the transformative over the normative, the mobile over the monumental” (Conquergood, “Caravans” 137-38). Somewhat like homeplace, we (practitioners) talk about performance as a thing that exists, and yet we have a hard time holding it for very long. If homeplace is always on the move—and I believe it is, for as Lucy Lippard says, “home changes” (23)—performance studies as a dynamic discipline may just be able to catch up with it from time to time. Performance practitioners do reach for the concepts of place, space, and home, and with increasing frequency as of late. Though our paths home are varied and unpredictable, understanding them may illuminate the conceptual landscape. This, in turn, may make the journey for those of us who wish to perform homeplace less like bushwacking and more like hiking by starlight. Leaving room for adventurous departures, we will nonetheless have a guide to travel by.

Performance studies covers vast and diverse terrain. An exhaustive classification of its research about home, place and space would be a monumental project. A loose charting of the various orientations performance studies scholars take toward homeplace, however, is possible. Rather than survey the whole territory, I will focus on recent trends as indicated by the types of studies that appeared from 2001 to 2009 in two representative journals: Text and Performance Quarterly and Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies. My analysis is guided by four questions: 1) Ontologically, what kinds of places do performance practitioners write and perform about? Where are they located in space and time? 2) Who performs in and through these places? 3) How do these performances of and through places, particularly homeplaces, proceed? What themes and happenings emerge? 4) To what rhetorical ends is performance used or described in relation to homeplace? From these guiding questions I propose four paths performance studies practitioners tend to take toward “homeplace.” As will become evident, these paths can be placed along two conceptual continuums: first, from place as an inert site of and for performance to place as an active agent interacting with people, and second, from the intimate places normally considered homeplaces to those more foreign, in which we may find resonance or dissonance with home. In order along these continuums, the four theoretical orientations are homeplace as: 1) event, 2) text, 3) director, and 4) performer. These metaphoric categories are less like locations within the literature of place and space and more like possible trajectories. As such, the essays and performances I discuss below may follow more than one of these lines; they are not mutually exclusive. I organize
my discussion around my own research and experience with homeplace performances, drawing upon my guiding questions to narrate how performance studies practitioners operate with these four theoretical orientations.

First, I must clarify what I mean by “space” and “place.” In her article about ballet studios as potential homeplaces, Judith Hamera asks whether there are “regulations” for the interactions of space, place, and performance (96). My answer is yes, but what the regulations are depend on who one asks. Many scholars turn to Michel de Certeau’s famous assertion that “space is a practiced place” to distinguish these two terms. For Certeau, place “implies an indication of stability,” while space “is composed of intersections of mobile elements” (117). Hamera follows this attribution of place as inert and space as active, suggesting, perhaps, that performance is concerned with space more than place. To some extent this aligns with Ronald J. Pelias and Tracy Stephenson Shaffer’s argument that performance art, “takes place and turns it into space” (Pelias and Stephenson Shaffer 177). Through performance, in other words, the stability of place is transformed into something more volatile, that is, space.

Not everyone agrees with Certeau, however. Bachelard, though he speaks only of space, distinguishes between “felicitous,” “inhabited space” and “indifferent space,” noting the differences between space that is lived (in) and space that is not (xxxi-xxxii). Lucy Lippard, for her part, explains that “Space defines landscape, where space combined with memory defines place” (Lippard 9). For her, place is the more intimate, more connected-to-humans of the two terms. I follow Lippard’s distinction here, not only because of this sense of connection, but also because her place seems more material, and so more consequential, than space. Erin Daina McClellan, who stresses the importance of understanding the rhetorical consequences of choosing space over place or vice versa, provides support for my choice. She argues that space is “abstract and intangible” while place deals more in particulars (7). I am interested in places that people inhabit in everyday life and how these are interrogated through performance. I am less interested in performance “spaces” (i.e., stages). Place, for my purposes, refers to a space—material and/or performed—that has been inhabited or that is meant to be inhabited, and that is infused with memory, identity, and life. Though I am indebted to his theories, I flip Certeau on his head; for me, place is practiced space.

**Homeplace as Event**

Local poet Barbara Rendall writes that, “Cape Bretoners living elsewhere seem to feel a little like orphans” (192). I am fond of repeating this quote, mostly because I think it so apt, but also out of a desire to prove that for all of my talk about home I am not simply homesick. Most displaced Cape Bretoners, it seems, experience this yearning for return. In 2006 I conducted a mini-ethnography to gain an understanding of how Cape Bretoners conceive of “home.” One of the themes I found was that people feel a connection to
Cape Breton that motivates them to return. People generally agree with the sentiment expressed by a participant named Danny: “people know who they are when they come from CB... they know that they’re from a place and that they have a tradition and they have a culture and I think that’s very important” (MacDonald, “Home” 23). When actual return is impossible for whatever reason, Cape Bretoners turn to performances—from the mundane to the extraordinary—to take them home. We listen to Celtic music, eat boiled dinner, and drink strong orange pekoe tea (preferably Tetley or Red Rose) with milk but no sugar. If we have access to a stage—be it in a pub, a kitchen, or a theatre—we may just create a version of home wherever we are.

Pelias argues that, “Performance is a desire for the ineffable, to say what cannot be said by placing one’s soul on the tongue, by sacrificing through discipline and prayer, by trusting the sheer luck or magic that beckons one to dance in the playground of angels” (“Performance” 109). Performance, if nothing else, can bring us home. One of my motivations for creating the 2008 Marion Kleinau Theatre production Blood from a Stone: Mining Elemental Genealogies was to recreate Cape Breton not in actuality but in spirit; to give form to the homeplace I experience even thousands of miles away. Even as I strove for some sort of authenticity I recognized I was staging my idea of Cape Breton. This homeplace was made of memories and dreams—my own and those of the people I interviewed. Such performances exemplify the first orientation to homeplace: the understanding of home as a collection of dreams materialized through a performance event.

Performance studies scholars who orient toward homeplaces as events conceptualize place temporally more than spatially. These places cannot be found on a map, but are also not wholly immaterial. Insofar as they exist as memories and projections (collective and/or individual), these homeplaces impact people’s lives. Those who perform in, through, and toward these ephemeral homeplaces are often those who have been displaced—by diaspora, exile, emigration, or just the passing of time. Theories of diaspora (see Clifford) and nostalgia (see Janover) become useful touchstones for those who take this orientation to homeplace, particularly in terms of understanding the “diasporic forms of longing, memory, and (dis)identification” experienced by people who consider at least one of their homeplace(s) to be somewhere (and/or, sometime) other than they are (Clifford 304).

Homeplace as event begins with a “relationship to an actual or imagined homeland” (Butler 192). This relationship exists generally in memories, the only discernable location for some homeplaces. Indeed, Elyse Lamm Pineau locates her homesteading performance Shadowboxing: Myths and Miniatures of Home within “the House of Memory and Imagination” (Shadowboxing 2). The title of this 2005 Marion Kleinau Theatre production points to the ephemeral nature of homeplace as event. In the performance, Pineau creates a temporary homeplace on stage to both match and interrogate her childhood home at her parents’ wilderness lodge in Canada. Throughout, she requests
that the audience reminisce with her by asking variations of the question: “Do you remember?” (5). In Shadowboxing, homeplace is built via the blueprints of memory. Similarly, in her article, “Fish, Homeland, and Portuguese Possibilities,” Lori Danielle Barcliff Baptista discusses the Portuguese concept of “saudade,” a word used to refer to the cultural memory of Portugal as a homeplace in the midst of the “global movement” of its citizens (64). She argues that, “the performative acts of remembering, witnessing, preparing, teaching, eating, and featuring bacalhau [re-constituted salt-cod] function to preserve a sense of Portuguese-ness and ward off future threats” (Barcliff Baptista 63). These performances of homeplace, created temporarily through the rituals of bacalhau, both rely upon and preserve the memory of Portugal as a homeland.

Even those who have not left their homeland in such dramatic ways may experience this need to (re)constitute a homeplace from memory. In his solo performance Memory’s Caretaker, Paul Bonin-Rodriguez begins with a scene about moving frequently as a child; at one point speaking as diasporic people might: “We remembered our birthplace, but not what it looked like” (161). He then sets out to narrate his memories, as if to create them onstage in order to set them free, identifying himself as a caretaker of memory ready to relinquish that role. He creates a homeplace on stage through the stories he tells, and in so doing simultaneously forges a connection with and releases himself from the bondage of home.

Though a variety of performance strategies may be used to transform memories and projections of homeplace into material events, the strongest strategy seems to be through narrative. In Shadowboxing, for example, Pineau uses narrative techniques to (re)create a version of her childhood homeplace. She explains “narrative homesteading” performatively in her script (as published in Liminalities): “The act of Homesteading . . . narratively speaking / Is the commitment to breathe life over the coals of memories. / Words exhaled over memory ignite / and illuminate the ‘still life’ with purity and precision” (38). In other words, as her parents did in the Canadian wilderness, she clears a place for home. Where they used the tools of pioneers, she uses those of performing storytellers. I use similar tools in Blood from a Stone, allowing several characters to build Cape Breton through their tales.

Several other performance practitioners point to the importance of storytelling in the creation of homeplace events. Hamera highlights the narrative construction of ballet studios as “homeplaces” (Hamera), Cristina Moretti argues that her guide Mohammed’s stories about Milan create a space for him there (Moretti), and Bas Spierings provides narratives of his “hometown” to give readers a sense of what it is like (Spierings). Storytelling, along with singing, eating, and surrounding oneself with the trappings of home, are all ways in which people create homeplace through performance; these performances are of interest to performance practitioners oriented toward homeplace as an event.
What these performances have in common is a sense of yearning—for belonging, for the comforts of home, or for an alternative placement (theoretically or physically) in relation to one’s homeplace. It is this yearning that motivates me to perform and write about Cape Breton, and others to perform their various homeplaces. Moretti argues that the “performative sense” of Mohammed’s tour through Milan is “important in constructing alternative notions of ‘belonging’ to the city” (4). Hamera argues that the ballet studio is, “paradoxically a utopia—a ‘no place’—performatively constituted from the daily labors and daily longings [for love, autonomy, etc.] demanded of and inspired by technique” (emphasis added, 99). The performative constitution of a homeplace is tied to a diasporic yearning to return and/or find a homeplace, real or imagined.

As I see it, performances of this sort are employed to achieve several related rhetorical ends. Namely, these goals are utopian, preservationist and revisionist. In Hamera’s ballet studio and on Bonin-Rodriguez’s stage we see examples of performance as an escape to the utopia of an imagined home. In Blood from a Stone and Barcliff Baptista’s description of her in-laws’ rituals with salt-cod, we see performances that attempt to bring homelands to life, preserve them in memory, and educate younger generations about them. Finally, in Moretti’s description of her Senegalese emigrant guide’s performative engagement with Milan, as well as in Pineau’s performative homesteading, we see examples of performance as a way to revise narratives of homeplace. Mohammed’s performative tour provides a resistant space for him within a homeplace that was not originally his own (Moretti), while Pineau’s purpose in Shadowboxing is “to inhabit, with a mature, critical, and embodied intelligence, the social history and ethical imperatives” of home—in other words, to create a more critical homeplace through performance (“Homesteading” 3). Performance practitioners engaging with homeplace as events, then, are concerned with the ephemeral homeplaces of memory and projection, as well as how these come to be materialized through performances that preserve, revise, or create new possibilities for the places we inhabit. The power of such an orientation lies not in a fascination with the past or belief in fantasy, but rather, in the possibilities it creates for hospitable living. As Janover states of nostalgia, such an orientation should be taken “not as a promise of the past but as the promising of memory itself . . . it keeps alive the possibility that we will be able to remember, sometime, thoughts and experiences that we have not yet had” (128).

Homeplace as Text

I am often asked to explain how I came to live in Southern Illinois. I always tell a story that strikes a balance between fate and choice. “I wanted to study performance studies,” I say, “and Canada held few options for that, so I applied to U.S. schools. But Southern Illinois University was my first choice.” There is a well-known song sung in Cape Breton called “The Island.” In it is
a verse that describes my experience well: “Over the highways and over the roads / Over the Causeway the stories are told / They tell of the coming and the going away / The cities of America draw me away” (MacNeil). If America (i.e., the U.S.) is an enticing place that lures people away from Cape Breton, I suppose I would count as one of the lured. My everyday experience is a series of guest performances. This country is not my homeplace; I am not a citizen but a visitor, a resident alien. Performing as an alien is tricky. I am never sure where I stand on stage, and I may never be off book. Sometimes I feel very much at home, a privilege afforded to me by the color of my skin and a mediated American education (i.e., a childhood filled with U.S. television). I pass for an American most of the time; my performance of homeplace receives the U.S. text’s stamp of approval. Other times, however, like when I slip into the dialect of my own homeplace, I feel very much like an alien, green skin and all. My body has felt the panic of forgetting the lines or making improper entrances on this stage of homeplace (I have had near breakdowns over the confusion of customs forms), but for the most part the text of U.S. homeplace has looked kindly on my performances. If all visitors to the world’s homeplaces felt so welcome, our world would be a very different place.

Performance scholars are interested in such everyday negotiations. Performances of and about the ideological discourse of homeplace—who gets to feel at home where and how—are of interest when orienting toward homeplace as text. These homeplaces can be found on maps, but only as those colorful lines that border nations, states, counties, and towns. Like words on a page, these seemingly benign lines index complex discourses of power that leave imprints, sometimes scars, on people’s bodies, and that shape people’s performances. Like performance texts, these texts guide or coerce our performances of citizenship on the stage called home. Homeplace as text is home as described by Sara McKinnon: “constituted through our personal experiences with various discourses and practices of belonging and exclusion” (3). Homeplace is a discourse of power that forms the scripts for performances of (would be) citizens.

Some performance practitioners are interested in performances that create and maintain the collectivities of spaces, discourses, and people called “nations.” Nations are real only insofar as they are performed, and as Stephen Rohs states, “A number of scholars have found in the last decade and a half that performative practices play central roles in the articulation of national identities” (2). My performances (staged and everyday) of Cape Breton include speaking and singing in the Gaelic lilt of my island, for example, through which I perform a certain level of Scottish-ness. Rohs describes the contested nature of festive performances of Irish nationality in New York in the 1870s, highlighting the stakes involved in performing nationality (Rohs), while Matthew Spangler discusses Dublin’s “Bloomsday Festival” (honoring James Joyce) as “the performative construction [and reconstruction] of Irish identity” (120). McKinnon, too, turns to Irish-ness and nationhood (it would
seem the Celts have a flair for performing nation). She questions the political implications of her realization that “on this Isle I feel more Irish / than I’ve ever felt American” (6). Pondering what it means for her to feel at home in Ireland, she recognizes that “being called home in Ireland as a white U.S. American illuminates the ways that I am a subject in Ireland, and around the world, because of my nationality and fair skin” (9). To feel at home in another’s homeplace requires being recognized as a subject there; in McKinnon’s critical acknowledgment of privilege there lies a slightly different attitude toward homeplace as text. That is, what seems a guide for citizens can quickly become a guard against aliens.

Feeling at home in a foreign nation is hardly a given. Like McKinnon in Ireland, I am treated hospitably in the U.S. (even as an alien) because my white skin helps me perform “American-ness.” As she states, “this is indeed what it means to be a subject everywhere; you are hospitably welcomed as home everywhere you move” (26). Hospitality is an important player in homeplace as text, as is its opposite, hostility. If my skin were a different color, if I were attracted to women instead of men, or even if I were to let my performance slip too far off script, I might not find this nation—this text—so hospitable. Performers Karma R. Chavez, Sara L. McKinnon, Lucas Messer and Marjorie Hazeltine take this orientation toward homeplace as text in their performance of “Home: Hospitality, Belonging and the Nation.” They perform hospitality and hostility in a family home to metaphorically evoke performing nation. In their words, they want audiences to consider questions of immigration through the concept of hospitality: “Who do we invite into our homes? Who is a good guest? What does it mean to be a good host? How do these values translate to our beliefs about belonging on a broader scale?” (2). In other words, theirs is a performance critiquing the dominant homeplace text.

Other performers orient toward homeplace as a text they wish to follow. Hector Amaya, a Mexican immigrant who narrates his performances of Americanness autoethnographically in the essay: “Performing Acculturation: Rewriting the Latina/o Immigrant Self,” explains how unwelcome he has felt in America: “As a brown person, I stood out in Calgary [Alberta, Canada] and, later, stood out in Austin, the place where I studied for my doctoral degree. This standing out determined the way the environment relationally constituted me and forced me to reflect on my appearance much more than I ever did in Mexico or within the confines of academia” (202). Because he wanted to be a good guest in this home, because he wanted to feel at home in the U.S., he changed his performance to match the environment—he followed the text of his would-be homeplace. He did so by changing “material elements” of himself—pointing to perhaps the most material facet of homeplace as text: ideological control of bodies and borders (201).

Every time I cross the Canadian-U.S. border I am reminded that although my mobility is greater than that of many, it has its limits. The message seems to be, “welcome to our country, but beware of over-staying.” This is
what homeplace as text does; it polices borders and behavior in homeplaces as big and abstract as nations and as small and literal as houses. Hamera, for example, highlights the constraints placed on dancers through the ballet studio as homeplace. Though the studio can be utopian, “it also may instantiate densely oppressive dystopias that implode into black holes of eating disorders, Darwinian cutthroat competition, ‘genetic privilege’ (Sadono) [sic] and plain authoritarian meanness” (Hamera 100). Similarly, Richard G. Jones and Christina R. Foust, who (following Henri Lefebvre) refer to the 16th Street Mall in Denver not just as a place but also as a “social text,” argue that its structure and aesthetics serve to keep some people in and others out (9).

Even homeplaces thought of as ideological and cultural havens, like the border (crossing) place occupied by “latinidad”—“the creation and performance of Latina/o identities that potentially build pan-Latina/o solidarity” (Chavez 166)—might be constraining. For Chavez, who grew up in rural Nebraska, the homeplaces provided by Latinidad and/or Gloria Anzaldúa’s borderlands are ultimately “stifling” (166). Because latinidad itself provides norms for where performances of homeplace should occur, and she is located outside of such spaces, it is not a welcoming homeplace for her (167). For people whose performances fall short of perfect citizenship, homeplace as text is an ideology with hands that mold people’s performances and hold the power to welcome them in or shove them out.

In the face of these ideologies of homeplace, practitioners turn to performance to achieve a variety of rhetorical ends. Some, like Amaya, Hamera, the Irish of Rohs’ essay, and myself, use personal and staged performances to more or less affirm the ideologies of homeplace. We may not agree with the text, but our performances tend not to contradict it. Others, like Chavez, perform to expand the text of homeplace, to render it more inclusive, to make more fluid borders. Still others, like Chavez and her co-performers of “Home,” as well as McKinnon in her self-reflexive writing about Ireland, perform to critique homeplace texts, to change them for the better. In McKinnon’s words, “It is when these discourses emerge from invisibility that changes to the national imaginary of belonging begin to take place” (29). Performance scholars who view homeplace as texts, then, see ideologies of nationhood and hospitality/hostility that control bodies and borders. Their performances work to affirm, expand, or critique and change these homeplaces, shaping their texts for future performers.

**Homeplace as Director**

As a part of my research about Cape Breton coalmining culture, I performed tourist in my hometown. That is, I chose to visit the Cape Breton Miners’ Museum (a local museum dedicated to coalmining) to experience an approximation of the authentic experience of coalmining in Cape Breton. In addition to fairly typical exhibits, the museum features a (re)created 1932 ‘room and pillar’ mine called the Ocean Deeps Colliery (*Cape Breton*).
Retired coalminers act as tour guides, treating visitors to an educational and amusing tour through various technologies of mining. Donning a pit helmet and a poncho, I ventured into the mine with a guide named Wishie, my father and sister, and a group of others, “playing miner” for about a half hour. The physical structure of the mine, the instructions of our jolly tour guide, and the general atmosphere of the environment all affected my performance in the museum, directing me to act in certain ways and not others. The mine spaces are cramped (I am far too tall to have been a comfortable miner); the eeriness encourages sticking with a group, and the norms of tourism behavior dictate who speaks when, etc. Were I to write extensively on this experience, along with my wanderings through the recreated company houses and stores that dot the property of the museum, I would be following a tradition of describing places as directors—typically (though not exclusively) tourism sites as environments that direct tourist performances.

Performance practitioners who engage with places as directors deal with literal places, sites that can be definitively indexed on a map. They are places perceived as environments, relatively inert but influential to the people who perform within them. Such places are structured in ways that encourage some performances and discourage others. They are the directors, while the people within them fill various roles as performers. Most of the literature from this perspective employs performance as a lens through which to view everyday life.

Michael S. Bowman’s discussion of tourist performance in his essay “Looking for Stonewall’s Arm” is instructive in framing performance scholars’ orientations to these places as directors. Drawing upon Dean MacCannell’s concept of “sight/site sacralization,” he argues that the process of creating tourist sites is “akin to a directorial affair where actors are put into motion, prompted to say and do things that will allow them to experience and enact the tacit meanings and values of the sight/site” (119). While the people who create these sites help set the terms for this directing, the directives exist in the structure and aura of the places themselves. As Andrew F. Wood argues of Las Vegas, some places are quite efficient in their directorial role, impacting people’s behaviors often without them even noticing (325). Tourist-performers in Vegas, he argues, are encouraged to dress in particular ways, walk in particular places, and engage in particular behaviors (such as staying out of would-be photographer’s shots) (316-24). Similarly, Jackson B. Miller and Phaedra C. Pezzullo point to how the architecture (physical and organizational) of a Native American museum (Miller) and Louisiana’s “Cancer Alley” (Pezzullo) control the experiences of those who tour them by encouraging particular actions and not others.

Non-tourist places also direct the performances of those within them. Hamera describes how ballet studios enforce norms for behavior, explaining how “Rules for corporeal placement in ballet are echoed by maps organizing studio space” (97), while Alexandra G. Murphy does the same
for airplanes, arguing that the theatricality of flight, with its emphasis on ritual, is meant to give people a familiar sense of place (313). Jones and Foust, in their aforementioned study of Denver’s 16th Street Mall, highlight how the infrastructure of the street contributes to patrons’ understandings of what constitutes acceptable performances within it. Specifically, they argue, “Structural othering designates the primary purpose of city spaces as ‘consumption’” (13). Places, from this perspective, direct people in subtle and overt ways.

Interestingly, these directions often revolve around either making people feel at home or highlighting the differences between the place in question and home. Murphy, for example, explains how airplanes and the performances within them are meant to make air travel seem like just another day, while Jennifer Iles describes how battlefield tourism provides a kind of home away from home. She explains that because “every facet of the passengers’ lives is determined—where they eat, what they eat, where they sleep, what they see, and with whom they see it,” battlefield tourists never really have to encounter people or environments that differ markedly from what they are accustomed to (170). In other words, these places are meant to be hospitable, to make people feel at home. On the other hand, places like “Cancer Alley” (Pezzullo) or the Ocean Deeps Colliery discourage people from feeling at home, contrasting these places with the comforts of homeplace to highlight their inhospitable (and often unjust) nature.

Some performers thwart the directions given by places, as when transient people take up residence on the Mall (Jones and Foust), or when Wood finds “a paradoxical home in movement” (320) on the monorail in Vegas, a place constructed as an escape from home. Bowman argues that tourist performances are shaped by both the attributes of the place itself, as well as the level of “control or direction” instilled in it by its creators (118). People in these places are not automatons; they can choose to follow the directions given by a place or not. In Wood’s words, “tourists do indeed employ a range of tactics to craft their own performances,” from “commodity empathy” to “critical struggle” (321). Performance studies scholars seem much more attuned to the critical end of this spectrum, highlighting instances when performers act against (or creatively within) the directions given by a place. Thus, Jennifer Iles points out that not all participants respond to battlefield tours as expected (174), Miller admits that some patrons will take a cultural orientation antithetical to the one museum exhibits encourage (236), and Hamera argues that ballet dancers will “inevitably seize opportunities” to perform “differently” (98). Murphy, for her part, devotes a whole section of her essay to “Tactical Resistance in Flight,” (308-13), while Wood prefers to focus his essay not on typical tourists, but on “post-tourist flâneurs,” performers who inhabit places ironically, asserting their agency through clever acts of resistance (325).

In fact, although various possibilities for performances exist within directorial places, performance studies practitioners seem to value
performances aimed at changing or even avoiding sanctioned behavior. In her autoethnographic exploration of backpacking, for example, Tracy Stephenson Shaffer organizes her reflections around the “authentic” performance of backpacking, a performance predicated on breaking the rules of tourism. It seems as though performance scholars are intent on insisting upon the agency of people within places, even those constructed (by other people) to direct their experiences. This is in line with Bowman’s encouragement that we should strive for “better tourism” (105). Viewing places as directorial, then, involves recognizing the impact an environment can have on individuals’ performances while insisting that the freedom to choose one’s own path still exists. Using performance as a lens through which to view homeplaces as directors, then, is most often a means to rhetorically construct an agential actor (often, tourist) as opposed to a passive one.

Homeplace as Performer

In my essay, “Out of the Pit: The Culture of Memorializing Miner-Martyrs,” I position the sites of coalmining monuments as active places that perform with the people who visit them (MacDonald, “Out”). Taking a cue from Bryant K. Alexander, who argues that “space and place can have character: those combinations of qualities or features that distinguish and dictate doing” (51), I argue that coalmining monuments perform transcendence in various ways. I make this argument not because I want to imbue these places with a sense of life that they lack, but rather because, having spent time in such places, I cannot believe that they are completely inert. These places performed for me, told me stories, and took my breath away. Two of the monument sites I studied were in my hometown in Cape Breton. They are places I have inhabited throughout my life—places that have played host to celebrations and ceremonies as well as everyday activities. It was only when I approached them as more than homeplaces, however—when I acknowledged that they are more than the background of my life—that I was able to witness their performances. I believe places, home and otherwise, can be viewed as performers.

Performance practitioners who view homeplaces as performers generally refer to actual, locatable spaces, but they do so in a way that suggests these sites are too dynamic to be contained by the fixity of a map. The places they describe are active; they speak and tell stories, they teach, they reach out to grab people. They are personae (Spurlock 8), places personified, characters in Alexander’s sense. It is not so much that the people who inhabit or pass through these places are entirely passive, or that places perform when no humans are watching (though that is an intriguing possibility), but that places have a dynamic quality typically denied by the belief that only humans can perform. Scholars of homeplaces as performers highlight the agency inherent in places, just as I argue that coalmining monuments and the places surrounding them possess character: “those combinations of qualities or features that distinguish and dictate doing” (Alexander 51).
Spurlock explicitly argues for the agency of place in her essay about organic farm tours, stating that, “the scene itself is no mere backdrop. Instead, it takes on a persona of victimage that raises questions for those participating in the tour with regard to precisely who is able to act and in what capacity” (8). Kathleen McGill, too, approaches place (the Gerbode Valley in California) as a cast of performers, likening the valley to “a ‘happening’” (393). Finally, Rebecca M. Kennerly describes roadside shrines as performances, arguing that studying such sites involves paying attention to “what the ‘something’ is that is ‘happening’ there,” noticing the performative process that brings such places into being (232). Others are less explicit in arguing for the agency of places but do so implicitly through their aesthetic choices. Ronald J. Pelias, for example, describes New Orleans’ Bourbon Street as a place that “gives permission” and “offers options;” he even addresses it as a lyrical conversation partner: “Oh, Bourbon Street! Oh, Bourbon Street, how you bring relief from the forces that hold, how you let me escape from the real” (“Personal” 48, 50, 53). David J. Eshelman, on the other hand, personifies cities, making them into characters in his performance A Taste of Buffalo (Eshelman).

These last two authors highlight the agency of places they have called home. Pelias begins his essay by saying, “The French Quarter in New Orleans has always been a part of my consciousness” (“Personal” 47). Eshelman, for his part, claims that his experiences living in Austin, Texas and Buffalo, New York where he grew up inspired him to write A Taste of Buffalo, a musical about “the ‘life cycles’ of U.S. cities” (2). He describes these cities (and others) as having “relationships” to one another, and is particularly “interested in the sacrifices cities make in order to ‘succeed’” (2). Phaedra C. Pezzullo describes a performing homeplace of a different sort; her description of tours of Louisiana’s “Cancer Alley” demonstrates that homeplaces sometimes perform out of desperation. She states: “With full appreciation of the irony of inviting people to tour toxic or polluted sites, residents of these areas guide outsiders through where they live, work, play, and pray, providing stops along the way to highlight particular concerns, such as pollution sources, peoples’ physical ailments, and related environmental/social problems” (227). The residents of this homeplace cannot ignore its performances; it commands their attention, and so they command the attention of others.

What these and other writings of performing places make apparent is not that these authors infuse places with character, but that they perceive character traits within them. To do this often requires a shift in attention, “a shift that includes but does not privilege humans” (McGill 391). That is, it requires listening to a place rather than imposing a plan or grid upon it. Spurlock, highlighting the unguided nature of the farm tours she studied, explains that they encouraged a sort of “witnessing” more powerful than the voyeuristic viewing of a tourist gaze (17). McGill outlines a loose method (or, perhaps, anti-method?) for understanding places like the Gerbode Valley. She says it involves “allowing ‘something’ to emerge on its own” through processes akin
to Richard Schechner’s “selective inattention” and/or just “sitting and looking” or “walking over the land” (399). It is through such listening that she is able to describe the Valley as “actively dialogic” and “performative” (McGill 396).

These are primarily persuasive performances. Some places, like my coalmining monuments and Kennerly’s roadside shrines, persuade us to remember, and to work toward the prevention of senseless loss: “Roadside shrines call attention to themselves, insisting on a performative engagement with them from those who mourn, those who are dead, those of us who pass by, and those who would have them removed” (252). Other places, like the Gerbode Valley (McGill), “Cancer Alley” (Pezzullo), and organic farms (Spurlock), persuade us of their vulnerability and the need for environmental protection. This message is of great importance; as McGill argues, it is a matter of life or death (400). Still other places, like Pelias’ Bourbon Street, persuade us to act upon our desires (Pelias “Personal”), or beg us to beware of taking our desires too far (Eschelman). The commonality is that these places persuade us to act. Performance scholars engaging with such places enact a shift in perspective, revealing the agency in the places with which they co-exist, allowing themselves to audience the persuasive performance unfolding around them. It seems they agree with McGill that, “humans need to recast their roles from that of single player on a cultural stage to one of many species in a large living theater” (401).

**Future Trajectories of Homeplace—Journeying Along These Lines of Flight**

Based on recent essays in two central journals, I have outlined four theoretical pathways performance studies practitioners often take toward homeplace. These four interconnected orientations—homeplace as event, text, director, and performer—can be placed on two continuums, first, from place as relatively inert (i.e., as event; as text) to place as relatively active (i.e., as director; as performer) and second, from intimate places—as when performers create homeplaces through performance—to those more public and/or foreign—as in the directorial performances of tourist places. The orientations I have outlined here are neither mutually exclusive nor jointly exhaustive. Other orientations are possible and perhaps desirable, and other thinkers may choose to organize them much differently. The framework I have outlined here is beneficial for several reasons. First, it shifts focus from theories developed by philosophers outside of the discipline to those developed by performance studies practitioners. This is important not because disciplinary boundaries should be kept intact, but rather because these scholars are most aware of the traditions and missions of performance studies. Second, this system draws upon performance itself for its metaphoric foundations, organized as it is around dramatic elements. Third, this schema preserves the mobile spirit of performance studies by foregoing the rigid categorization of homeplaces in favor of outlining orientations toward homeplace that may overlap and interact.
In addition to providing guidance for future navigation toward homeplace, this review of theoretical positions highlights the importance homeplace still holds, even in this milieu of supposed “placelessness” (Hill 3). According to Lippard, “The search for homeplace is the mythical search for the axis mundi, for a center, for some place to stand, for something to hang on to” (27). Such a search is important, for responsible speech and action requires knowing where one stands, at least for a moment in time. For homeplace to truly become “that space where we return for renewal and self-recovery, where we can heal our wounds and become whole,” we must responsibly interrogate our relationship with place(s) (hooks 49). Simple or nostalgic statements about a home that existed in the past are not enough; as McKinnon argues, “Rather than recuperate spaces as our home spaces, it is vital to question what home means in that context, who can call the space home and how” (28). The authors summarized here are engaging in this critical questioning, through both the written word and embodied performance. I have no doubt that they and others will continue to build this discourse of homeplace. This essay is my organizational contribution to our collective efforts.

On a personal level, tracking these lines of flight has inspired me not only to continue researching my own homeplace(s) and my relationships with them, but also to move into directions I have left relatively unexplored until now. I wonder, for example, about the critical similarities and differences between Cape Breton and Carbondale as texts, and about the privileges and oppressions my body carries as a result of residing in both places. I am intrigued by the possibilities presented by homeplace events. Could staged performances like Blood from a Stone or Pineau’s Shadowboxing, for example, be used to educate communities about their own relationships to homeplace and/or heal the pain diasporic communities feel in the wake of years of separation? Finally, I cannot help but look curiously at the house I currently call home and ponder what it would mean to truly listen to its performances, to learn from its memories, and to act as it persuades me. What if, instead of searching for a place to stand, I allowed a place to choose me? Homeplace is calling. I will gather the fluid maps drawn by my colleagues around me, and set off for home again, until I no longer need it or, more importantly, it no longer needs me.

Notes

1 I recognize that these journals are representative of a particular segment of performance studies, namely, the NCA tradition, and that relying on these journals alone leaves a lot of research untouched. At the same time, they are hotbeds of performance research and, as such, can provide the basis for a first attempt at surveying the theoretical field.
These orientations almost map onto the aspects of Kenneth Burke’s pentad, but I forego such a categorization scheme here in favor of my own because it allows more flexibility for my analysis. In the future, it may be useful to apply dramatistic analysis to studies of homeplace.

Boiled dinner is a light-brothed stew made with salt pork, potatoes, carrots, and cabbage (among other possible vegetables). Tetley and Red Rose are popular brands of tea in Canada and Cape Breton, and most Cape Bretoners drink our tea—brewed strong—at least twice a day.

In her essay, “Performing and Sustaining (Agri)Culture and Place: The Cultivation of Environmental Subjectivity on the Piedmont Farm Tour,” Spurlock describes visitors on the farm tour as “playing farmer” (8).

Many authors adopting this orientation to place cite Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, whose work on tourism and performance seems to encourage this critical performative stance.
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