

which seems relatively arbitrarily delineated; the three genres overlap in time but dominate according to the political and social conditions of society.

An annoying tendency in cultural criticism has been to conflate all postwar activity, at least that of the last 20 years, as “postmodern.” Buxton’s contribution to critique is to explore with interpretative creativity and credibility the possibility that particular historical configurations lead to particular ideological resolutions in television series, giving rise to different genres. The issue Buxton develops, more or less in the interstices of his argument rather than as a clear center, is that of historical particularity: How can we understand television as the attempted imagined resolution of social contradiction unique to specific social conditions?

In the end, Buxton offers no theoretical closure; we are left with one paragraph concluding that packaging may overcome television fiction’s autonomy as a cultural form—a startling conclusion for a monograph that begins by showing the fiction’s development within material production, which is hardly “autonomous.” If the critic’s job is, as Buxton says, to point out ideological structuring absences, there should be a specific political point to criticism; otherwise, theory deteriorates into methodology, with no more justification for its existence than for other types of research of which he speaks so slightly. Buxton is, I think, correct to suggest that the new audience theory should not abandon text. To retreat into a new sort of structuralism, however, does not seem to push the cause of critical studies any farther toward the

political critique that was the original goal of the theory of ideology on which he bases his work.

The Many Lives of the Batman

Edited by Roberta E. Pearson and William Uricchio. New York: Routledge, 1991. ix + 213 pages. \$39.50 (hard), \$13.95 (soft).

A review by Matthew P. McAllister
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

This book’s title, *The Many Lives of the Batman*, has a dynamic dual meaning. First, the “many lives” refers to the elastic nature of the Caped Crusader as a character—the Batman is, to apply a term used in the book, a “floating signifier” in comic books and different media. There are many different Batmen: the grim Batman of the 1940s comic book, the amateurish and overly patriotic Batman of the 1940s movie serials, the campy Batman of 1960s television, the postmodern Batman of 1980s comic art miniseries *The Dark Knight*, and the Michael Keaton Batman of the 1989 blockbuster movie, among others.

But also there is another meaning associated with the Batman’s “many lives.” In large part because of the character’s flexibility of meaning, it offers a unique showcase for the applicability of different scholarly approaches to mass communication and popular culture. The two editors of *The Many Lives of the Batman*, Roberta E. Pearson and William Uricchio, take great advantage of this opportunity by offering an eclectic

selection of interpretive and critical perspectives on Batman as a commodity, a cultural icon, and a source of popular appeal. Despite claims of "blurred genres" and "paradigm dialogues," different intellectual approaches toward popular culture and mass communication do not talk to one another often enough. This stagnating separatism closes off avenues of growth, and it is thus refreshing to see within one book many different approaches being applied to one cultural phenomenon.

The book is organized according to issues of production, audience, and content. It begins with one perspective that is often missing from scholarly tomes, that of the media practitioner. The first chapter is an insightful (although not comprehensively referenced) history of the Batman character—and by extension a history of the comic book medium—by Bill Boichel, the owner of a comics-related business. The next two chapters are interviews with two comic book creators recently associated with the Batman character, Dennis O'Neil and Frank Miller. The interview with O'Neil, the current editor of two Batman comic books, provides a good overview of what the comic book industry looks like from a practitioner's perspective, including how a comic book is produced. The interview with Frank Miller, the comic book "auteur" of the much publicized and high-selling miniseries *The Dark Knight*, deals with the revisionist image of the superhero that recent comics creators have attempted, and Miller's subsequent disillusionment when this trend was either ignored or co-opted by the larger comic book companies. Eileen

Meehan next takes a more critical political economic perspective, specifically focusing on how the economic strategy that accompanied *Batman: The Movie* (including promotion, licensing, and merchandising decisions) fits in with the synergistic philosophy of the mega-media corporation that produced it (at the time Warner Communications, Inc., now Time-Warner).

The book then shifts focus and begins to deal with issues of the audience, a topic that is currently drawing much academic interest. Patrick Parsons presents a history of the comic book audience, providing much valuable and otherwise difficult-to-find quantitative data about the changing nature of the comic book audience. Camille Bacon-Smith with Tyrone Yarborough draws on folklore scholarship to attempt an inductive study of how different audiences interpreted *Batman: The Movie*. Lynn Spigel and Henry Jenkins argue that how people remember mediated phenomena is strongly influenced by current cultural contexts, and provide evidence for this argument by contrasting 1960s press musings about the "pop art" controversy of the Batman television series with recent interviews of people who grew up watching the program. One could argue, however, that comparing the columns of television critics with the remembrances of then-child viewers is comparing discursive apples and oranges. Finally, in the wittiest writing of the book (and an essay that must have irked if not shocked those at DC Comics), Andy Medhurst interprets Batmen of different eras from a subcultural gay-studies perspective, arguing that the Bat-

man of the 1940s and the television "camp" Batman may offer unique meaning to many members of the gay male community.

The last two essays deal with Batman as text. In an article applying one version of postmodern theory, Jim Collins shows how comic books and the movie version of Batman are explicitly intertextual, referring constantly to previous cultural forms and thus increasing the possibilities of multiple readings. The last essay, "I'm Not Fooled by that Cheap Disguise," written by the two editors of the book, is reminiscent at times of the approach taken at the Center for the Study of Popular Culture at Bowling Green State University. Looking at the values communicated by Bat-discourse, the article focuses on the changing nature of the character, the relationship between Batman and both the Joker and Robin, and the subtle ways through which Batman as a cultural text legitimates the status quo.

Aside from a few minor misspellings (Spiderman should be Spider-Man; Comic Buyers' Guide should be Comic Buyer's Guide—comic book people are touchy about this sort of thing), one problem with the book, and maybe an inherent problem given the book's goals, is fragmentation. At times it was a bit difficult to get a handle on the book as a cohesive work. The book would have benefited from a concluding essay that attempted to tie together the many perspectives into some sort of coherent package, showing how analyses of production, audience, and text relate to each other and help us to understand cultural phenomena as a whole. Of course, such an essay

would stress not only the commonalities: pointing out the fundamental differences in the perspectives would also help the reader understand the intellectual value and location of the book's contents.

But despite this, overall the book has many strengths. It focuses attention on a cultural form that often is ignored in communication scholarship. Nearly all of the essays successfully integrate historical context in their contributions to the Bat-culture. This is refreshing in that much scholarship on comic books completely discards the history of the medium and of past academic work, or presents a nonreflexive history, ignoring interactions between comics and other media, for example, or all previous scholarship except that of Frederick Wertham, when in fact around 200 scholarly works about comic books were published *before* Wertham's 1954 *Seduction of the Innocent*. And lastly, the book nobly illustrates how a variety of analytic frameworks may be applied to one popular character, highlighting that the multidisciplinary nature of communication studies is one of its most vibrant attributes.

Pray TV: Televangelism in America

By Steve Bruce. New York: Routledge, 1990. xii + 272 pages. \$59.50 (hard), \$16.95 (soft).

A review by Stephen J. Pullum
University of North Carolina at
Wilmington

Although media attention to televangelism has diminished within the last

Where does Batman live? Batman lives and operates out of Gotham City. Interestingly enough, Gotham City was not identified as being an independent city until Detective Comics #48, over twenty issues after Batman's debut. Up until that point, while "Gotham" was occasionally referenced, it was only used in the context of the time. You see, in the late 1930s/early 1940s, "Gotham" was a popular term by journalists to refer to New York City. So when Bill Finger and Bob Kane made references to "Gotham" in early Batman stories, they were likely referring to Batman living in New York City. It was these overlapping lives that are illuminated in this critical anthology, which analyzes the contexts of the character's production and reception across a wide spectrum of time and media forms. ...more. Get A Copy. Amazon. Online Stores ¼. Audible Barnes & Noble Walmart eBooks Apple Books Google Play Abebooks Book Depository Alibris Indigo Better World Books IndieBound. Libraries. Paperback, 240 pages. If anyone has any good nonfiction stuff on the Batman send the mail my way. I was excited to read this. ...more. flag Like · see review. Dimitris rated it liked it Aug 03, 2019. Rob rated it liked it Jun 24, 2012. Chayce rated it it was amazing Apr 25, 2016. Jaya rated it really liked it Aug 10, 2017. Batman Bruce Wayne. Batman on the cover of Batman: Hush, art by Jim Lee. Publication information. Publisher. Batman has been adapted in live-action and animated incarnations, including the 1960s Batman television series played by Adam West and in films by Michael Keaton in Batman (1989) and Batman Returns (1992), Christian Bale in The Dark Knight Trilogy (2005–2012), and Ben Affleck in the DC Extended Universe (2016–present). By 1942, the writers and artists behind the Batman comics had established most of the basic elements of the Batman mythos.[34] In the years following World War II, DC Comics "adopted a postwar editorial direction that increasingly de-emphasized social commentary in favor of lighthearted juvenile fantasy". Batman's first big-budget live-action movies were going to be a cause for excitement no matter what, but that doesn't mean they were the most accurate depiction of the hero. As much as people made of how Batman was portrayed in Dawn of Justice, neglecting Bruce Wayne's philosophy against killing was something that happened right from his movie appearances in the '80s. Batman kills so often in Tim Burton's movies that we could probably devote about half of these entries to such incidents, but we'll consolidate them for the sake of covering more ground. In Batman Ret