

audiences. However, with the institutionalization of the Hollywood press corps and the related growth in the extratextual discourse circulated about film stars, film celebrities became a blend of the everyday and the exceptional. The combination of familiarity and extraordinariness gives the celebrity its ideological power. One can see the construction of this unity in the type of acting and performing that has been central to the institution of film.

### The Extraordinary and the Ordinary in Film Performance

Once the narrative film came to represent the mainstream of commercial cinema during the second decade of the twentieth century, film performance became principally a form of professional acting. The decline of the documentary, the sports film, and the newsreel as the centers of the filmic experience was furthered by the growth of radio as the preferred new medium for the discourses of news and information. Film acting, however, was perceived to represent the "real" and the "natural" (which are, of course, cultural constructs) to a much greater degree than stage acting. Part of this naturalistic aura surrounding film acting is derived from film's documentarian origins. The theater, with its proscenium, its staging, the clear artifice of the presentation, and the projection of the actors, is not physically present in the film. Instead, we are given an apparently less constructed scene; the camera takes us, for example, into the living room of a house after showing its exterior. In concert with this conception of the naturalness of film and the artifice of the stage, it was generally believed that a good stage actor did not necessarily make a good film actor. The stage actor had to build the believability of his or her character, had to become the character. To stage critics, acting entailed creating a temporary artifice of character, and the artifice had to be discernible. The good film actor, on the other hand, was believed to be someone who did not use the craft and artifice of acting: he or she performed naturally. Film director D. W. Griffith chose his actors more on the basis of their appearance than for their acting ability. Sergei Eisenstein searched the streets to find the faces that would typify the characters in his scenarios. Qualities of beauty, youth, and stereotypical appearance became central to the profession of film acting to a de-

gree they never achieved in stage acting. The ability to "not act" also became a valued commodity in the search for film stars.

Attention to the naturalness of the film performer is also connected somewhat to the historical development of acting in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Richard Sennett has chronicled the transformation of stage performance from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, and he notes that in the eighteenth century, actors assumed clear-cut social positions and classes on stage, particularly in melodrama. Thus, stereotypes of performance were common; particular actors became expert at portraying particular types of classes or characters. In the nineteenth century, great acting rested on the development of a unique interpretation of the character; in other words, actors, such as Frederic Le Maitre in Paris, achieved renown for their ability to personalize their roles and transcend the text. They were thought to possess some superior quality because they could shock the audience with their ability to act naturally and therefore overcome the limitations of the characters they played.<sup>21</sup> The personalization of the acting profession grew gradually from the late eighteenth century throughout the nineteenth century. As Elizabeth Burns points out, the practice of linking actors' names with those of the characters they played began in the eighteenth century. As a result, audiences would see Garrick's Hamlet or Irving's Shylock; the self and the personality of the self became clear factors in the understanding of the theatrical text.<sup>22</sup>

In the early twentieth century, the acting techniques of Stanislavsky were gaining influence, roughly simultaneous to the narrative development of film. Although it was another three decades before Stanislavsky's techniques were formulated into the Method school of acting in the United States, their investment with the construction of the self through the personalization of the character matched much of the development of Hollywood film acting. The Method technique demands that the actor internalize the psychological makeup of the character in order to achieve a more natural portrayal.<sup>23</sup> This technique was in opposition to the character acting tradition of the British and American stage. The theatrical tradition of the actor's observing behavior and accent from the world around him or her could be seen as developing the character from the outside in; in this technique, meticulous attention is paid to manifest signs of class and habit. Method

acting, in contrast, is psychologically deep when it is taken to its extreme of character development.

The salience of Method acting for film stemmed from three factors.<sup>24</sup> The first is linked nominally to technological distinctions. Because film deals with faces and expressions in close-up, it made the grand and sweeping gestures of stage performance look oddly inauthentic. The close-up possibilities of film psychologized and interiorized the meanings of filmic texts. With the advent of sound film, the highly developed and resonating stage voice, the very grain of that voice, also appeared unnatural and forced. New ranges and new constructions of character intimacy were possible when voice projection to a theatrical audience was no longer necessary. This relationship between technological change and the personalization of the screen performer is not simply one of cause and effect. The use of film technology is positioned around the articulation of certain kinds of powerful discourses. Film, as a type of mass media, was involved in the expression of forms of individuality that were possible within modern mass society. Film provided a channel for the proliferation of a discourse on individuality and personality. The technology of film is therefore connected to the expression of this discourse on the forms of modern individuality.<sup>25</sup>

The second factor leading to the relative dominance of the Method form of acting in film is that the technique allows for the expression of the personalities of the actors involved in the production. On its own, this may not seem to be a very great consideration, but if one thinks of the various interests involved in the production of a film, one can see the impetus behind constructing characterizations that transcend the individual film. As mentioned above, the film star's agent is actively working to create a unique use value and exchange value for the film actor that can be represented. Barry King has argued quite effectively that the actor as celebrity or star expresses a value that is quite separate from the individual film production.<sup>26</sup> Thus, the film star represents the wresting of control of the production away from the producers and the directors. If a director, like Griffith and Eisenstein, among others, chooses leads on the basis of age, beauty, or other physical features, and not on the ability of the performers to act, then the control of the production rests with the director. His or her ability to edit, to construct the scenario, to juxtapose a series of images

into the story diminishes the productivity and use value of the actor to the finished product. However, if the uniqueness of the personality of the star is critical to the success of the film production, then control of the film moves toward the star's perceived interests. Method acting allows for the permutation that the internal expression of a character can also be a playing out of the psychological dimensions of the star him- or herself. According to King, this is imbricated in the control of the economics of production and the division of labor in the film industry: "Under such circumstances, a potential politics of persona emerges insofar as the bargaining power of the actor, or more emphatically, the star, is materially affected by the *degré* of his or her reliance on the apparatus (the image), as opposed to self-located resources (the person) in the construction of persona."<sup>27</sup>

King goes on to conclude that "impersonation," which is the ability to play a particular character, becomes less valued in the economies of film production than the capacity for "personification" — the ability to construct a continuing personal and individual mark in each film role.<sup>28</sup> He explains why:

The ramifications are complex, but basically personification serves the purposes of containing competition amongst the tele-film cartel companies by representing the star's contribution as resting on his or her private properties as a person.... The centrality of personae (stars) as an index of value provides a form of control — shifting or ever threatening to shift, signifiers from the actor to the apparatus — over the detail of performance in favour of those who have control over the text.<sup>29</sup>

The third factor leading to the interiorization of character and actor in films is connected to the audience construction of the celebrity. Method acting has deepened the significance of the mundane, the everyday lives of relatively ordinary people. In coordination with the conception that film acting does not involve the abstraction and impersonation that stage acting utilizes, the audience is positioned much closer to the enigma of the identity of the film celebrity. Moreover, the psychological identity of the film actor is more central to understanding any of the film's texts. Actors such as Marlon Brando and James Dean were able to build careers on combining the interiorization of Method acting with the search for their true selves. They were able to include the audience in this search for the ur-text of their star personalities.

### The Audience's Pleasure and Play and the Construction of Significance with Intimacy and Enigma

The relationship that the audience builds with the film celebrity is configured through a tension between the possibility and impossibility of knowing the authentic individual. The various mediated constructions of the film celebrity ensure that whatever intimacy is permitted between the audience and the star is purely at the discursive level. The desire and pleasure are derived from this clear separation of the material reality of the star as living being from the fragments of identity that are manifested in films, interviews, magazines, pinup posters, autographs, and so on. Depending on the level of commitment of the audience member, certain types of fragments or traces of identity are deemed adequate. For some, the characters of the films themselves, which among them construct their own intertextual framework of the celebrity's identity, are quite sufficient. For others, those called fanatics or fans, the materiality of identity must be reinforced through the acquisition of closer representations of existence and identity. The autograph and the pinup poster epitomize the committed fan of a film celebrity. Belonging to a fan club entails an investment into the maintenance of a coherent identity, as members circulate information about the celebrity that for the members establishes a somewhat separate and distinctive episteme concerning the star's true nature. Recent work on fan culture has articulated the relative affective investment that can be part of the cultural experience of the star for the audience. Fandom can actively transform the meaning of stars well beyond the material presented in magazines and newspapers.<sup>30</sup>

In his book on film stars, Morin lists some of the requests that fans have made of their favorite celebrities. Some ask for locks of hair, others for small possessions that will allow the fan to enter the private sphere of the star through the fetish object. Most ask for photographs. Some are driven to ask their favorite stars' advice on their own personal matters.<sup>31</sup> According to Margaret Thorpe, in the 1930s and 1940s a studio typically received up to fifteen thousand fan letters a week. A first-class star would have received directly three hundred letters a week.<sup>32</sup>

The range of audience participation in the construction of the film celebrity sign is wide and varied. Nevertheless, stars possess a general allure in their combination of the everyday and the extraordinary that

is modalized through a discourse on intimacy and enigma. The ordinary elements of the film star are important as a marked entrance point for the audience to play with kinds of identity and identification. Since its inception, the film industry has produced stars who have emerged from apparently "normal" backgrounds. The mythology of stardom that has been circulated in the trade literature since Laemmle's Biograph Girl media event is the possibility that anyone can be a star. Because of the sustained focus on external appearance, as opposed to acting ability, the film star appeared to be chosen quite randomly. Merit was secondary to luck and circumstance. In this way, the Hollywood film industry perpetuated a myth of democratic access. The concept of merit and ability was transposed into the language of character and the personal history of the star. Humble beginnings, hard work, and honesty were the extratextual signs of the film celebrity that supported this myth of the democratic art. The extensive discourse on the stars' personal and private lives often was constructed on how fame and fortune could corrupt the ordinary human being housed in the star personality. This theme became one of the central film story lines of a progressively self-reflexive Hollywood. From *42nd Street* to three versions of *A Star Is Born*, Hollywood reinforced its anyone-can-make-it mythology.

In contradistinction to the democratic nature of access, the image of the film star expressed the inaccessibility and extraordinary quality of the celebrity lifestyle. In double senses of the word, the images of wealth were typically *classless*, and in this way were compatible with the democratic ideology that surrounded Hollywood movies, despite their oligopolistic economic structure. The mansions of the movie stars had all the signs of wealth and prestige but none of the cultural capital to reign in the appearance of excess. The swimming pools, with their unique shapes, the immodest and therefore grandiose architecture pillaged from countless traditions without cultural contextualization, and the elaborate grounds and gates were all signs of the nouveau riche, a class excluded from the dominant culture because of its inability to coordinate the signs of wealth. Movie stars' prestige was built on the signs of consumer capitalism, and their decadence and excess were celebrations of the spoils of an ultimate consumer lifestyle. Their wealth, generated through the expansion of leisure as an industry and the entertainment consumer as a widening domain of subjectivity, was cause for celebration—not cultural responsibility.

To use Bourdieu's typology of taste and distinction, the movie star's ostentatious presentation of wealth exemplified an aesthetic that was obvious and overdone. In opposition, those who possessed not only capital but cultural and intellectual capital constructed their distinctive taste in terms of abstraction and distance from these more obvious and overt expressions of wealth.<sup>33</sup>

The power of the film celebrity's aesthetic of wealth and leisure in the twentieth century can not be seen to be static. With its close connection to the construction of consumer lifestyles, the film celebrity's forays into recreational pursuits helped define the parameters of pleasure through consumption for all segments of society. Perhaps the best example of this expansive and proliferating power to influence the entire *socius* has been the growing centrality of the Hollywood image of the healthy body. Tanned skin had been seen traditionally as evidence of physical labor, specifically farm labor. Although there may have been a bucolic connotation to the image of the tanned and brawny farmhand, it contained no further signification of an easy, leisurely life. To be tanned was evidence that one had engaged in hard work under the sun. Hollywood film stars helped construct a new body aesthetic as they attempted to look healthier under the intense lighting of their film shoots. The activity of suntanning achieved a glamorous connotation because it now indicated one had the time to do virtually nothing but lie in the sun. The film star worked in this domain of breaking down and reconstructing conceptions of distinctions. Thus, certain expensive or class-based outdoor sports, such as yachting and tennis, provided a conduit between these new body images of health and fitness that demanded time and energy in the sun and the other moneyed classes. Leisure and wealth became in the twentieth century associated with having a tan and a well-toned body; however, these new signs, appropriated from the laboring class, had to have been achieved through sports and hobbies, and not work.<sup>34</sup>

The classlessness of film celebrities despite their clear wealth aligned them as a group with their audience. Their wealth, if thought of as an extrapolation of a consumer subjectivity, also aligned them with an ethos fostered in late capitalism. The construction of identity in the domains of consumption as opposed to production made the film star an image of the way in which a lifestyle/identity could be found in the domain of nonwork. The star, then, to borrow from Ewen's study of the development of a general consumer consciousness in the

twentieth century through advertising and general business objectives, performed as a "consumption ideal": a representative of the modern way of life.<sup>35</sup> Anyone has access to the goods of the large department stores, and therefore can play in this democratic myth of identity construction through consumption.

The chasm between the type of lifestyle constructed by the film star and that constructed by the audience is continually filled in by the rumors, gossip, and stories that circulate in newspapers and magazines concerning the complex and tragic lives led in Hollywood. In early Hollywood, the reported excesses of lifestyle and success were treated in a disciplinary manner by the press. If one thinks of a film star as a consumption ideal, then failures and tragedies were the results of a consumer lifestyle that was incongruous with the personal roots of the star. Much of the writing of the personal life stories of the stars, particularly the form of gossip writing that focused on failure, emphasized the traps of success. The discourse on film star tragedy, then, was concerned with the reconciliation of the personal and the psychological with the manner and means of consumption. The root cause for the diversion of lifestyle from the person's true nature was the instant success gained by the film star. The disciplinary morals offered by these scandals of the stars for the audience concerned the need to match one's psychological personality with an appropriate lifestyle and consumption identity. The stars represented extreme constructions of lifestyle. The audience member had to work toward some kind of balance. Finally, the audience also learned about the essential human frailties and personality types of these distant stars. Despite their larger-than-life presence on screen, film stars were essentially human and covered the gamut of personality types.

### Summary

The film celebrity as a general discourse occupies a central position in the development of the twentieth-century celebrity, and it is for this reason I have provided a rather lengthy genealogy of its formation. Because of cinema's history, covering the entire twentieth century, and because the cinematic apparatus's development and growth coincided with the growth and extension of consumer capitalism, the film celebrity has provided a way in which the discourses of individualism, freedom, and identity have been articulated in modern soci-

ety. With the film star's relative nonattachment to material forms of production because of his or her work solely in the manufacture of images, the discourse on and about screen stars was particularly concerned with the manner of consumption and the associated construction of lifestyles. The discourse on film celebrities and their consumption was also integrated into a study of personality, character, and general psychological profile. Through various extratextual sources, the celebrities provided the ground for the debate concerning the way in which new patterns of consumption could be organized to fit the innate patterns of personality.

In the rest of this chapter, I examine a contemporary film celebrity in depth to reveal the way in which these various discourses are modalized through a particular celebrity sign. Within the discussion of the intertextual and extratextual elements in the sign/text construction of the celebrity, I develop a typology of celebrity and audience subjectivity as it relates to film.

### **Tom Cruise: The Construction of a Contemporary Film Celebrity**

#### **The Channels of Knowledge**

Tom Cruise is classified by a variety of sources as a movie star. To achieve this status, Cruise articulates through various texts and representations that he possesses certain qualities that are not possessed by others. He exits the realm of the everyday and moves into the representational world of the public sphere. For Cruise, the filmic text, where he performs various roles that are constructed into clear-cut narratives, becomes the primary means by which he becomes identifiable as a recognizable public figure. Surrounding the particular moments of each film release are the intersections of several strategic discourses that work to construct the celebrity quality of the film star. On one level, the agency that represents Tom Cruise, along with the corporation and production company that has produced the film, attempts to promote an organized conception of Tom Cruise that is connected with the specific release of the film. Cruise, then, is both contained by the package of the film and is the package that works to draw the attention of the press to consider the film significant or of

interest. The film star works in the arena of publicity that predates the exhibition date of the film.

#### **The Origins of Film Stardom: The Physical Performer**

The specific constructions that are strategically operated in the release of a film can be likened to Richard DeCordova's historical categories of the development of the star persona.<sup>36</sup> In the early twentieth century, audience knowledge about the performers in cinema was limited. Thus, we see the development of monikers that were connected to their performances on screen rather than their real names. Film actors were identified by the audience and the film industry, as mentioned above, through their physical characteristics. We can call this first category of identification, in line with DeCordova's analysis, the *physical performer*: what is identified by industry and audience are the physical characteristics that make him or her unique in the field of film performers. Thus, this is a discourse that emphasizes beauty or lack thereof, the performer's nose, smile, eyes, entire body type. It is an objectification of the performer that is more often than not metonymic; that is, one element/feature represents the entire performer and connects his or her reality from one film to the next. The metonymic process should not be seen as emerging solely from the industry or the audience. The industry attempts to read the public, based on a variety of polling techniques as well as less scientifically and more culturally defined conceptions of beauty and attraction. The historical organization of this pretesting can be captured by the screen test, where a performer is filmed to determine his or her commodity potential and value to the studio. If the test is successful, then the performer is released in a feature film and marketed as a starlet, a rising star. Audience reaction to the new performer is fully tested after the release of his or her first films. A determination of star quality is determined from this rereading of the film's audience, general public reaction, and the associated press coverage of the individual performer.

#### **Cruise as Physical Performer**

In the transformation of DeCordova's categories into an individual celebrity text, one can see that the construction of the physi-

cal performer emerges at the beginning of any film celebrity's career. At that point, extratextual knowledge of the actor is limited. Even his or her on-screen presence is often constrained to only moments of screen time—a newcomer is not often the star of his or her early films. Nevertheless, there is a particular quality or group of qualities that become the way in which the actor becomes recognizable as a specific type. When the celebrity is identified in these physical terms, there is the risk that he or she will become typecast, or arrested in the formation of celebrity status and cast in roles based only on some clear-cut stereotypical image/quality.

Tom Cruise's emergence as a film actor and star is first connected to the physicality of his performance. The category with which Cruise was identified, by both industry and audience, was that of youth. In his second film, *Taps* (1981), Cruise, although originally cast for a much smaller part, was able (according to the biographical information made significant when he began to star in films later in his career), because of his apparent innate screen presence, to expand his role into something much larger and more significant. In the film he plays a gung-ho, arms-obsessed cadet at a military academy. His role presents youth as pure action: unthinking instead of contemplative, assured, confident, and narrow-minded in his choice of actions. His character, David Shawn, is willing to murder and quite willing to die. All of this is done with a certain bravado that is expressed in Cruise's use of his smile and grin, something that has become a trademark in his movement to celebrity status. In terms of the film's character, the smile and the grin indicate the reckless insanity of the personality. It was with this role that Cruise's name moved into the popular press.

Cruise's film debut was also in a film designated specifically for a youth audience. In *Endless Love* (1981), a Franco Zeffirelli-directed film about modern obsessive teenage love, Cruise plays a small role that is not mentioned in any of the reviews. What is significant is his position once again in terms of categories of youth. The film industry worked to establish a legion of youthful stars in the 1980s. Connected with their rise were several coming-of-age films as well as the construction of a group of actors who came to be known through the popular press as the Hollywood brat pack.<sup>37</sup> As a market segment, the youth audience was considered to be the very center of the film industry. The development of films that focused on generational themes, and through those narratives established territory for the elevation

of certain young actors to stardom, could be seen as a general industrial strategy.<sup>38</sup> Cruise was part of this organization of the film industry around its principal exhibition market.

In these earliest incarnations, Cruise possesses a character type that is closely aligned with his own physical look. He is a physical performer, and our knowledge of his private world is virtually nonexistent. He is characterized by his engendering young male handsomeness. As well, he must be structured and must structure himself into the construction of filmic youthful maleness. The gendering of his physical presence, then, is carried out in reference to past icons who define what makes a male film star. He is thus engendered into a cultural pattern of representation.

What this means is that Cruise, as a new potential star, is mapped onto the types of male stars that predated his appearance. In the postwar period, the intersection of male and youth has been represented by past stars as confused rebellion. The images of Marlon Brando and James Dean, along with Elvis Presley, established this dominant construction of male youth. No doubt the extratextual elements that revealed aspects of their personal lives also enhanced the images of these stars beyond their filmic type. Generally, however the consistency of character type in their films operates as the primary focus for the rearticulation of filmic maleness in future male stars. Cruise's construction of male "physical performer" must reply to the way in which these past stars exhibited strength and presence. Fundamentally, we can see that Dean, Brando, and even, to a degree, Paul Newman represent the interiorization of male power: there is a repressed fury in their performances that is represented by their brooding character portrayals and their bursts of aggression and violence.

These past film stars, then, operate as icons or archetypes that work to define the organization of new types of stars in their ordinary or emergent forms as physical performers. Cruise's physical performance must also work in response to the antiheroic male film stars of the 1970s: De Niro, Pacino, and Hoffman.<sup>39</sup> Because of their representations of ethnicity and of the working class and underclass, the designation of heroic qualities to these stars seems a misnomer. Nevertheless, they represent film stars: they are instrumental in the organization of film investment capital, they can demand high payment fees as well as a percentage of box-office revenues, and they are easily and readily recognizable in the public sphere. Tom Cruise's

emergence as a physical performer, then, must negotiate these filmic identities to establish a certain continuity in the construction of the male film star and the uniqueness or differentiation of his particular example of the lineage. What this entails for the emerging star is that an attachment to the cultural icons of male representation produced by filmdom must be made evident so that subsequent extension of the icon can be made in the growth of the individual star.

What is interesting is that Cruise's first six films are intensely focused on youth and, more or less, on rebellion. In *The Outsiders* (1983), Cruise is involved in midwestern youth gang encounters between the rich and the poor. In the first film that features Cruise in the lead role, *Losin' It* (1983), a generic low-budget male-oriented teenage sex comedy, the emphasis is on loss of virginity, adventure in Tijuana, and a red convertible sports car. His next two movies establish the clear nature of the physical performer Tom Cruise. In *Risky Business* (1983), Cruise plays an upper-class teenager who plays out his fantasies when his parents go out of town and leave him alone for the first time. Finally, in *All the Right Moves* (1983), Cruise plays a very talented quarterback for a working-class town's high school football team. His success on the field is seen as his way out of the dead-end setting of the steel factory community.

As mentioned above, all of these films provide a unified theme concerning Tom Cruise as performer. All of them emphasize his youth. By implication, this emphasis on youth also emphasizes his youthful body and face. Cruise's screen presence, then, is constructed specifically around his embodiment of male beauty. His confidence in movement is part of this construction. His athletic build becomes another marker of his success as engendered representation of filmic male. Iconically, Cruise is connected to stars who represent the very mainstream of American film beauty. In the tradition of Newman and Redford, Cruise embodies Americanness as opposed to some Other of ethnicity. In terms of appearance, he is neither exotic nor enigmatic.

The emergence of the film celebrity is dependent on this original construction of the physical performer, where the actor is celebrated as a "type." The actor remains relatively anonymous except for these screen images. There is no deepening of the meaning of the actor beyond the screen presentations. However, the screen presentations provide a certain redundancy of image, an overcoding that is directed toward a decoding by the audience of the physical performer's reason

for being celebrated, the material that can be used to determine the legitimacy of his elevated public stature.

There is a danger that the process of development of the screen star may be arrested in terms of what I have labeled as the actor as pure physical performer. In such a case, the categorization of "type" overcomes the actor's possibility of creating subjective differences in character portrayals. If the type is replicable by other performers, then the inherent value of the emerging screen star is limited. One can see this operation of the economics of film production in relationship to stardom most starkly in the relatively rapid positioning and replacing of female screen presentations. For example, in the James Bond series of films, there has been a consistency in the actors who have played Bond. Sean Connery became synonymous with the Bond persona through the 1960s, as did Roger Moore in the 1970s and 1980s. In contrast, the women in these films have been constructed to be infinitely replaceable, because the nature of their fame is built entirely on their physical performance. The basis of their physical performance is dependent on their ability to present alluring images of the female body. Although the Bond character clearly represents a "type," the patterning of that type engages an elaboration of performance beyond a clear aesthetic of beauty. Built into the type is a construction of masculine allure that permits a greater degree of action, power, and will. The very legitimate characterization of the many female actors who have appeared in the Bond films as the "Bond girls" underlines the film industry's systematic maintenance of a female stardom stalled and often imprisoned within the confines of the category of the physical performer.<sup>40</sup>

### The Picture Personality

The progression from physical performer to "picture personality" is the principal subject of DeCordova's in-depth analysis of the early history of screen stardom.<sup>41</sup> It is also analogous to the progression of the individual star from clearly formulated representation of "type" on the screen to the substantiation of the character type through the development of a public profile of the actor that is fundamentally extratextual in the contemporary moment. The key difference between the picture personality and the physical performer in the past was that the actor's name, as opposed to the character's name or type, be-