

Space and Theatre

Marvin Carlson

Theatre as an artistic and cultural activity has been the subject of academic speculation ever since the Greeks, but it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century that European and American scholars institutionalized a field of theatre studies. A significant part of this new field's self-definition involved a clear splitting away from traditional literary studies, within which theatre had previously had its academic home.

The entire Western tradition, from the Greeks onward, considered the drama primarily as a branch of literature—the other basic divisions being the epic and the lyric. Traditionally theatre scholarship was based upon the literary text (Aristotle's indifference to spectacle is an early and notorious example of this bias) and the actual process of the physical realization of this text, while not entirely ignored, was a matter of considerably less interest.

Two pioneering theatre scholars presented a radical challenge to this orientation at the turn of the nineteenth century, Brander Matthews in the United States and Max Herrmann in Germany. Their new perspective, which was bitterly resisted by many of their colleagues in both countries, was not to reject the study of literary drama, but to insist that such study was incomplete unless one went beyond the literary text to consider the physical conditions of performance, the spatial realization of that text. Thus it is no exaggeration to say that the foundation of modern theatre studies was grounded upon a spatial reorientation—from the linear reading of drama to the three-dimensional staging of it. Matthews, who in 1899 was named the first professor of dramatic literature in an English-speaking university, was particularly interested in a spatial concern, the shape of historic theatres and the relation of that space to the plays presented in them. In his 1910 *A Study of the Drama*, he stated this fundamental principle in these terms: "It is impossible to consider the drama profitably apart from the theatre in which it was born and in which it reveals itself in its completest perfection" (Matthews 3). The scale models of historical theatres built to illustrate performance spaces by Matthews and his students may still be seen at Columbia University in New York. In a very fundamental way, the new orientation introduced by Herrmann and Matthews still serves as the most widely accepted model for historical research in theatre, as may be seen in a very recent articulation of the aims of the discipline by one of its leading scholars, Robert D. Hume. In a survey article on the "Aims, Materials, and Methodology" of theatre history in his period of specialization, 1660-1800, Hume observes: "I would suggest that one crucial function of the theatre historian is *to demonstrate how production and performance circumstances affected the writing and public impact of plays*" (11). One could hardly ask for a clearer or more concise statement of the Herrmann/Matthews project.

Although the establishment of theatre studies as a discipline offered a new methodology and new sources of investigation, its object for most of the twentieth century remained essentially the same as that of the tradition of dramatic literature in which it was grounded. That object was to provide a fuller and deeper understanding of the largely European works of the traditional canon. Theatre studies maintained a consistent, if unacknowledged position as an adjunct to literature and its basic goal to provide a better understanding of the dramas of canonical literary figures like Shakespeare, Schiller, and Molière. This is why the single spatial investigation in the field of theatre history that has inspired by far the most scholarship is the question of what exactly was the physical stage upon which Shakespeare worked. John Cranford Adam's 1942 *The Globe Playhouse* was a leading early example, but books or essays on the subject are now legion, encouraged of course by the recent physical re-creation of an imitation of the theatre near its original site in London.

Although the interest of Matthews and Herrmann was focused on a particular physical space, that where the play was presented, it must not be forgotten that theatre has always involved a great many other spaces, some physical and some imaginary. The fictional character in drama, like fictional characters in epic or lyric literature, is situated in an evoked space, sometimes referred to as the "imaginary world" of the fiction, and which is conjured up in the mind of the reader as a part of the receptive process. The "imaginary world" of the dramatic character is phenomenologically more complex in actual staging because a part of it, often a tiny part but always a part central to the dramatic action, is present as a real space visible to the audience, while the rest, like the entire imaginary world of the novel or poem, is traditionally evoked primarily through language.

Within the theatre, this linguistically evoked world is normally referred to as "off-stage" space, although that term is not widely found in theatrical theory. In the early days of semiotics, Kier Elam calling this space diegetic space, following Plato and Aristotle, who made a basic distinction between mimesis, the showing of an action, and diegesis, the narration of it (see 111). Much European drama relies heavily upon such diegetic spaces, from the space where three roads meet that saw the fatal encounter of Oedipus and Laius, through the riverbank where Ophelia died, to the green head on the coastal background of *Riders to the Sea*.

An important attempt at articulating an analytic vocabulary of onstage and offstage spaces was offered in a 1989 essay by Tim Fitzpatrick, "The Dialectics of Space-Time Dramaturgical and Directorial Strategies for Performance and Fictional World." Here Fitzpatrick argued that the so-called offstage space is in fact composed of many different kinds of space, beginning with the division into what he calls "localized off" and "unlocalized off" (60, 62). Localized off refers to spaces that are physically contiguous to the viewed setting, immediately accessible through a window, perhaps, or a door, while unlocalized off refers to more remote spaces, existing only through linguistic reference, such as Moscow in *Three Sisters* or the remote Ugandan village of Ryanga from which Jack returns in Friel's *Dancing at Lughnasa*. Fitzpatrick's

system is particularly useful in the analysis of the entirely new critical and practical perspective on off-stage space opened in recent performance by the introduction of modern electronic technology, a subject to which I will return later.

Important as off-stage space is in the imaginary world created by the theatrical performance, the central space of that performance is of course that actually occupied by the performers and observed by the spectators. This space and how it has been changed and controlled has a central preoccupation of theatre history, as researchers have considered the permutations of the wing and drop system, or the development of the box set. An excellent example of such scholarship is Richard Southern's classic *Changeable Scenery: Its Origin and Development in the British Theatre*.

The space of the audience, from which this performance is observed, has received lesser, but still significant attention. With the development of indoor theatres in the renaissance, theatre's normal spatial arrangement became the form still dominant today, an audience space and a performance space, separated by some form of proscenium arch. Somewhat surprisingly, for all its visual advantages, the move to an indoor theatre resulted in a serious diminishment in the ability of the performer to exploit the potentials of the space traditionally provided for his activity.

The creation of permanent indoor theatre spaces allowed for the development of elaborate scenic backgrounds, first in Italy and then throughout Europe, but this increase in visual spectacle was at the cost of the performers' previous flexibility with the stage space. With movement indoors, illumination assumed an importance unknown in previous performance situations, and all the ingenuity of the renaissance and baroque designs could not create an adequately illuminated stage space that would allow actors the freedom of movement within that space that they had enjoyed in open-air production. Almost the only illumination for the acting area came from the chandeliers that illuminated the auditorium, and while the development of footlights provided more visibility for the actors' space, these actors, if they wished to be seen, still had to move within a long, narrow band at the front of the stage. The result, as can be seen in the few seemingly reliable sketches and engravings we have of pre-nineteenth century performance, was that the actors normally lined up across the stage, utilizing very little of the space open behind them.

From the beginning of the modern indoor theatre in the renaissance until the beginning of the nineteenth century, then, the stage space, although in fact dimensional, was from the audience's point of view, and the actors' use of this space more like a painting, or at best a bas-relief. With the development of significant projectable and controllable lighting, however, performers could once again fully utilize stage space for desired effects to an extent that had been possible to them before the theatre moved indoors. Although the idea of the proscenium arch framing an essentially flat "stage picture" was still common throughout the nineteenth century, theatre practitioners from the romantic period on began to see stage space in a different way, first fully articulated in theory by Adolphe Appia at the end of the century, who characterized the stage space not as an animated painting, but as a cubic, three-dimensional space,

the living forms within it defined by light. The process of arranging the bodies of the actors within the stage space that in English is now called blocking begins to appear in the early nineteenth century in the notes and sketches of Goethe and in the first published promptbooks in France.

Although the space on stage is obviously of central interest to students of theatre, audience spaces have not been neglected. Though the founders of modern theatre studies like Matthews focused upon questions of staging, their reconstruction of historical theatres led them also to consider from the beginnings the implications of the obvious spatial differences in audience arrangements of the classic Greek theatre, the Elizabethan stage, and the clearly socially divided audiences of the eighteenth century theatres.

I have already mentioned Richard Southern's highly innovative *The Seven Ages of the Theatre* which attempted, as early as 1961, to provide a fresh approach to theatre history that challenged the two most distinctive features of previous major works in the field, the standard pattern of periodization—the Greeks, the Romans, medieval theatre, the renaissance, and succeeding centuries in chronological order, and the strong bias toward the literary canon, primarily that of England, France, and Germany. Southern begins his book by attempting to reduce theatre to its essence, the first of what he calls its “seven ages.” He finds this in the encounter between Player and Audience. “Take these apart,” he concludes, “and you can have no theatre” (Southern 21). Thus spatiality is placed at the most fundamental level of theatre studies and the spaces of performer and spectator given equal fundamental emphasis.

In fact the attention of theatre historians has been directed as much toward audience as performance spaces. Almost all of this work appeared in the later twentieth century, and was concerned, directly or indirectly, with how the spatial arrangements of the auditorium have reflected social status. The obvious social implications of such spaces as the Elizabethan pit or the royal and aristocratic boxes were remarked upon by theatre historians as soon as Matthews and his students began to study physical theatres, but such analysis became more important later as some theatre historians, in examining non-literary aspects of theatre, became interested in theatre as a social rather than an artistic phenomenon. A relatively early example was James J. Lynch's 1953 book, subtitled *Stage and Society in Johnson's London*. Its main title significantly looked to the spatial arrangement of audiences as the basic representation of this social orientation: *Box, Pit, and Gallery*. The rise of a specific sociology of theatre, pioneered by Georges Gurvich and Jean Duvignaud in France in the 1950s and 1960s, encouraged more of this sort of historical analysis. Thus, for example, Timothy Murray, in his 1977 “Richelieu's Theatre: The Mirror of a Prince,” suggested how the spatial arrangements of this key historical structure expressed and reinforced a whole system of social power relationships (see Murray 275-97). More recently, Joseph Donohue's 2005 *Fantasies of Empire* uses the controversies surrounding the arrangement of audience space in this theatre to illuminate a broad spectrum of social, political, moral and legal questions in Victorian England.

Only recently have theatre scholars begun to consider theatrical spaces beyond those of the stage and the auditorium. The generally neglected backstage spaces, important as they are to the functioning of what the public sees, have been rarely studied or even mentioned in our historical studies, and yet they also not only reflect social status but provide all manner of additional information about the actual physical creation and operation of the performance. Gay McAuley's *Space in the Theatre* is—to the best of my knowledge—the only modern attempt, aside from technical architectural studies, to consider in any detail these neglected spaces, both in the front and in the back of the theatre house. The former she designates as audience space and the latter as practitioner space, neither of course so fully documented or studied as stage space. Indeed she also includes a consideration of an even less known or documented space, rehearsal space, which, though never seen by the public “can have a significant impact on the final production” (McAuley 70).

Not all of the spaces so far discussed, those of the performer, the spectator and in the case of a theatre building, the space which unites and includes these other spaces, have been considered with equal attention by theatre historians, but together they have made up the central spatial concerns of traditional theatre history. Naturally they shared the often unacknowledged biases of that tradition, most notably an interest in the theatre of Europe and the United States, to the almost total exclusion of the rest of the world, and an interest in the staging of canonical plays to the almost total exclusion of so-called popular or minor forms. During the 1970s and 1980s, however, these biases began to be widely exposed and challenged. Many things contributed to this major shift in the field of theatre studies, but probably the most distinct and the most clearly involved with these challenges was the rise of the new approach that came to be known as performance studies.

Other cultural changes added further impetus to this change. One clearly was modern globalization, creating a world view in which theatre history could no longer casually ignore whole continents like Africa, South America, or Australia, or confine its study of Asia to a handful of manifestations, mostly Japanese. Another was a rise in interest in popular culture, forcing attention to the vast array of popular forms of theatre hitherto ignored by the high art bias of the tradition. Both of these were also reinforced by a major change within the study of art itself, especially the performing arts. Just as the study of theatre had from the beginning been dominated, and somewhat distorted, by critical models derived from literary studies, so the study of the performing arts in general had operated on a model derived from the plastic arts, and the concept of the art object. A key expression of the change that took place in this attitude during the 1970s was Gerald Hinkle's 1979 book, *Art as Event*. Hinkle's argument was that critical understanding of the performing arts has been hampered by the application to them of strategies evolved in the plastic arts and literature, where performance is not essential. Theatre should be viewed “more as an event than an object in perception” (Hinkle 40).

Looking beyond the spatial assumptions of the European literary theatre encourages the theatre historian to be conscious of performance spaces more prominent in other cultures, and of their very different histories and association. A 2008 article that I co-authored with a Moroccan scholar provides a sample of such research, based on the circular performance space, the *halqa*, widely found in traditional Arab culture and recently taking on a new meaning as a post-colonial reaction to European performance spaces. Aside from the post-colonial dynamic of this spatial choice, the article considers the relationship of the *halqa* to various cultural traditions of North Africa and the Middle East, its use in folk festivals, popular gatherings, and in the tradition of the traveling storyteller, and finally its mystic and religious associations (see Amine and Carlson 71-86).

This different perspective also opened many new ways of looking at space and the theatrical event even in the much-studied European tradition. No longer was the focus upon the embodiment of a particular dramatic text, but upon the whole social and physical context of the event. To the best of my knowledge, the first theatre historian to utilize this new perspective was Michael Hays, who began his 1974 book *The Public and Performance: Essays in the History of French and German Theater 1871-1900* with an essay entitled "Theater Space as Cultural Paradigm." It opens with this striking spatial observation: "Until recently, the social value and function of the buildings, the architectural forms which enclose the theater event, have remained largely unexplored territory. Critical investigation has instead focused attention on the smaller space of the stage or on the actor and the director." Hays goes on to assert that the location and shape of the performance area potentially provides the information "which first allows us to propose a connection between the ordering principles of the theater event and those of society at large (3).

Richard Schechner was another pioneer in such analysis, though from a more anthropological than socio-cultural direction. In his major 1975 essay "Toward a Poetics of Performance" he observes that: "too little study has been made of the liminal approaches and leavings of performance—how the audience gets to, and into, the performance place, and how they go from that place" (Schechner 122). To take a single famous example, clearly the necessity of crossing the Thames by boat to reach the marginal, quasi-respectable entertainment district of Bankside, where the major Elizabethan public theatres were located, was a significant part of the mental contextualization of attending those theatres. The study of such space has now become an important new dimension in the analysis of both historical and contemporary theatres. As Susan Bennett observes in her 1997 *Theatre Audiences*, "the milieu which surrounds a theatre is always ideologically encoded" and thus "shapes a spectator's experience," and uses this insight to analyze the geography of Joan Littlewood's Theatre Workshop and a variety of other nineteenth and twentieth century theatres (126-30).

Perhaps the most important recent addition to the consideration of space in the theatre has been stimulated by the growing use of live video and digital imaging.

These technologies together are today creating new spatial dimensions and even new concepts of space in theatres around the world. Film, of course, has been with us now for over a century and almost from its beginning was utilized by experimental theatre artists. While clearly a film onstage presents an image of another space, however, it remains simply that, an image, not actually a space. If, for example, instead of the Queen providing a narrative describing the physical location of Ophelia's death—"There is a willow grows aslant a brook" (Shakespeare 166)—we should see at the back of the stage a film of this space, this space would remain still an essentially absent, narrated space for audiences watching the performance. Such filmic images Thomas Irmir has usefully designated as "second level" images, not fully integrated into the scene on stage but operating rather more like "footnotes to the stage picture" (22). Their primary use has nothing to do with the extension or elaboration of the scenic spaces but rather, as Patrice Pavis has suggested, has been "to provide background or ironic comment on the stage action" (125).

A very different visual space, however, is created by the ever-increasing introduction of live video into the performance area. There was an enormous expansion of such experimentation in Europe in the 1990s, perhaps most notably in the work of German directors like Frank Castorf and René Pollesch. In a series of productions beginning in the late 1980s such directors began utilizing live video as a way of creating a new sort of theatrical space, a real space located somewhere between onstage and off. As one of its practitioners, Jan Spechenbach, has explained: "The paradoxical nature of the process of bringing the means of live transmission into a space that is involved in nothing other than transmitting a selection of this space makes filmic explorations possible that are not possible either in traditional film or video" (80). The constant renegotiation between the mimetic and the diegetic, which in the most extreme cases involves not only onstage and offstage space but audience spaces, lobbies, and dressing rooms, poses significant new challenges to theatre analysts seeking to chronicle and explain the experience such work offers.

The German theatre critic Thomas Oberender has suggested that recent theatrical use of video is primarily of two types, which he calls *Einspielung* and *Live-Produktion*. In the process of *Einspielung* the video is used in the same way that film has traditionally been used in the theatre—a sequence created at some earlier time is played simultaneously with live action in the present. *Live-Produktion*, on the other hand, takes advantage of the potential immediacy of video by placing alongside the live action on stage a living picture actually taking place at the same time. According to Oberender, the first production in Germany to utilize *Live-Produktion* was Fred Kelemen's staging of *Desire*, based on Eugene O'Neill's *Desire Under the Elms* and presented at the small experimental stage, the Prater, in 2001.

For *Desire*, Kelman created an onstage bungalow composed of rooms some of which were visible to the audience and some hidden from direct sight but observed by live video cameras. Thus the offstage actors seen as video images were no longer in some unidentified space but in an actual onstage room which the audience could

physically locate but not see within. The result was a new blend of the impressions normally associated with live theatre and film. Even though the audience was aware that the actress they had just seen live on stage was still performing live, the effect of seeing her on screen was essentially the same as the familiar “absent” depictions of conventional film or video.

In order to fully break away from that deeply conditioned effect, another staging innovation was necessary, which Castorf introduced in his next major production, a Dostoevsky adaptation, *Injured and Humiliated*. The setting was again a several-room bungalow, surmounted by a large video screen, but in the larger Volksbühne Castorf could combine this staging with a turntable, so that, unlike *Desire*, the hidden offstage spaces could be revealed live as well as by video. Thus the production opened with a scene of a group of actors chatting in a living room, seen only on the large overhead screen. Then the stage revolved, revealing this scene being broadcast from another room, now visible through a wall of glass doors. However, this revolving not only revealed the actors and room, but the video camera and its crew filming the scene, something never seen in *Desire*. Thus the audience was simultaneously presented with a live action, its video projection, and the apparatus by which this projection is being created. This marked a fundamental step forward for such experimentation, in that Castorf foregrounded the fact that with video the image and its space can for the first time become a part of the lived moment in which it is generated, creating a feedback loop in which the medium becomes a part of the reality in which it is embedded.

Castorf’s video artist and camera operator, Jan Speckenbach, has characterized theatre of this sort as a kind of “live cubism.” The effect sought is that of a collage of selected views, of fragmented perspectives, of discrepant ways of seeing which never coalesce into a unified vision. It makes possible a kind of “filmic exploration” that is impossible either in traditional theatre, film or video by “bringing the means of live transmission into a space that is involved in nothing other than transmitting a selection of this space” (78). One reviewer of *Insulted and Humiliated* described the visual complexity of Speckenbach’s design in these words: “Cameras . . . are mounted all over this labyrinthine container-set, parts of which we never see directly except as glimpses through open doors or peeks behind patched-up windows.” Nor do the cameras remain stationary. They are on occasion “picked up by actors who follow other actors into this Everyman-warren that is also a forlorn No Man’s Land” (Rouse 14).

Spatially speaking, these turn of the century experiments by Castorf and others basically utilized live video to blur the boundaries between virtual and diegetic, between onstage and offstage space. All the spaces experienced have a grounding in physical and contemporary reality, even if we can access them only through the eye of the camera. A more radical sort of performative space has been developed by other groups, first in dance and then in certain experimental theatre companies. In the 1999 dance piece *Friends*, by Netherlands choreographer Krisztina de Chatel, for example, dancers simultaneously performing in widely separated spaces were brought

together to seemingly dance with each other in an electronic space which had no actual physical reality, and audiences could observe this space alone or in conjunction with one or another of its various components. Electronically created space, of various kinds, has been built into the recent work of a number of experimental theatre groups in the United States and in Europe.

One of the best leaders in such work was the Big Art group, founded in 1998 with the stated aim of using “the language of media and blended states of performance in a unique form to build culturally transgressive and challenging new works” (bigartgroup.com). Typically they use several different live video cameras to capture separate images which are then combined in form a new image in virtual space. Instead of locating these cameras in widely separated locations in the manner of de Chatel’s *Friends*, however, they place them in different parts of the stage, so that the audience can simultaneously see the collage of combined images and its component parts. Let us take for example a sequence in the production *Flicker* in which a character is pursued through the woods by a knife-wielding maniac. The actress in fact runs in place, her back toward the stage-right camera, looking back over her shoulder at the camera and presumably at her pursuer, whom we see in another digital image brandishing a knife. In fact, as the audience can clearly see, he is neither running nor anywhere near the actress, but is being filmed in another location. As the run continues, the digital body of the actress is replaced in virtual space by that of a male actor in a red wig and costume similar to hers. As the “run” continues, it provides another replacement in this same virtual space. In the traditional theatre, such a run would be quite difficult to stage since its spatial demands are much more suitable to the film, and it would be surely presented as a brief sequence performed by a single actress. In *Flicker*, on the other hand, this coherent body exists only in digital space, while the audience is simultaneously aware of that digital coherent body and of the contributing and varied parts of this body in various parts of actual stage space around it.

In the United States, experiments with virtual space have so far been confined to small theatres, but in Europe, a number of major directors and companies, inspired by the work of German directors like Castorf in the 1990s have recently begun to incorporate live video to introduce new spaces into their productions, and their tours have exposed such experimentation to an international audience. The Flemish director Ivo van Hove toured widely with his 1997 production of Moliere’s *The Misanthrope*, which utilized live video projections of the actors throughout, occasionally following them offstage into the dressing areas. The 2000 production of Peter Weiss’s *Marat/Sade* by the Triumviratus Art Group of Varna, Bulgaria, featured a very large video monitor/screen mounted directly above the stage, as in recent productions of Castorf, so that the audience was always offered a double focus of live and mediated spaces. On this screen appeared not only different perspectives of on-stage action, as in Big Art, but views of live action off-stage as in Castorf, going not only into the dressing rooms, lobbies, and spaces actually outside the physical theatre, but also into the

audience, so that spectators while experiencing their own personal space could also see it appearing on the stage monitor.

In Katie Mitchell's 2007 staging of Virginia Woolf's *The Waves* at the National Theatre in London, Woolf's multilayered and internalized novel was brought to life on stage by utilizing much the same techniques as those of Mason's Big Art Group. The setting consisted only of a long table center stage but the visual focus was divided between the actors working around (and on) this table, and the large video screen above them which in the manner of Castorf and Triumverus offered a continually changing master visual image and which in the manner of Big Art was an image existing only in this virtual space and constructed by observed movements and manipulations of the actors beneath it on the main stage. Thus, for example, in the scene "London 1906" a pair of actors sits at one end of the long table and another pair at the other end, while two cameras merge them on the overhead into a foursome sitting at an apparently small restaurant table. Similar constructions of merged characters, characters and scenery, and visual special effects provide an ongoing visual narrative on the overhead screen very much in the manner of Big Art.

In his excellent study on the phenomenology of theatre, *Great Reckonings in Little Rooms*, Bert States advanced what he considered the most basic phenomenological feature of this art: "Theatre is the medium, par excellence, that consumes the real in its realest forms: man, his language, his rooms and cities, his weapons and tools, his other arts, animals, fire, and water—even, finally, theatre itself" (8). Some recent performance theorists have argued that in this mediatized age, the living element of theatre is being consumed by video, but these recent international experiments suggest that, on the contrary, the omnivorous appetite of theatre can encompass not only video itself, but, on a deeper level, the reversion of video back into life in the objects of its view and the subjects controlling that view. Thus virtual space has not proven inimical to theatre, but an extension of its possibilities, making its on contribution to the complex and always shifting interplay of reality and illusion, presence and absence, distance and empathy, which has always been a part of the theatre experience.

Works Cited

- Amine, Khalid, and Marvin Carlson. "Al-halqa in Arabic Theatre: An Emerging Site of Hybridity." *Theatre Journal* 60.1 (2008): 71-86. Print.
- Bennett, Susan. *Theatre Audiences*. London: Routledge, 1997. Print.
- Elam, Kier. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London: Methuen, 1980. Print.
- Fitzpatrick, Tim. "The Dialectics of Space-Time Dramaturgical and Directorial Strategies for Performance and Fictional World." *Performance: From Product to Process*. Ed. Tim Fitzpartick. Sydney: Frederick May Foundation, 1989. 49-112. Print.

- Hays, Michael. *The Public and Performance: Essays in the History of French and German Theater 1871-1900*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research P, 1974. Print.
- Hinkle, Gerald. *Art as Event: an aesthetic for the performing arts*. Washington: UP of America, 1979. Print.
- Hume, Robert D. "Theatre History 1660-1800: Aims, Material, Methodology." *Players, Playwrights, Plahouses: Investigating Performance, 1660-1800*. Ed. Michael Cordner and Peter Holland. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007. 9-44. Print.
- Irmir, Thomas. "Das Theater der neuen Sehens: Zum Einsatz von Video und Film bei Frank Castorf Rene Pollesch und Olaf Nicolai." Ed. Thomas J. Kleiner and Holger Ostwald. *Quadratur: Kulturbuch 5* (2003): 130-34. Print.
- Matthews, Brander. *A Study of the Drama*. Boston, Chicago, New York: Riverside, 1910. Print.
- McAuley, Gay. *Space in Performance: Making Meaning in the Theatre*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1999. Print.
- Murray, Timothy. "Richelieu's Theatre: The Mirror of a Prince." *Renaissance Drama n.s.* 8 (1977): 275-97. Print.
- Pavis, Patrice. *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. Trans. Loren Kruger. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Rouse, John, and Marvin Carlson. "The 2002 Berlin Theatertreffen." *Western European Stages* 14:3 (Fall, 2002): 5-24. Print.
- Schechner, Richard. *Essays on Performance Theory 1970-1976*. New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1977. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet, Prince of Danemark*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.
- Southern, Richard. *The Seven Ages of the Theatre*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961. Print.
- Speckenbach, Jan. "Der Einbruch der Fernsehtechnologie." *Einbruch der Realität: Politik und Verbrechen*. Ed. Carl Hegemann. Berlin: Alexander, 2002. 80-84. Print.
- States, Bert O. *Great Reckonings in Little Rooms*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985. Print.